

17  
16

As we have seen, Mailer regarded the CIA as the greatest of domestic dangers to the nation, so great a danger that if they paid him \$500 per person first they would be allowed to hear about and join his planned "democratic police."

A man of principle, no less; a man willing to incur official displeasure when he alleged all sorts of dastardly deeds to those officials <sup>who</sup> were were offended, suspicious, wrong-head, mazi<sup>v</sup> minded of just ordinary intelligence and police cowboys running wild in their ~~rod~~ rodeos in which people <sup>w</sup>re cattle to them.

Principled and brave, a real Dick Daring, that is Mailer, <sup>re</sup> portrayed by Mailer himself.

Lacing the lan<sup>d</sup> with it in all his speeches, for which it ~~is~~ just happened he got rather decent fees.

This was in 1973 and 1974. He wrote a book about these intelligence horrors, as he ~~sw~~ them big book, even for Mailer a big book ~~Harlot's Ghost~~ Harlot's Ghost appeared in 1976.

The ~~surprise~~ ~~in~~ the New York Times of February 3, 1991, ~~the~~ <sup>Under this</sup> ~~the~~ ~~three~~ ~~had~~ ~~line~~ of Elaine Sciolino's story ~~contains~~ includes:

When ~~it~~ ~~gave~~ ~~24~~ ~~pages~~ ~~for~~ ~~an~~ ~~article~~ ~~to~~ ~~which~~ ~~it~~ ~~devoted~~ ~~it~~ ~~highly~~ ~~critically~~. *in its August 16, 1976 issue*

New York magazine gave Mailer 24 pages for the text of the article he wrote for it and the entire cover except for the magazine's name. More than a third of the cover is taken up with "MAILER ON THE CIA." About a quarter of the cover reads, "A Harlot High and Low: Reconnoitering Through The Secret Government."

This "reconnoitering" was by the Mailer who had never been there. Not once. But Mailer being Mailer, he "reconnoitered" it anyway. Authoritatively, pointedly and a bit excitedly.

Underneath a half page of heading<sup>es</sup> facing the first page of his text is, in large type, "A long trail ~~is~~ fested by the CIA's 'moles' leads ~~to~~ from the death of Marilyn Monroe to Watergate. ~~By~~ this analysis, the author explores the bizarre, interconnecting <sup>y</sup> borrows underneath it all."

It means "who benefits?"

Why attribute it to ancient Latins, if you are a Mailer, when you can excite people by attributing his version of it to Lenin.

With all the name Lenin brings to mind. All the prejudice, too.

It is but

*opens*

*both  
CIA jobs.*

Not bad for beginners, inferring that Marilyn Monroe's death and Watergate are CIA jobs.

*while*

On the first page, inferring again and saying there is no proof, he again has the CIA as the "producer of Watergate."

By his substitute for proof: inference, assumption and what is with him called "analysis."

Actually it is mostly rehash with a special "ailler interpretation that is sometimes facilitated by a bit of his amateur shrinkery.

It is real penny-dreadful stuff than most publishers would have laughed at without a name like Mailer's on it, one that would numb the reviewers and commentators. To those who had no knowledge or recollection of what was live on coast-to-coast TV and on the newspaper pages three years earlier perhap it was stimulating to read, set off with italics:

*indent + single space*

"The master who taught me the deadliest of Oriental ~~arts~~ martial arts taught me that the outcome of a battle is decided in the minds of the opponents before the first blow is struck." - Gordon Liddy."

In the course of blowing up a case out of nothing "ailler gets really schoalrly:

*indent + single space*

"There is a tool of inquiry provided by Lenin...ask the question: 'Whom?' Whom does this benefit? Whom did the Watergate benefit?..." (page 44)

Long befor<sup>h</sup> Nicholai was a gleam in any eye ~~Quid habet cui bono~~ was a Latin maxim question and it had long been a maxim for lawyers to ask themselves as they thought about their cases that were not entirely clear. 18A

But ~~it is~~ one of Mailer's neat tricks. Another is ~~his~~ powerful ~~analysis~~ <sup>the</sup> weapon Mailer employs to make the nonexistent- not even rational conjecture - ~~with~~ case that the Watergate was a CIA job.

Watergate<sup>and</sup> ex-CIA spook E. Howard Hunt's wife was the bag lady for the Committee to Re-elect the President, not inappropriately known as CREEP. <sup>She</sup> died when the airplane <sup>to a cutoff who was to get it</sup> which she was taking the payoff to those capture. That ~~crash~~ <sup>crash</sup> was near Chicago's Midway airport. It was not a mysterious ~~crash~~ <sup>crash</sup> save to those who live for inventing mysteries.

