

*The*  
"WH Flap" or Baker's Report

One of Nixon's real problems was that, as the quoted comment of Time says, he had tried to use the CIA to deter investigations that were, in the last analysis of himself. Discouraging the investigation was obstructing justice. That is a crime. It is an impeachable offense. And by the time Baker's and the committee's reports appeared - the full committee's on July 13 - attention was focused on the actual impeachment proceedings in the House committee. That committee seemed likely to approve impeachment. The House itself seemed likely to vote impeachment. And this would have meant a trial of Nixon by the Senate.

The last thing Nixon needed was another impeachable offense.

Nixon's repeated and repeated explanation of his immediate misuse of the CIA to ~~excuse~~ Pat Gray's holding the FBI back for him is that he had this "national security" duty to protect the CIA, an "unrelated" proper activity of which in this alleged "national security" area could be jeopardized.

Actually, the only jeopardies of this character - and they were without "national security" character - ~~the~~ were the Mullen cover operation for the CIA and the laundering of the secret, illegal Nixon money. Both were relevant, not "unrelated."

But Nixon did need help. He needed the appearance of propriety. He needed anything that could improve his image because by then the polls had long been consistent in showing that his support had been reduced to his hardcore of the unthinking who showed up as only a little above 25% approval of him as President.

Baker's face was well egged, too, because his "report" had laid the egg that smeared him. It was a nothing. It suppressed well-known and reported names, hid relevant facts, and while pretending to be an expose of the CIA, it omitted what was well-known. It was a one-day story and that was a failure. The real attention it got was from the inspired leaks it did not live up to. It in no way accomplished its ends that were hidden from those who would not see only, promoting Baker and his career and helping Nixon, intertwined objectives.

For the Nixons and the Bakers there is but one solution to this kind of problem:

"public relations." That "PR firm" went right to work, washing the Nixon and Baker faces.

"C.I.A. Agent Said to Give Secrets to Russian in 1972" read the upper deck of The New York Times' headline on its front-page story by John H. Crewdson. The line-line lower deck built sensation on sensation: "A Report Drunken American Disclosed to Soviet Aide What He Knew Emerges as Result of Watergate Inquiry."

The reader need not trouble himself. Not a word of it is true. This makes it more important because had there been such a drunken CIA agent and had he told a Russian spy all this and the later stories allege, there still would have been no real harm.

Crewdson, naturally, gives no source. Traditionally, a lurid tale like this needs none, on the assumption the intelligence services never talk hence can't be quoted.

The only connection with Watergate, and that was contrived, is reference in one of the suppressed CIA reports to a "W H Flap" over which there was an internal CIA flap. Because of his involvement in Watergate, Bennett and the Bullen agency had to be cut off from CIA.

There was the pretense that all the foregoing in this book, all of which was publicly available and all the sources of which save one are given, somehow was secret from the Russians. There was the pretense, as late as July 1972 inside CIA and July 1974 in the Baker report that the use of Bullen as a CIA front was a secret!

The reality is that his personal participation with Hunt, Liddy, Gregory and in the wide assortment of dirty tricks he proposed ~~xxxxxxx~~ to his White House cronies and in his personal laundering of almost a quarter of a million dollars in secret campaign funds made Bennett too great a liability. He had to be offed.

The day of his delayed report to the CIA his case worker whose name, Martin Lukasky, was censored from Baker's report, ~~xxxx~~ wrote saying that "if the Bullen cover is terminated the Watergate could not be used as an excuse." The Baker pretense is that the CIA could not tell Bullen that its cover had been breached.

"W H Flap" to the rescue! With this opening to Crewdson's story:

*martin pub*

# Hunt says He Spied On Goldwater for LBJ

By Lawrence Meyer and John Hanrahan  
Washington Post Staff Writers

Watergate conspirator E. Howard Hunt Jr. has told the staff of the Senate select Watergate committee that he conducted surveillance of Sen. Barry Goldwater (R-Ariz.) during the 1964 Presidential campaign at the order of President Lyndon B. Johnson, according to informed sources.

The exact nature and duration of Hunt's activities were not revealed, but Goldwater, an amateur dabbler in electronics, said yesterday that he had no indication that the surveillance involved electronic eavesdropping.

Another source said that Hunt was not certain of the dates of the surveillance, although he told the committee staff it began well before Goldwater's presidential nomination at the 1964 Republican Convention and lasted until after his overwhelming election defeat that November.

Hunt said he undertook the surveillance with a team of operatives, under directions from Mr. Johnson through an intermediary, according to the source, who declined to say who Hunt named as the intermediary.

Goldwater, who declined to give the source of his information, said he had been told in the past two or three days that Hunt and a team that "could have been as many as 30 people not just working on me but working on other people, too" operated out of offices in "downtown" Washington. Although Goldwater said he could not be certain of the group's name, he thought it was "domestic investigations." Goldwater said he did not know the names of

## COMMITTEE, AT COLI

COMMITTEE. From AT the other people under surveillance.

Goldwater said he had the impression that Hunt and the others involved in the operation were "on leave" from the CIA (where Hunt was supposed to be working at the time). "If I had to guess, I would guess that they didn't want to be traced back to the CIA," Goldwater

said. "I knew 10 years ago what was going on," Goldwater said, asserting that friends in the CIA and the FBI had told him then that he was under surveillance by both agencies. Goldwater said he had "no idea" what the investigation involved since he had no indicated that it delved into his private life, financial affairs, "home life or anything like that." Goldwater said he learned only two or three days ago of Hunt's professed involve-

ment. "I don't even know the man," Goldwater said.

Attempts were made last night to reach several aides to President Johnson in 1964, but only two could be reached.

Lawrence F. O'Brien, a White House aide in 1964 and later chairman of the Democratic National Committee, said he had never heard of Hunt at the time and, "Honestly, I never heard of such a thing," he added, referring to Hunt's reported testimony.

Horace Busby, a special assistant to the President at the time, said that Hunt's testimony "strikes me as preposterous on its face . . . While I thoroughly disbelieve it, I don't want to dispute the man on the basis of information I don't have," Busby said. Busby said he knew of no connection between Hunt and President Johnson or the White House in 1964. "I find it incredible . . . that Mr. Johnson would

have any need of surveillance of Sen. Goldwater," Busby said.

At the time, Goldwater said, "I just assumed it was one man or two men assigned at the direction of the President . . . It never bothered me, I never got upset about it. Oh, I guess if should have, but knowing Johnson as I did, I never got upset about it.

"I would naturally be concerned to learn what they did find out," Goldwater added, "not that I did anything wrong." Goldwater said he would like to know if Hunt kept a dossier on him. "But the fellow wouldn't tell me."

Goldwater said he did not

press his source of the information for details. "I didn't want to get too involved in it," Goldwater said. "I figured sooner or later it would come out."

Goldwater had said last April, "I was bugged by the other side and paid no attention to it." Yesterday, how-

ever, Goldwater said, "I found my place bugged and I know something about that because I'm an electronics expert."

At the same time, Goldwater said of President Johnson, "I knew that he had espionage. He had to have. For a long time I thought it was within my staff." Goldwater said that the Democrats "seemed to have my speeches before I had them" during the 1964 campaign.

A spokesman for CIA Director William E. Colby also said yesterday that Colby had "no comment" on Hunt's reported testimony. A spokesman for the FBI said he "categorically denied" Goldwater's assertion that the FBI was involved in any surveillance of him in 1964.

Hunt's appearance before the Senate Watergate committee's staff was part of an ongoing investigation by the Republican staff members of the possible role of the CIA in the Watergate affair. The committee's vice chairman, Sen. Howard H. Baker Jr. (R-Tenn.), has been directing this inquiry for several months.

