

"Senator Baker and the CIA" Evans-Novak WxPost 3/30/74 HW 3/31/74

When I began reading this column yesterday, knowing the conservative and Establishmentarian beliefs of the authors, I wondered from the head if they would be drawing upon CIA sources or serving CIA ends.

(They have not be pro-Nixon in their WG opinions and writings and speakings.)

The penult, graf is a clue and the conclusion is that "However much he (baker) may hurt the CIA, Howard Baker can scarcely help the President."

Personally, I take this as a conservative/Establishmentarian warning to Baker that if he persists in his defense of Nixon and his manufacturing of a fake case against the CIA he does so at his political peril/

There is a dead giveaway in the penult graf which opines "old complaints" about the CIA are from "superdoves such as Sen. J. W. Fulbright" (in the sense of no others) that "The CIA is permitted to run wild by Symington and other Senate protectors."

This postulates the truth as falsehood.

Symington in particular has done precisely this and notoriously in WG matters.

(Ref.: notes on St. George appearance, summaries of what Symington has suppressed in his secret CIA hearings, marked transcript of Foreign "relations hrgs on Helms' nomination as A, bassador to Iran.)

If he is not alone in it, and he isn't, Symington personally is suppressing both proof of the CIA criminality and confessions of other White House crime.

(In any study of whether the Senate has protected the CIA, Russell's comment to the effect you can't believe a word they tell you in the Warren executive sessions plus his giving up oversight responsibilities after my contact with him plus my Russell file should be assessed.)