Because Dorothy Hunt was on the plane plane, as with other aspects the fabled ~~Water-~~

19

Senate Watergate committee made an investigation that while extolled by the media as the best of possible investigations was much less of an investigation than was <sup>believed</sup> indicated.

For example, with the question of the source of that crooked money so important and no record of it having come from any bank, that derring-do committee did not get the serial numbers of the large-denomination bill. Large withdrawals in cash in such denomination are required to be recorded by the banks. I got them by asking a Chicago reporter to ask the sheriff's office for them. The Chicago papers did not even seek and publish those numbers that could have lead to the source of all that illegal money.

*Some "investigation," official and journalistic.*

But there was no reason to believe that the plane was sabotaged.

Read by the CIA.

Which is the case Mailer is phonying up.

With that for him magical "if.":

"If Hunt and Dorothy Hunt had known a great deal about Dallas (which involves both both the JFK assassination and in Mailerese the CIA) and were threatening to tell the world, the n Hunt would not have to brood over such details. He could assume his wife's plane had been sabotaged to crash. Of course we would not be talking about anguish, but masterplans <sup>to</sup> and last-reel perils. The likelihood is that Hunt and Dorothy were tapped in a smaller game, and the crash was a mixture of inefficiency, cynical ~~management~~ maintenance maintenance and who knows? - some overloaded psychic intensity among the passengers."

*indent & single space*

There is, naturally, not the slightest reason even to suspect, that powerful

Mailer "if", that ~~the~~ "Hunt and Dorothy had known" anything at all, leave alone Mailer's "great deal" about Dallas.

It is pretty horrible to suggest that the CIA killed an entire pl<sup>n</sup>eload of people and than over a major city wht, with the added deaths possible, on the ground in the thousands, <sup>just</sup> to kill one woman - a non-Mailer "if" - if it had wanted to.

But there are Pulitzers in such uses of the tiny word "if" to give ~~an~~ enormous meaning <sup>to what</sup> and cannot ~~honestly~~ <sup>any</sup> ~~mean~~ <sup>meaning at all.</sup> especially when the whole concept is ~~any~~ as well as baseless.

*But*

And without them such articles cannot be foisted off on trusting readers (whether or not the editors are conned when <sup>they</sup> see ~~nothing~~ green that folds) by those so impressed by their omniscience that they do make ~~our history~~ fiction of our history - for <sup>o</sup>mney.

However one may evaluate this childishness contrived in long words, it is still <sup>Mailer</sup> Mailer, in 1976, roughly equating the CIA with the Gestapo and the KGB, without any holocausts. (Other than <sup>of innocents</sup> that Dorothy Hunt <sup>planeload</sup>.)

That a be-Pilitzered writer would be so indifferent to his making such a fool of himself and so indiffer<sup>e</sup>rent to the national harm from it is not as bewildering as it once was. But in this kind of irresponsible ,immature writing Mailer was doing to his reputation what no enemy could do to it.

As it seems Mailer himself began to understand by early 1994. <sup>PP</sup> The CIA then extended an invitation for him to visit and speak to them. <sup>A</sup> Surprise? <sup>PP</sup> The <sup>N</sup> even more of a surprise, given all he had said about it, Mailer accepted the CIA's invitations.

With pictures <sup>New York Times</sup> the CIA gave that momentous event about a full page. <sup>on February 3, 1992</sup> Under the three deck headline that reads

Mailer ~~is~~ Visits CIA  
And Finds he's  
With Friends. Really,

~~Elaine~~ Elaine Sciolino's story includes:

#21  
indent to  
single space

WASHINGTON, Feb. 2 — Like the narrator of "Harlot's Ghost" who devised convoluted schemes to avoid detection in his spy posts overseas, Norman Mailer quietly slipped in and out of the Central Intelligence Agency last week.

Although the veteran novelist spent seven years writing his 1,310-page book on the agency and its role in American life, the visit marked the first time he had set foot in its sprawling headquarters on the banks of the Potomac, invited as part of its guest speaker program.

But why was Norman Mailer, the lifelong promoter of the left, receiving a standing ovation from a standing-room-only crowd of more than 500 officials who crammed into the bubble-topped auditorium to hear him?

### A Reversal of Roles

And why did three dozen senior officers meet him afterward in the private conference room of Robert M. Gates, the Director of Central Intelligence, for a two-hour debate on subjects as wide-ranging as his definition of treason to the demise of Communism?

Had they all forgotten that this was the same Norman Mailer who between belts of bourbon at his 50th birthday party in 1973 announced the creation of a "people's C.I.A." to rein in a devious agency that he said threatened American democracy?

Forgotten, no, but perhaps forgiven. Over the years, as the cold war waned and then ended, both the author and his subject have mellowed. At one point during the long afternoon encounter it seemed that the world had changed so much that the two sides had reversed roles.