A source close to Hunt said yesterday that Hunt met Monday with Baker and on Tuesday with other members so the minority staff, and will probably meet with them again next week. In all of the committee discussions with Hunt to date—some informal, some with Hunt under oath—the main topic has been CIA domestic operations, the source said.

Baker appears to have collected a large number of allegations relating to CIA involvement in domestic matters, the source said, and Hunt is providing information about some of these activities.

Hunt, currently serving a sentence of 2½ to eight years in prison for his role in the break-in and bugging of the Democratic National Committee's Watergate headquarters at the Allenwood (Pa.) Prison Camp, has been accompanied to his meetings with Baker and the Senate committee's minority staff by one of his attorneys, William A. Snyder of Baltimore. Snyder declined yesterday to comment on the meetings.

Another of Hunt's attor-

liams, who said he has not been present for the meetings with Hunt, confirmed that Baker and minority counsel Fred Thompson were quizzing Hunt about "CIA domestic activities," but said he could provide no other details.

Baker's inquiry into CIA domestic activities beyond the 1972 presidential campaign appears to be outside the scope of the Senate resolution establishing the Senate select Watergate committee. That resolution authorized the committee to

"conduct an investigation and study of the extent, if any, to which illegal, improper, or unethical activities were engaged in by any persons, acting individually or in combination with others, in the presidential election of 1972, or any campaign, canvass, or other activity related to it."

Although an attempt was made on the Senate floor on Feb. 7 to enlarge the committee's scope to include the 1964 and 1968 Presidential elections, the proposed amendment was defeated.

One source close to the Senate committee said yesterday that despite the resolution's limitation of the investigation to the 1972 campaign, the argument could be made that the 1964 campaign activities are relevant to show a precedent for the 1972 bugging. In any case, this source said, it would be politically awkward for committee chairman Sen. Sam J. Ervin (D-N.C.) to bar an attempt by Baker to put on Hunt's testimony if Baker decides to do so.

So Mullen has been CIA from its beginning in 1950? What else is new?

A digression at this point is not for boasting. It is to inform the reader about the fakery of the spooks, their pretense that everything is secret, that nothing is known to whatever "enemy" is at any time imagined to endanger us.

Arrant nonsense!

All of this book to this point was written before the Baker report was released except for that report. That Mullen, personally and as an agency, were CIA, is clear in this writing completed months before there was any Baker report. If it was not a secret from me, could it possibly have been from the Russians? Or any other intelligence service in the world?

There is the fiction that intelligence is spying and dirty-works. Humbug! "Real intelligence is the analysis of the public-available.

4A In this case, all that was needed, as these earlier chapters show, is such non-secret sources as any library affords, like Who's Who. With Who's Who showing Mullen's early career in a notorious intelligence cover and leading to Mullen from Hunt's own biography, there was no secret about Mullen's connection with CIA.

Yet as late as in this propaganda gadget called the Baker report the pretense that Hunt had to be "recommended" to Mullen on his retirement from CUA is still preserved when the fact is, as the reader now knows, Hunt had been there all along, all during his last years at CIA, and during those last years had been engaged in the "seamy" activities here reported but not included in the Baker report. Like impeaching Douglas.

In itself this says enough about the Watergate committee, its report and Baker's.

And the Nixon-Baker need which had become a CIA need, too. ~~THESE WERE~~ These were served by the next leak, to Laurence Stern of the Post. He had another page-one story in the issues of July 7 for which he continued to get information as he wrote, more of it being in the later editions.

"Ex-Agent Identified In 'Flap'" followed by "CIA Operative Quit; Mexican 'Cover' Closed" is the headline. But the give-away on the faking is apparent in the lead:

120 "A veteran Central Intelligence Agency covert agent who resigned in 1969 in protest to U.S. policies in Latin America figured centrally in the closing of a Mexico City

Unlike the Baker report-leaking humbug, which is not connected with Watergate, the earlier chapters of this book contain what has Watergate relevance. That Baker avoided ~~wasz~~ what was so readily accessible to me says much about his "investigation" and its real inspiration and intent. On this basis alone it can hardly be an interest in exposing Watergate crime or reaching legislative remedies for what they ~~xxxx~~ did to the nation.

2  
imp } 'cover' operation run by the Washington-based public relations firm Robert R. Mullah & Co.

"The ex-agent, Philip B.F. Agee, was the unidentified subject of a cryptic reference to a 'WH flap' in the recent report of Sen. Howard Baker..."

"WH" is CIA for Western Hemisphere, not White House. "Agee served in the Western Hemisphere (WH) Division of the CIA's clandestine services, in Ecuador, Uruguay and Mexico from 1960 to 1969."

With two of these coinciding with Hunt's assignments there was the possibility that Agee and Hunt might not have been strangers. Aside from this, and with Agee having become disenchanted and quit not less than three years before The Watergate, ~~except~~ there is no Watergate connection. Agee had a different "cover" called "The American Institute for Free Labor Development." It is one of the arms of the AFL-CIO that for years was without secrecy engaged in CIA and other governmental work, so closely that in the 1950s I was offered its access to the diplomatic pouch for bringing something from Europe. The late Serafino Rounaldi, who I also knew, had run the Latin American branch. Irving Brown was boss for Europe and North Africa. This is the agency through which the CIA and the State Department handled operations like overthrowing the popular elected Guyanan government of Chedi & Jagan. These facts are secret from the people, not from foreign intelligence services.

By way of commentary on the efficiency of United States intelligence, while I did not use labor's access to the diplomatic pouch, in the early 1940s, before Pearl Harbor, as an investigative reporter I did, to get safely out of Chile valuable intelligence materials some of which were thereupon used by FDR in his famous "fire-side chat" on Latin America. This was intelligence gathered by another reporter who could not get it to me because of pro-Nazi influences in control of the Chilean postal service. The situation in Latin America was like that, the condition of our intelligence was that poor. And during The Watergate, with United States help, the same forces were again put in control of Chile after elections had tossed them out.

Agee's defection had nothing to do with Watergate. "nobody can live for a decade in Latin America and implement United States policy in that vast area of starvation and hunger with revulsion unless he is a Hunt. (Part of my own intelligence service was in this area where the conditions of the majority are so deplorable they are beyond the comprehension of the average American.)

But his defection was leaked to give a semblance of reason to Nixon's obstruction of justice and Baker's protection of Nixon. The stories flowed for about 10 days and then Agee, too, was out of the news.

Arthur H. Hochberg was revealed to have closed the CIA cover office Mullen had provided the CIA in Room ~~308~~ 306 of Singapore's prestigious Cathay Building in late August, 1972, a date that suggests Watergate cause, not any "FE" (for Far East) "flap." (NYTimes 7/6/74)

both) Agee was found vacationing in Cornwall, England. He told the Associated Press Star-News (Post 7/9/74) he had already written a 220,000 book, contracted to Penguin in London, telling "what we did in Latin America, why I quit and why I decided to write about it."

Not Watergate.

The book includes "an asertion that the agency participated in the murder of some of its employees." (NYTimes ~~9/~~ 7/9/74) and that Agee personally "was involved in the assassination of locally employed C.I.A. agents, known in the agency as contract employees." Agee denied this. ~~and by the time five days after the initial leak the CIA was busy in the fabric of the news~~ By this time legislators were noting "that there was no ~~conviction~~ evidence linking Mr. Nixon's concern about the F.B.I. inquiry in Mexico to Mr. Agee." This was a single paragraph buried in a single story (NYTimes 7/9/74), not the sensation of the deceptive headlines.

Stern flew to London, interviewed Agee, and filed a story that gave new information about CIA dirty-works in Latin America, not new to anyone knowing how the spooks work and what policy is and has been. (Post 7/11/74) But nothing on Thw Watergate.

It took a week for the <sup>libel</sup> ~~liebl~~ of Agee to be ~~amixed~~ corrected, His denial "that he had ever disclosed information about the agency to the K.G.B." The fact is that none of this business, his alleged drunkenness included, had any confirmation, even basis. The same

paper the same day (NYTimes 7/11/74), again not page one, with a tiny headline, "No Comment by C.I.A.," reports, "Subsequently official sources said that although Mr. Agee had traveled to Cuba on three occasions after resigning from the C.I.A. there was no indication he had spoken with Soviet agents there or anywhere else."

How then did all these lies get made up and fed to the press which, trusting its sources it also never identifies, it printed?

Some of General Haig's "sinister forces" to which he attributed the eradication of incriminating evidence from Nixon's tapes?

Far from anxious to get the CIA however he could, Agee turns out to be a balanced man. He told Charles Collingwood, whose interview CBA TV aired July 15, that he believes the CIA itself was not involved in the break-in at the Watergate.

Were Agee not concerned about this international<sup>al</sup> front-page series of character assassination, he can sit back and await publication ~~with~~ of his book with the satisfaction that comes from unprecedented pre-publication attention, an augury of profit which he needs to live and keep his family and of the attention to his book the publicity made inevitable in almost all countries.

But without this abuse of him that can have had no origin not official, there could not have been the phoney defense of Nixon's obstruction of justice or the non-support of Baker's report made to appear to be support of it. Agee was their convenient victim because they had the need and because as an investigating Senator Baker had access to real CIA secrets not Watergate-related. In the end, with publication of Agee's book, there would not have been secrets left. And meanwhile, there was also the cover for the closing down of the Mullen-CIA fronts. None were closed after Agee's defection. All ended after The Watergate arrests. Leaks to the Singapore office and the lesser-known one in Amsterdam tended to lead the press away from the one Mullen cover operation that could have relevance, that in Mexico City. So barren is Baker's report on this that it does not even include the ~~address~~ address I had so little finding, on the same street as the bank used in laundering this illegal Nixon funding that was used in Watergate crimes, the bank in the same building as the Ogarrio who never made a public appearance or statement and whose use as a CIA "asset" seems to have been probable.



8

This entire "PR firm" type operation so characteristic of spooking and so firtuitous for Nixon and Baker is all the post-release attention the non-report called the Baker report got after the day ~~it was~~ his "embargo" on it ended. His concoction was that lacking in substance. And without this Agee diversion there would have been critical comment on its gross inadequacies where it was not also irrelevant to his legitimate committee function.

It took a week for the Post to get around to editorial comment on this obviousness: (7/11/74) marked in blue

Strong as this may seem, as criticism it falls far short of what this Baker caper not only justifies but request for understanding of what he was up to, Nixon's unimpeachment.

That the Post led the pack in chasing the Agee chimera is not cause for criticizing it because the legitimate part of the Agee story is the most legitimate news. That a CIA agent became disenchanted and overcame his life's experience to defect and then wrote a book exposing what he regards as evil is a proper journalistic interest.

But that in a week and in the days that followed this week neither the Post nor any other well-staffed paper took the time to analyze the Baker report is not easily explained. That is a proper journalistic function, too, in a land where the press has this function without which representative society can't function and the people become a rubber stamp of the administration in power.

~~analyzing this report is not difficult~~ x

By the time of this excellent Post editorial the Baker report was history, the impeachment committee in the House required more attention than the papers could give it -predictable to politicians and public-relations pros- and the Baker report did escape any real analysis.

There are simple means of evaluating the genuineness of Congressional investigations. One is comparing what they do with what it is known they can do. Another is whether they use their powers and authority and if they do, how.

The foregoing chapters contain more than enough for comparing the Baker report with the readily-available Watergate-relevant. What committee's have the legal right and the authority to do in pursuance of their proper functions includes the issuing of

subpenaes. The simpler subpoena requires attendance upon the committee and testimony. Duces tecum subpoenae additionally require the production of documents specified in them.

The Baker report holds no indication that he had issued any subpoenae. It contains no protest that a single request for a subpoena had been denied.

It can happen that witnesses cooperate voluntarily, requiring no subpoenae. But when evidence is missing and it is known to be available and when committees have subpoena powers, that the evidence is missing means the committee didn't want the missing evidence. In turn, this has meaning for those possessing the evidence. It gives them the most accurate evaluation of the committee's intent. If they are not asked for the evidence they know they have, they know the committee intends to circumvent whatever that evidence addresses or can relate to. In plain English, the witness knows what he can get away with thereafter.

The CIA was not the only essential source for Baker if he ever intended any real investigation. No real investigation was possible without a real investigation of Hunt. None of Hunt was possible without an investigation of his income and expenses. His expense accounts say when he went there. The Fielding break-in is an example, and his return via New York City, as all his partners in crime also detoured, coincides with the burglary of the NAACP legal-defense and educational fund. There were Chilean diplomatic burglaries in New York and Washington. If any Watergaters were involved, they could be expected to be expense-repayment records. And there is no doubt they were involved, as there is no doubt even news stories indicated.

There was also the question of Hunt's dual employment, first by CIA and Mullen and then by Mullen and Nixon. This required getting all financial records dealing with Hunt and all were available under subpoena if not voluntarily.

My own early reading on the lack of serious purposes by the Watergate committee came when I wrote Sam Dash as soon as his appointment as counsel was in the papers. I sent him the leads on Hunt's employment by Nixon at the time of the crime, proven correct and thereafter avoided by Dash and his committee; and on Nixon's improper use of tax money for personal benefit, not official purposes, also later proven exactly correct. In neither case was I guessing, without specific, factual knowledge. When Dash never responded I knew

and his committee would circumvent these areas so urgently requiring exposure and Congressional deliberation. History proved it right.

The 13 volumes of the committee's printed transcript and exhibits total 5858 pages. It then published an additional 2157 pages of legal documents. In these 8,015 pages and in the three large volumes of its July report there is no record of who paid Hunt when and for what. There is no single question asked of anyone of or even indirectly relating to this most basic evidence, for Hunt's criminal activities were for his employer, Nixon, and Nixon is responsible for the acts of his agent.

Suppose Mullen paid Hunt for work Hunt did for Nixon - and ~~Munt~~ Mullen was already paying Hunt with federal money from its HEM non-competitive contract. Mullen also was paid by CIA. Hunt could have been subsidized in his Nixon crime by federal money, another crime requiring investigation in any honest investigation.

earlier-quoted

Bennett's own/words are enough proof on this. He was paying Hunt for work Hunt did for Nixon. The source of the funds with which Hunt paid therefore becomes essential.

Bennett's face did not shine from the TV tubes during The Watergate hearings.

Hunt is known to have committed criminal acts not charged while he was working for Nixon. Whether he did these for Nixon or as a self-starter can be established by the days on which he was paid ~~for~~ from White House funds as well as his expenses account. Dean's letter to me is proof that these records did exist and had been given to the FBI. There is little doubt that the FBI took all Bennett's relevant records as it should have taken other relevant company records dating to before Bennett became its president then owner. These records also had to have been available to the prosecution. No full investigation was possible without a look at how the prosecution performed. After Petersen's testimony this became the minimum requirement of anything better than a Whitewash. These records were available to the full committee, they were available to Baker and there is <sup>of them</sup> ~~no~~ neither citation nor quotation -not even reference to them.

Q.E.D.: no investigator had serious purposes. The certainty of this was immediately known to Nixon and all his underlings. Their courses of conduct were predicated upon the certainty the investigation would cover up all it could. it was so, resulting in Nixon's unimpeachment and the character of his defense.