When Mr. Mailer confessed that he was not opposed to the C.I.A. conducting "wet jobs," K.G.B. slang for murder and assassination, and that the American people would not be upset if the agency assassinated President Saddam Hussein of Iraq, one career officer in the clandestine service said he was shaken.

"It really shocked me when he said that," the officer said. "We've been so conditioned to the fact that such operations are wrong, that they're illegal. Then you hear this and you gasp."

Mr. Mailer's novel is a glorification of the godless, life-and-death struggle against Communism from the mid-1950's to the mid-1960's and the men and women who waged it, a rare validation of an institution unaccustomed to accolades from the outside.

For him, the invitation to address the agency was an opportunity not only to see first hand the institution

he had studied so long from the outside but also to get its stamp of approval.

For the agency, the [redacted] of a former adversary proved just how far removed it is from its reputation as a pliant [redacted] and assassinations.

The visit, as described by officers and analysts interviewed later, also seemed to be splendid entertainment.

One longtime agency official recalled that in a gushy introduction

Richard Kerr, the Deputy Director of Central Intelligence, "talked about how Mailer was a World War II veteran, how he wrote 27 books, how he won the Pulitzer Prize twice, how he ran for the mayoralty of New York, how he went into the ring with Jose Torres."

"When Kerr said, 'Who would have ever thought I'd be here introducing Norman Mailer at Langley,' well, it

brought the house down," <sup>one official</sup> the official said.

Mr. Mailer surprised his audiences when he told them that even without a cold war the agency had a more important role than ever, a message that fit nicely with Mr. Gates's pronouncements that the agency's mission has not evaporated just because the Soviet Union has disintegrated.

"I told them that ideology distorts intelligence and that during the cold war they ended up being seen by the world at large as spoilers," Mr. Mailer said in an interview.

He called the danger of nuclear proliferation to the developing world "ragging, adding, now that the cold war is over, the C.I.A. can get out of the heart trap of ideology and begin to [redacted] intelligence on the rest of the world."

### Novel Draws Criticism

As for the novel itself, several agency officials dismissed Mr. Mailer's C.I.A. as not at all believable, not now, not ever.

[redacted] November [redacted] agent who [redacted] Watergate, [redacted] in his review of "Harlot's Ghost," the writer

who presumes [redacted] Mailer work [redacted] espionage without [redacted] young man [redacted] a promoter exit [redacted] patrons what it was like."

One veteran operations officer familiar with American intelligence even before the C.I.A. was created after World War II said the agency was never the free-for-all that Mr. Mailer describes, not even in the days

of William J. (Wild Bill) Donovan, the creator of the O.S.S., America's first coordinated intelligence agency.

"Anyone who worked for Bill Donovan knew perfectly well that you didn't run riot," he said. "Yes, he was a flamboyant man of endless ideas, 90 percent of which were wild. But in the last analysis, he was a sane, rational man, and the impression that his people were running off doing things with no sense of responsibility is not true."

A female C.I.A. analyst was more blunt. The aristocratic, larger-than-life, East-Coast, Ivy Leaguers with insatiable appetites for sex and duplicity, she said, "would never have passed the polygraph."

But when you have Norman Mailer in your presence, why quibble over facts? The audiences did not dwell on the inaccuracies in their craft or on his mixing up cryptonyms and pseudonyms. Neither did they break it to him that unlike his narrator, agency officials do not spend much of their time rock-climbing writing endless letters or taking three-month vacations in Maine.

"As a [redacted] one operations officer said, 'you have to get beyond the reticent British colonial mentality which says that jasmine don't smell in the Kashmir in September,' and that as result the whole book is worthless."

### Delight About Mistakes

On the contrary, some officials were delighted that in a world where secrecy is sacred, Mr. Mailer got it wrong. "It bothers you most when someone has a lot of sources in the agency and what is written is totally accurate," said one official who has worked both as an analyst and administrator. "You like to see inaccuracies."

Do it any wonder they loved Mailer?  
It do not indent

There is, fortunately, only one Norman Mailer. Also fortunately, there is only one CIA.

Sciolino asks the right question, <sup>u</sup>Why was Norman Mailer, the life-long promoter of the left, receiving a standing ovation from a standing-room only crowd of more than 500 CIA officials?

She did not have to answer this question. Her story did that.

And so we have the Mailer who was impelled to <sup>to oppose</sup>organize the CIA and who condemned all its barbarous acts, like assassinations, giving the officials of that CIA a pep talk in which he "confessed that he was not opposed to 'wet jobs', KGB slang for murder and assassinations, "if by the CIA."

That really shook those CIA officials up!