This is a simplified analysis. It could be expanded considerably because all the abundance of available information extends it. Its purpose is merely to inform the reader of what everyone, including all the top CIA executives, knew to be the minimum upon which everyone could depend. As with Nixon, it told them what they could dare.

While this is the reality of the situation, Baker's own report was released with the most impressive record of CIA cooperation. This is the only positive impressive fact about the whole enterprise. The report itself is so sloppy, so unserious it lacks all identification. It does not have a title, leave alone a title page or cover. It has no signature, no authorization cited, not authorship given, no table of contents, no date. It is a "report" without conclusions, in title or in fact. Even its pagination is by hand and often illegible after mimeographing. Its form is not that of any report, official or unofficial, the first of the pages being the last and only reproduced in a series of letters between the CIA and Baker. It is followed by the last Baker letter to Colby. After that is five pages of unsigned, undated material that by itself and at the beginning lack meanings. The heading, in underlined capitals, is Preliminary CIA Comments on Senator Baker's Revised Staff Report "CIA Investigation." What one is left to presume is the beginning of the report follows. It bears but a single identification or title, "INTRODUCTION".

In fairness to the CIA and because without contradiction from Baker Colby's claims and representations are at least partly validated, both letters are reproduced in full: Lil-first 3 pages.

Also in fairness to the CIA, handing it a report of this character "in the late afternoon of June 27" was to it ample assurance that whatever it said would not be included in a document handed out in advance for use the morning of the third working day thereafter.

What is impressive is that for this <sup>in</sup>house of a report the Baker mountain labored with 2,000 pages of testimony from 24 witnesses and 600 documents, all from the CIA. To this must be added the absence of any Baker allegation that he asked for and was denied essential evidence.

This enormity of words from a single source, the CIA, is encapsulated to Baker's

apparent satisfaction and for his needs in 43 pages of double-spaced typing. Not one page of the 700 documents is appended. There are 143 footnotes that at most refer to a maximum of less than two dozen of these 700 supplied CIA documents. Unless there is a Baker representation that the CIA dumped irrelevancies upon him and his staff - and the reports lacks this claim - a reasonable inference is that the documentation does not support his charges.

However, the footnotes alone do support what never happened, criminal charges of perjury against a number of top CIA people. ~~However~~ Basis for this existed without Baker's project. It adds details and specifications. The information withheld and lied about are subject to construction as obstruction of justice, which is all that Nixon ordered of the CIA for his unimpeachment.

The text, fame that it is in the midst of this CIA plenty, adds strength<sup>2</sup> to criminal charges but does not disappoint those who expect of Baker and his staff only defense of Nixon and his gang. It is broken into a two-paragraph introduction followed by a one paragraph summary of each of these "seven categories"- Mullen, Pennington, Tapes, TSD (for Technical Services Division), Martinez, and Recommendations. This breakdown alone assures it is not a Watergate report. The categories assure it is not an investigation of either the CIA or its Watergate role. And the Introduction spells these facts out without mentioning them in saying the investigation was "beyond the competence of the staff" which it limits to "in terms of number and time." Full honesty, were this the case, required the addition "because we waited until we knew the end was near before we began." In justification of what is no more than a propaganda effort it says the job should be done by "the standing jurisdictional committees." There is nobody in the Congress who does not know that none of the "oversight" committees can exercise real oversight and none have the disposition to begin to perform any part of the function, which is outside the capabilities of a couple of members of each House of the Congress who already has too many assignments.

Short as this Introduction is, it also had an unreported disclaimer~~✓~~ built-in for Baker's protection. While he had been taking credit for this endeavor as /his, the "Baker"

15

report, its opening sentences describes it as a staff report, not his responsibility- "submitted at Senator Baker's request." Having eaten the cake in his own self-promotion and Nixon's defense he still has the cake of self-protection should there be complaint or kickback. And having gotten all the benefit from it in advance, Baker is careful to make no claim at all in the text where this same first sentence describes the limited objectives as "to summarize the highlights of an investigation of CIA activity if any, in connection with the Watergate incident and aftermath." This is a further limitation, to the break-in and the covering-up. With regard to them the "if any" as late as July 1974 is incongruous.

There is an unintended expose of secrecy for secrecy's sake alone, to prevent embarrassment to officials not to protect essential national interests, in the quiet ballyhoo that because the report "make reference to, and in some cases quotes from, material which is classified. Therefore, each copy of this report has been treated for security reasons as if it were classified. They are numbered and accounted for as in the case of classified material." Well, my copy has no number and the leaks began before the drafting was completed, as we have seen.

The hippodroming of what is really a nothing report is continued throughout it by the substitution of descriptions for the published names of CIA employees who are not secret agents or anything like that. What was given to the papers, which used them, is masked in the report. Several of the names appear above. Others that were actually used in the public hearings, like Howard Osborn and Earl Wagner, are secret on this expose report. Obviously there is no need for this secrecy. It is part of the spooks own game, not a national or a spooking need.

"Background" is described as "published" material, no disqualification is meaning is imparted. This is neither its function nor accomplishment. The first of its three pages is quasi quotation from Nixon's self-justification for using the CIA to obstruct justice, his May 22, 1973 speech in which he made the false claim that the FBI's "investigation could lead to the uncovering of covert CIA operations totally unrelated to the Watergate break-in." This is falsehood. The Baker report, rather than showing it

to be a President lie to protect the President against his own criminal acts that long before May 22, 1973 included obstructing justice, seeks instead to validate the lie. What the report does not say is that each intelligence agency comes across the activities of the others and each protects all the others. Only if there were Watergate-relevant evidence turned up by the FBI would it ~~xxxxxxx~~ have a chance of ever being used.

Only the irrelevant if used to illustrate the justify Nixon's lie, the case of the Pentagon's spying on Kissinger, by then published with no damage to the nation interest or security at all. When high officials conduct the nation's affairs in this matter the nation should know it. Keeping improper conduct secret does not serve the "national security." In any event, the one agency not involved - so it is not a Nixon defense - is the CIA.

The one substantive matter in the entire introduction is a question Baker did not ask of the CIA until November 8, 1973, long after he should have and more than a year after it was no longer secret because I had been able to trace it out, as earlier chapters show, more than a year earlier and from public sources: Lil-facsimile:

This is a cruel fake. The informant whose name is hidden is Bennett. It is not that "information had come to his attention concerning the 'Watergate Five.'" He knew and acted in concert with not fewer than two of the seven and was part of obstructing justice from the outset as he was part of where he was not the initiator or a long series of other Nixon crimes. Afterward, he committed misprison of felonies by remaining silent. The so-called "intensification of the staff's investigation" was not to expose Watergate crime. It was to build a Nixon defense by making this operation ~~xxx~~ seem to be what it was not, the urgent "national security" matter Nixon pretended him to obstruct justice so he would remain unimpeached.

"One of the remaining "categories" are titled as they are in the Introduction.

(7-12)

ROBERT BENNETT AND THE MULLEN COMPANY is six pages more than half of which are footnotes that can mean nothing and do mean nothing to the readers whose numbers are guaranteed to be infinitesimally small. (The copy I should have received by being on the committee's press list never came. Copies sought after release through several other senators also were not received. Baker did not want his report distributed and filed. the publicity

7. QUESTION: On or after June 17, 1972, did any of the individuals associated with these break-ins in any way communicate with any individual associated with CIA to discuss the Watergate break-ins or the Ellsberg psychiatrist office break-in, other than Mr. McCord who wrote letters to CIA which are part of the Watergate hearing record?

ANSWER: On 10 July 1972 an officer of a commercial concern communicated to an employee of CIA (informant) which had come to his attention concerning the "Watergate Five." The relationship of this informant and his company to the Agency was and is classified. Since this information was hearsay, contained a repetition of then current published speculation, and indicated that the informant had appeared before the Grand Jury on the matter, no action was taken. The employee's hand-written memorandum for the record on this matter is contained in sensitive material which Agency officers have made available for review, but not retransmitted by the staffs of the four CIA Subcommittees as well as the staffs of the Senate Select Committee on Presidential Campaign Activities and the Federal Prosecutor. A search of the Agency files has uncovered no information of the type referred to in this question.

An examination of the aforementioned sensitive material<sup>4</sup> reveals that there was no reference shown as to the scope of the CIA's search of Ellsberg's list and Mullen and Company and led to a further identification of the staff's investigative efforts in other CIA-related areas.



15  
in the major media he had already received for it served his ends.

The opening sentence, by this time news only in the date, says that there had been "a relationship" between Mullen and CIA since 1959, when Mullen started. Or he was CIA from the beginning of his "public relations" business whether or not before then. This question is not addressed. It is followed by the lie that Hunt had no Mullen connection before he retired from CIA in 1970 and then for the first time "joined Mullen and Company with what flunder Robert Mullen understood to be Director Helms' blessing." Even after Hunt went to work for Nixon in the White House "he undertook negotiations with the Agency with respect to the "Mullen cover.

In less polite language, and what the Baker report does not say, in effect Hunt was still working for CIA after his retirement and at the time of his caught crime he was working for it as well as Nixon and Mullen because Mullen was working for it. Hunt, then, become another CIA break-in involvement, was, if unwitting, part of that crime, too, as with Martinez, then on its direct payroll.

Bennett's activities, less than a full page in a mere listing, is restricted to what was public knowledge long before this report, a fact hidden by elaborate footnoting to the secret which merely duplicates the public. As an example, what I had written months earlier, the emphasis that of the report, "Bennett serves as the point of contact between Hunt and Liddy during the two weeks following the Watergate break-in." The footnoted source is ~~the~~ not the public one I used, filed openly in court, but to "Staff interview of Linda Jones, supra note 15, at 8; Executive Session Testimony of Robert F. Bennett, supra note 2, at 153-157." Linda Jones is not identified. She is one of two of Bennett's secretaries who were also deposed in civil suit and whose depositions are public. This in pretending that Baker had done this big thing of a real investigation when he had really extended Nixon's cover-up, this report cites only the unavailable as its sources, making it appear that the information from which it was prepared is hot stuff, original work and top secret, all of which is baloney.

"The true nature of Bennett's relationship with the CIA was not known to us until late November of 1973..." (p.9) What in the world were they then investigating, Baker's staff or the full committee's? I had this only weeks after the break-in and without

seeking or receiving state secrets. This line, too, is Baker's self-promotion and a cover for the non-investigation by the committee whose vice-chairman he was.

The one ~~thing~~ new disclosure in all of this is the second half of "Bennett asked for and received from Hunt a price estimate for bugging Clifford Irving for Hughes," which Hunt told the committee in executive session and was leaked to the papers, and "Bennett received a scrambler from Hughes personnel for use on Mullen telephones." By avoiding dating this, a careful omission, because there was a joint Mullen-Bennett-Hunt/White House/Hughes operation most of which was hidden by the committee in Hunt's public testimony, Baker hides White House involvement in these dubious Hughes projects. It also makes no mention of Hughes largess to Nixon and his family over the years, more than \$200,000 to a brother, which led to a well-publicized scandal, and two contributions to Nixon, each in secret and each for \$100,000, plus the money Bennett laundered. ~~xx~~ <sup>approximately a</sup> half million dollars ~~seems to have exceeded the probable~~ is public knowledge. *Was Hughes' involvement in services?*

There is news to which no meaning is given in Bennett's report through his unnamed "case worker" we have already identified as Lukasky from what was published - Baker here masks the name- "that Bennett had established a 'back door entry' to E.B. Williams, the attorney for DNC [Democratic National Committee] in order to 'kill off' revelations of the Agency's relationship with the Mullen and Company [sic] in the course of the DNC lawsuit." This was done ~~through~~ "via attorney Hobart Taylor," of whom nothing is said at all. (p. 10)

The meaning on which Baker does not report is that this means both the CIA and Nixon, through Bennett/Mullen, who worked for both, interfered in the suit against Nixon's gang by the opposition Nixon did in by all his dirty works, the Democrats.

It is the ultimate in political dirty-works.

(However, it was not all that great an accomplishment. Williams had no interest in the information in this book which I offered him as soon as he ~~met~~ took the Democrats' case.) His works for them was not up to his earned reputation in the law.)

20  
purpose of this inspection from Baker's own description was limited to the "taping capacity at the CIA." (p.13)

If there was any Watergate connection, Baker does not give it. The obvious conclusion is that it is missing because it does not exist. "e suggests it further by "Pennington may have been a 'domestic agent' and ~~his~~ the part he served," the Security Research Staff, was abolished in August of 1973." (p.14)

Baker ~~pretends~~ *failed*  
~~to~~ ~~expose~~ other illegal "domestic" activities when they were relevant.  
picking on  
His ~~relaxation~~ of Pennington is in pursuance of his defense of Nixon and his self-advancement not in pursuit of his Senatorial obligation.

These four pages abound in references to "the Pennington matter," "the Pennington information," to "suppression" and suggestions that he had some "role" ~~in~~ never specified in the "destruction of documents" (which is not the same as what it is meant to convey, "the destruction of evidence"- and newspapers are not even "documents") These are meaningless generalities, fortified by 16 footnotes. But the actuality is that they say absolutely nothing while implying the most sinister. There isn't the slightest indication of what was "destroyed" or of what was removed from the files inside CIA. This is not because Baker did not know. It is because honest reporting destroyed his defense of Nixon by blaming the CIA for the wrong, not the right things.

These footnotes cites the testimony in executive session of three CIA people plus Pennington, without any quotation on the essence, the contents. There is no citation of Mrs. McCord having been asked what she burned nor is there to McCord's three appearances before Thompson without any Senator present, the trickery that Fensterwald ended.

This guilt by insinuation and in contradiction to fact never ends. The final words of this section alleged "more active participation by operative [sic] Pennington" in "the destruction of documents by Mrs. McCord and others" (who-her children?). But ~~if~~ ~~she~~ ~~lx~~ "destroyed" ~~was~~ anything more than newspapers and old typewriter ribbons, what McCord testified to and Baker deliberately suppresses, there is not a single Baker word to give it substance.

Hiding the fact that Thompson had McCord in on this matter three times is enough of an indication of the Baker-Thompson intent.

Inherent in this is still another set of phoneyed up defense; of Nixon again because Baker here says that the CIA destroyed <sup>proof</sup> ~~evidence~~ that it was ~~ixix~~ operationally deep in The Watergate, of which he presents no evidence, and if it does not have this meaning this section has none at all- and of Silbert, who failed to obtain and use search warrants, which would have prevented any destruction. (There is no published record that Silber asked for a single search warrant. That to search the Cubans' rooms was sought and used by the police -immediately.) With Silbert promoted after he covered up for Nixon, defending him was defending Nixon in still another manner.

Baker reports "panic" inside the CIA after the arrests. With all the characters connected with it anything short of panic would be abnormal. It would have been abnormal also if panic subsided after Nixon ordered the CIA to cover up for him and after leaks from the FBI and of FBI investigations became commonplace.

This is not to say that the CIA behaved properly. It is to say that Baker made out no case of any Watergate connection or any wrongdoing in connection with Watergate while ignoring ~~this~~ the latter case, which could be made.

The same is true of four pages, again half footnotes (pp.17-21) on TAPES.

Who can defend destruction of anything by the CIA itself at this juncture without some non-partisan knowledge of what was destroyed? The tapes were destroyed. <sup>"during the week of January</sup> This section/22,197 adds nothing but new inferences to what was printed in the papers, except what can be a kind of justification, there had been a similar destruction exactly a year earlier," on (p.17) January 21, 1972." This was before Watergate and whatever Baker says in the absence of evidence is indicative of practise.

One "good" reason for destroying the tapes once the bugging and taping system was exposed is because it is illegal. The CIA is without police powers or rights. Baker avoids this explanation.

There was a "more complete transcription" of the Cushman tape of his conversation with Hunt. (p.19) It "contained an insignificant but uncomplimentary reference to the President."

With both Cushman and Hunt working for Nixon is there any wonder any crack against him would be edited out of anything to be used in public? But if anything else of anything of consequence was censored, Baker doesn't even suggest it.

The CIA did find Cushman's secretary's notes of Ehrlichman's call ordering the CIA to give Hunt "carte blanche." (pp. 19-20) This Baker dared not and could not suppress. So he masks it with all these entirely unproven accusations.

There is more than reasonable basis for suspecting the CIA is this and all related matters. If it had been innocent it could hardly have done more to make itself look guilty. It did set itself up for all the impica implications Baker makes. But he makes them with no proof at all and what he says is hardly the result of anything that anyone could honestly call an "investigation."

The longest ~~xxx~~ part, nine pages (21-30) is Hunt-TSD SUPPORT \*\*  
~~HUNT-TSD SUPPORT~~— ELLSBERG PROFILE. (111- no underlining) It should be the longest. I also should be longer and say more. Baker's approach is not what did Hunt do but "whether the CIA had advance knowledge of the Fielding break-in"(p.21)

In ticking off his list of the CIA's help to Hunt/Nixon (p.22) Baker includes something relevant to he and his colleagues avoided in their public hearings, /one of their documents my copy of which was stolen: "preliminart steps toward a phoney New York telephone answering device." With and for CIA and when he was engaged in forbidden domestic intelligence Hunt had this service, ~~much more elaborate than Baker here describes. A CIA document spelling this out was suppressed entirely from the public hearings and the exhibits. Suppressing this was in accord with Congress' traditional tolerance of anything the spooks do, legal or illegal, and with t is committee's acceptance of CIA perjury, of which this is a number of examples ~~Baker includes as fact in contradiction to testimony~~ where Baker never suggests perjury.~~ These "preliminary steps" for a "device" are really "a New York 'backstopped' telephone (a telephone with a New York number which would in reality be answered by a Washington CIA switchboard) answering service was well on its way to completion."(p.23) Even "the actual relay number to be called" was known, it was that close to reality.

The CIA had and refused to deliber a "Mr. Edward" file and a "bigot" ~~or "big E"~~

(contraction of "big shot"?) file on Hunt. This "recent" evidence is proof of the committee's intent not to investigate when it should have, before the testimony of the CIA top executives and Hunt.

The CIA paid close attention to Hunt's "casing" pictures for the Fielding brea-in. It admitted deciding they were "casing" pictures, that the locale of Southern California was decided on and that a blow-up of one revealed Dr. Fielding's name. (So did his auto's license number, not mentioned.) Baker does not say so, but it is impossible that with all the investigative worry about the leaking of the Pentagon Papers, it is not possible that Dr. Fielding was not known to the CIA, more when it was working illegally and uneasily on an Ellsberg profile. (pp.26-27.<sup>30</sup>)  
wrozzzpxzzzzz

Regularly Baker notes that the truth is other than CIA witnesses testified to, even that help to Hunt continued to November instead of being ended in August as was sworn, but he implies no more than naughty-naughty, not criminal lying. There is little of consequence and nothing else really new. There is less than was known. It is proof that Baker, too, was not investigating Hunt and his acts and connections.

The CIA was no more interested in a real investigation than Baker. However, in his letter comments on the Baker report Colby did call Baker a liar, in more polite language. Where Baker claimed (p.24) that "the committee's requests to obtain this ["Mr. Edwards"] file have not been granted, Mr Colby said, ""Mr. Edwards' file matter has been made available for the Committee's review, and the Committee already possesses the relevant material." Ditto on what Baker called "recent testimony and secret documents" (p.26), in the sense that Hunt had other CIA contact after working openly at Mullen. Quite the opposite, Colby charged, because these materials "were made available to Congressional committees as far back as May of 1973." Baker's staff, of course, had access to the work of the other committees. We have seen some of what he and they suppressed.

They have other disagreements which may be semantic. The CIA claims unfair treatment and makes its own case. It does appear to have provided Baker with exactly what he was looking for and there is no doubt Baker did not want it. He then had the problem of what to do with it. There is only so much he dared suppress entirely. What he did not he

24  
hid in footnotes, ignoring it in the text of the report. What follows also is proof of CIA false swearing because it is Hunt's requests for CIA help after August 31, 1971. And the CIA provided its files prior to the public testimony, ~~in~~ more than three months before Hunt and the CIA's top three testified.

He "requested a 'retired lockpicker' ~~xxxxxxx1972~~ and entry man in the time period of March-May 1972" and was referred to the personnel people.

"Hunt, in late 1971, requested some 'security types' to check physical security and monitor telephones in Las Vegas 'in connections with Hunt's work on the Hughes account with ~~the~~ Mullen and Company. Hunt was referred to...an [Agency proprietary (name deleted at Agency request)]" (Here the brackets represent names the CIA asked to be deleted)

"Hunt contacted [deleted at Agency request] an active CIA employee until November 10, 1972) sometime in late 1971 regarding a weekend entry operation."

There are three other admitted Hunt requests that were honored, two in October and one December 8, 1971, long after the CIA's leaders swore they broke off contact. One related to "Indo-China War documents," another to a computer trace of the man who "allegedly former" the "National Independent Party" in a Latin American country, and the third a meeting with the CIA's Deputy Director of Plans (clandestine operations, dirty works) "did meet with Hunt on October 15, 1971 to discuss Mullen and Company problems."

Hunt was referred to a former CIA employee. Either there is remarkable coincidence or the CIA was quite sensitive to the potential of the June 17, 1972 arrests because the chief of the section who referred ~~him~~ Hunt to this "'retired lockpicker' and entry man" just happened to retire the first working day after those arrests, on June 19, 1972.

(p 37) (p 27)  
These footnotes do expose the CIA's perjury and its willing participation in what it had to know were crimes and in a way that was criminal for it because it is precluded from any domestic work. But they also expose the committee and its intentions in its whitewash pretended to be an investigation. All these requests were at a time Hunt was working for both Nixon and Mullen, to the CIA's knowledge. They are outside what even the broadest mind can conceive to be the needs of a one-time interview. They show that Nixon's

25  
operations were gangsterism in the White House. The Watergate committee was as complacent as the CIA.

When the CIA knew Hunt was asking for help he said was not for the White House but "in connection with Hunt's work on the Hughes account with ~~the~~ "Mullen and Company" he was given the help he asked for. This is a separate CIA illegality. What makes it more fascinating is that Hughes and Mullen were both working for CIA. And this coincides with the unsuccessful attempt to burglarize Hank Greenspun's safe, the Bennett idea Haldeman like so much, or another White House, not a "Mullen and Company" job. The Watergate committee took testimony of that caper beginning very early, when McCord first told the story on its witness stand, <sup>on May 18, 1973.</sup> It deliberately suppressed all of this, which it had in its possession June 19, 1973. (p. 27 actual, misnumbered in Baker report) Thereafter Helms, Cushman, Walters and Hunt all testified and none was asked about this. Not even when Hunt did testify to his part in the Hughes project, including his meetings with ~~W~~ Hughes' man Winte in the Mullen office and in Hughes' California offices.

This combination leaves no innocence for anyone, the committee collectively and Baker and his crew separately also; for the CIA; of for the Nixon personal Gestapo.

Burying the scant mention in footnotes seems to have effectively obscured it from the press or the press was less than diligent.

Regardless of all other considerations, of which this added media failure is but one, in this Baker raises new questions about himself. Here had he all this new evidence of the most overtly illegal activities of exactly the nature he was supposed to be investigating and he was utterly silent about them except for a few obscure footnotes.

Q Why didn't he investigate?

Only because it meant investigating Nixon and he was defending Nixon.

The beginning was the end.

No investigation. No innocence. No impeachment.

Baker's report has another "unt" section, HUNT -- MARTINEZ -- CIA (no underscore)

(pp. 31-# 5)



~~x(3)~~(31-5)

Its five pages/continue the covering up while pretending exposure. This was an area in which exposure rather than inuendo was probable if not certain. Among the many witnesses available used are Hunt and Martinez. Hunt is not quoted once and the two references to "artinez are not in direct quotation and have no relevance to the purpose of this "catergory."

Martinez, despite the official,lying until Helms was before the Watergate committee, was and for years had been a CIA employee, transferred to "informant" status at about the time Hunt ~~was~~ began the series of burgarlies, a correlation Baker avoids in giving this time merely as "in the summer of 1971."(p.31) If not earlier the CIA admits knowing of "artinez' connection with Hunt "a month after ~~the~~ his participation in the Filing break-in." Baker does not say whether the CIA knew of this break-in and he had the live Martinez before him to question, as he did the Miami CIA station chief, to whom "artinez spoke, as he did to his case officer. (p.31) For a rank amatear these omissions would be glaring. For the Baker staff they are incredible. Their omission from the report is another characterization of it as not of serious purposes. By this time there can be no question that the CIA knew all it had to and more than it probably wanted to about what Hunt was up to. It cannot have been unaware of the breakin and it was aware of the "casing" for the job from the pictures it developed.

In posing one of the correct questions, "whether the CIA was aware of Hunt's activities," Baker manages to hedge it wrongly in two way, dating these "activities" to "early in 1972," and wrongly limiting it to "when he was recruiting Cubans to assist in the Watergate break-in." (p.31) B arker"s recruiting of Cubans for Hunt began the year before, not in 1972, and there were other 1872 jobs than the cuaught break-in. Again, evidence of other than serious purposes and of covering up despite the pretense of vigorous exposure.

Where he stumbled into significant information Baker was fully equal to hiding the significance. Another example is, "On the morning of June 18, ~~1972~~ 1972, the Miami ~~station~~ Chief of Station dispatched a cable to CIA headquarters regarding t e activities of Martinez but deliberating Martinez' ~~earlier~~ prior references to Hunt's activities."(p.34) Period. No other meaning. But the CIA lied in saying that the man then Martinez' case officer

21  
"was on an 'African safari' throughout June of 1972." (p.33) But the seccëssor case officer testified in secret that "the former case officerx was in Miami on June 19." (pp 33-4)

June 18, 1972 was a Sunday morning. Martinez correct name had not appeared in the papers. And what was the station chief in Miami doing working on Monday morning if there was no special reason? That was a time to cable Washington "regarding the activities of Martinez" which Baker leaves entirely undescribed with this casual mention only?

On a Sunday morning?

What it is obviously means is that the CIA, in Washington, Miami or both, knew the whole story and starting covering up. Without doubt the station chief was working that Sunday because he had been told the whole story Saturday, when the CIA knew. Baker could not have explored this? Could not "report" on the content of the strange cable? Could not "report" - he was this big investigator - what "activities of Martinez" required Sunday morning cabling to Washington?

Martinez only of all the Cubans and Hunt and McCord? This meant that Washington knew immediately that its active employee Martinez was involved in the crime and thus it was.

The sudden "safari" quite obviously was to remove the case officer, to make him unavailable. This need not mean so he would not have to testify about Martinez only. There is no reason to assume the CIA didn't know the whole story and every reason to know that it did and that the case officer would insulate the station chief and would have all those office's knowledge.

Two other witnesses Baker should have called and from his footnotes did not are Andrew St. George and Frank Fiorini. He had to know St. George, whose close personal relations with all these Cubans goes back to before the Bay of Pigs, was writing Fiorini's book, had a deal with NBC for TV use, ~~and~~ Baker did know of St. George's article in Harper's Magazine for November, 1973, dealing with this area of Baker's supposed investigation. It is the third cited source in the Introduction. ~~THIS MEANS~~ Baker also knew that St. George had testified before the Symington "oversight" committee in secret.

But he has no reference to any of this.

St. George is a rarity of the far right. He is a Hungarian monarchist. He does not always separate belief from what he presents as fact. However, he wrote much that Baker ignored, some that Baker may not have known about until after he lifted the embargo on his report but nothing that he could and would not have known about had he had the slightest interest or had his purposes been other than self-promotion and Nixon's unimpeachment. St' George's "Confessions of a Watergate Burglar," in True for August 1974, distributed much earlier and available in proof even earlier, is a long account of Fiorini's experiences with the other Watergate characters and of some of his exploits that, true, false or exaggerated, were right down the alley Baker pretended to have staked out. St. George knew Fiorini from 1957 on.

These are St. George quotes from True, the first directly related to this section of the Baker report:

"Let me tell you something, Rolando [Martinez] made \$1200 a month, and if the Company [i.e., the CIA] paid him 12 thousand ti wouldn't have been enough. Rolando was never any kind of Zipster."

On Hunt's recruiting Baker dates in the summer of 1972: "This in the summer of 1970 when Hunt came to Miami and told Frank Fiorini they were going to work for the White House," Frank asked few questions. Hunt was talking about action and Frank needed action the way shipwrecked men need fresh water."

What could it mean when Hunt talked about "action?": "Hunt was different. He was a professional. [as distinguished from Barker, "that faking brown-nosing" and Liddy "who was like an Eagle Scout...always talking" but no more.] He'd been a clandestine officer all his life. That's another thing everyone is snickering about - how Howard tried to assassinate Castro, and Castro is still around bigger than ever. Alright, but hey, listen: Howard was in charge of other CIA operations that involved 'disposal,' and I can tell you, some of them worked." (Disposal" is slang for assassination.)

What was Watergate "action?": "...anything that had to do with Howard Hughes correspondence, memos, anything." This is what there were looking for inside the DNC, plus "Mitchell and Ehrlichman suspected Democratic National Committee bosses were prefitting"

and other blowing of the whole "patriotic" cover like "we knew the Democrats had a (shit list' of damaging rumors about "Republican leaders. We dug for that, everywhere..."

Fiorini is nothing if not a blabber. Neither the committee nor Baker were interested. How truthful and how exaggerated, if either, would have been easily determined. But ~~how~~ <sup>this kind</sup> ~~sort of~~ <sup>should not</sup> ~~kind of thing~~ <sup>allegation/be ignored:</sup> "Liddy told us over and over not to worry; the men behind Watergate had 'contingency plans.' [John] Mitchell told me the same thing: don't worry. We'd be protected. [Mitchell has denied any prior knowledge of the Watergate entry.]"

St. George's explanation of the seemingly "absurd" Nixon operations and his claim that his friends are not mere bunglers is:

2...In the course of the 'special operations' undertaken during the two-years period by the...team, a number of 'surreptitious entries' (burglaries), 'electronic surveillances' (phone taps and bugs) and other 'countersubversive activities' (i/e. harsh harassment of President Nixon's opposition) occurred. Some of the targets; the Chilean Embassy in Washington; the Chilean delegation to the United Nations; the New York law offices of Sol Linowitz, former U.S. Ambassador to the Organization of American States...Senator Edward Kennedy; CBS Washington bureau chief ~~xxx~~ "an "ather [Rather is not bureau chief but he is a Nixon "enemy" and he was robbed]; Senator Jacob Javits; and a number of others ...Colson was wont to call the 'treason merchants.'"

Confirmation of most of these jobs exists. Several coincide with CIA interests. This Baker was supposedly investigating and exposing in this report. Martinez and (pp.36-43), Hunt were his foci. His conclusions, styled "ACTION REQUIRED," begins with the last in his order of handling, "Martinez. The only Martinez action he found required-of others, understand, when he had been "investigating" well over a year and had an enormous appropriation, consists of nine interviews and three sets of documents, none relating to anyone who was associated with Martinez outside the CIA hierarchy, or FBI agent ~~no writer~~ who had interviewed anyone and not one of the Watergaters.

He lingered with the fiction that there was a "relationship" between "the WH flap" and "the Watergate break-in" so "action required" on Mullen and "Company Relationship" (p. 37-8) consisted of three interviews: ~~the~~ "a. Mullen and Company secretaries (1971-1972). This is needed to confirm or deny suspicions relevant to the indicated Agency/Bennett/Hughes link. b. Far east cover (june, 1972). c. European cover."

The irrelevance of the last two to the break-in are obvious. He had had plenty of

interview the secretaries. He just hadn't done it. At least wto two were desposed in civil suits. And why only secretaries? Why not higher-up, like the corporate executives, the mysterious Minderman, and Caddy, among others? Only to avoid the unwanted.

The same is true of the documents "action required." He just didn't want them. <sup>obtained</sup>

Interviews and documents all of which should have been ~~xxxx~~ before the report was issued is all he recommends on "ESD Support of Hunt"/for all the world as though this had not been support of Nixon. (pp.38-9)

Ditto for "Psychological Profile on Daniel Ellsberg." (pp.39-40) Interesting he excludes the charged crime of the break-in. There is here and in the ~~xxxxi~~ full committee's work an "oversight" that can't be accidental. Xeroxes of the "casing" pictures examined so carefully by CIA (and of course, the FBI) are printed. (9H3863-71). They show fielding identification and in two cases Liddy. Liddy was provided with CIA false documentation. (9H3872) Liddy also appeared at the CIA in person with Hunt. There is another measure of the CIA's innocence and Baker's seriousness of purpose when he has no "action required" to learn if or why t e CIA didn't recognize Liddy in the pictures it developed when it had accurately analyzed them. Of course, it also knew the plane it met. There can be no doubt the CIA knew the whole story.

"Tapes" (p.40) discloses that "the Senate Srned Service (Symington oversight) Committee only" had access to the records like logs and memoranda. If this means anything it means that Symnington joined the CIA in covering up if the Watergate committee could not have access to determine what was destroyed, who was taped and anything else relevant to its responsibilities.

There are 11 numbered actions required under "Miscellaneous." (pp 40-3) For the most part these are quite legitimate and withing these official responsibilities. But they also disclose that interest was late in manifesting itself, encouraging the CIA to stall, as any investigator knew was inevitable. The first two, for the Watergate file and fora any and all on Hunt, were not even asked for until "mid-January 1974" and "in January of 1974" respectively. This was four months after Hunt's testimony.

The name of the attoreny described as "a former case officer" is so poorly hidden

21

there is no reasonable doubt it is Paul O'Brien, former CREEP counsel who was in on the payoff to Hunt, who is an "unindicted co-conspirator" and whose Partner, Kenneth Parkinson, was indicted.

Other of these "actions" are outside the committee's purview unless it can show relevance and in this report Baker fails. The Pennington case and his "domestic activities" are in point. These activities, while illegal, are none of the business of the Watergate committee where they are not demonstrably connected with The Watergate. But where they were, as with Hunt and Bennett at least, they are of no interest to Baker as they were of no concern to the full committee. This cast ~~down~~ further doubt on what Baker was up to, aside from smearing the CIA not for its wrong-doing but in his own and Nixon's interest.

To the last - and this is the very last - this entire report is an unintended self-exposure and an exposure of the unserious intent of the controlling influences on the full committee. Imagine this not even been thought of until July 2, 1974, more than a year after the public part of the investigation began:

"11. Michael Mastrovito of the Secret Service should be interviewed concerning his Agency communications on June 17, 1972. The reason is that Mastrovito "agreed to down-play McCord's Agency employment; that Mastrovito was being pressured for information by a Democratic state chairman; and that Mastrovito was advised by the CIA that the Agency was concerned with McCord's emotional stability prior to his retirement." The last "reason" is footnoted to "CIA cable traffic shortly after the Watergate break-in" which the CIA had supplied.

There is partisanship in the reference to pressure for information. It is apparent that more than two years after the crime that information was still secret. Did it make any difference who brought it to light? What was wrong, if the information should be public in a Democrat trying to get it?

Others may differ but I regard this Baker operation that is keyed to the clever operation of the cunning and unscrupulous Colson is an important <sup>part of the</sup> effort to keep Nixon  
^

unimpeached. Baker was vice chairman of the Senate's investigation. He undertook this so-called CIA investigation as a separate activity because the full committee, in his view, had not done it. He also did not. He converted his so-called investigation into part of Nixon's successful defense. He failed to go into what was public and could not have been more in point. How public and its significance was included in this book long before Baker issued his report. Nothing had since been added so the reader can evaluate its significance and the significance of Baker's deliberate omission of it. The CIA did have much to explain. It did commit crimes, as did its top leaders. But after his full committee's work and after his own adventure, which served to promote his personal ambitions, the chargeable crimes remained uncharged. Exposure still awaited the future.

The answer to the question what did Baker do about it is "join the cover-up," thereby also serving personal ambition and protecting Nixon who personally and through his hardcore are essential to that ambition.

Extra space

Motive is not always apparent. Ascribing intent means reaching inside a mind. Coincidences are real in real life. But some coincidence are just too much of a perfect solution to an urgent problem.

There could be countless postscripts to the foregoing analysis. There is much that could have been included and was not because the chapter is already overlong. However, one ~~not fitting~~ fitting of pieces together by one of the more perceptive of Washington reporters is, I believe, an appropriate postscript to Baker's "report" and "investigation." Walter Pincus is executive director of The New Republic. His editorial article titled "The Watergate Decoy" appeared in The Washington Post on July 22, 1974. Pincus' belief is that ~~Nixon delayed the~~ "Mr. Nixon may have had a [different] reason for seeking to delay the FBI inquiry: The Bureau was getting too near the truth."

It is Pincus' conclusion that Nixon knew all. Just before writing this he included what is here in point. "Remember, Kenneth Harry Dahlberg had a CIA past and the record of it is in Baker's files. This millionaire industrialist, Pincus reports, "was the subject of an FBI investigation 'at the request of the White House in December 1969.' FBI agents had with the White House that [ "the morning of June 22, 1972" ] day and found Dahlberg 'was not presently [Pincus' emphasis] connected with the White House." Just before his conclusion, Pincus wrote:



utes after the White House meeting began, and before Walters was told to see Gray, John Dean called Gray and told him Walters would be coming to see him, to ask for a halt in the Bureau's investigation of the Dahlberg and Mexican checks...."

Pincus believes the FBI investigation would not have involved the CIA. There is reason to believe the contrary, but is there reason <sup>here,</sup> either way, for neither Baker nor his committee to have investigated this coincidence in timing as well as what the earlier chapters of this book out together?