

What did Senator Baker know, When Did He Know
It - And What Did He Do About It?

Wise Chairman Baker was reminded of his first defense of Nixon about a year after the committee started its work and long, long after its last hearings when he was on "Face the Nation" on March 24, 1974. Baker had turned all the hounds away from the real Nixon spoor with a limited formulation of which ^{Dan} Schorr asked him, "in view of the fact that four of the associates closest [to Nixon] are now under indictment, whether you still think it is an issue of what the President knew and when did he know it, or whether it is a larger issue of whether President presided [sic] over something..."

This still left open Nixon's personal participation, a major question, but Baker, after all his own committee's hearings in public and in secret hewed to his initial limitation, "No, I think it's still a question of what did the President know." While admitting that Nixon is "responsible for the action of his agents," Baker did advance his defense of Nixon that was hidden only because the media didn't want to see it a step further, saying "the country...wants more than legal theories."

Would he want more with a pot-smoking long-hair?

Are the jails ^{not} overfilled with men and women who did more than violate the law?

But there was no protest when Baker said mere violation of the law is not enough for the country to get Nixon off its back. Nixon's impeachment assured no Republican successor and Baker so much wanted to be his successor!

Baker, recognized by the White House as its man, as Nixon's tapes show, was cunning but not obscure in the means he chose to keep Nixon unimpeached. This too-limited formulation is merely one. Another came in his examination of Hunt. From this much flowed.

It was September 25, the second day of Hunt's public testimony (9H3756) Baker asked:

^A "CIA is ~~precluded~~ by statute precluded from involvement in domestic affairs, and even non-domestic activity within the confines of the United States.... Can you honestly say...that the CIA was not involved in domestic activities?"

Mr. Hunt. No, sir, nor can I say that the CIA has ever stayed out of domestic activity. Senator Baker. Would you care to elaborate on that.

Mr. Hunt. I would like to consult counsel with regard to national security. [Laughter]

Senator Baker. Would you, please? It is any important point, really.

210
Ervin chided the audience for laughing and Hunt made a longer explanation of his reason for wanting "to consult counsel regarding certain national security aspects at least that might be involved in my reply." Baker told him "All right."

Here the transcript shows "[Conferring with counsel.]"

While Hunt was discussing whatever was in his mind with his lawyer, Sidney S. Sachs, The TV camera stayed on them. Their conversation was not long. They didn't have time to finish when ~~he~~ the clever Baker made his move:

"Senator Baker. Mr. Hunt, could I interrupt just for a ~~minute~~ moment. I understood you to say you wanted ~~to~~ confer with your counsel on certain security aspects of the question that I put to you. To conserve time and to provide against embarrassment to you or breach security ~~considerations~~ considerations, may I withdraw that question on the assurance from you and your counsel that we might pursue ~~this~~ that further in executive session?"

Mr. Hunt. Yes, sir.

Senator Baker. As we have done in other national security matters.

Could you, Mr. Hunt, suggest any way to this committee how we might legislate against further intervention by the CIA in domestic, especially political activity of this country?"

Mr. Hunt. Senator Baker, I believe that legislation is already on the books. How it could be further and better legislated against, I would have no idea.

Baker here dropped and the committee never picked up with illegal CIA activity, "especially political activity of this country."

He asked Hunt about Colson's secretary having the combination to Hunt's safe and "Well, if she had the combination to the safe, why was the safe drilled?" Hunt agreed that it was a good question, "I have often wondered."

Then Baker asked about the contents of Hunt's safe and was satisfied without meaningful answer when Hunt wanted to consult with counsel. Baker said merely, "Fine. Lets skip over with Mr. Hunt." (91E3757) He then asked about the missing two notebooks Hunt had left in his safe, notebooks John Dean had not been asked about when he was on the stand and Dean later admitted filing with Nixon's personal papers and then shredding. Baker prefaced his question with, "You have given us a number of names and references to material in those notebooks." He then asked, "why those notebooks disappeared? What was in them that would cause them to be so sensitive if they were found or why they would be a candidate for destruction, ~~if they~~...?"

Hunt's answer was explicit: "...they would provide a ready handbook by which any

investigator with any resources at all could quickly determine the parameters of the Gemstone operation. And other operations in which I was involved, and contemplated."

Baker dropped the hot potato fast, with the lame explanation "I would like to pursue that further at another time and it may be that you could discuss that with us in an executive session or with an additional line of inquiry later." (9H3757)

This was a brief exchange. It also was an exceedingly meaningful one. When none of those things that Baker said he would come back to were ever picked up it meant that his and the committee's purposes were much less serious than its press led the people to believe.

In fairness to Hunt, he had not only volunteered more than Baker had bargained for - he did not refuse to answer a single question. He did veer off into generalities when Baker asked him about what was in the safe, but that did not mean the experienced members of the committee, all lawyers, or its staff, had to be content with a woy Hunt. In shifting to a generality Hunt did no more than signal a reluctance to go into details. It was not Baker's obligation to follow Hunt's cues. It was his obligation to conduct the investigation that made him a national celebrity and a presidential contender.

Nothing was more essential to that investigation, the public obligation Baker assumed in accepting the committee assignment, than the last specifics in Hunt's quoted answer:

His notebooks that disappeared from his safe would disclose

a) "the parameters of the Gemstone operation," which is to say the whole Nixon domestic spying and dirty-works operations, of which the caught break-in was only a tiny part;

b) s "other operations in which I was involved," of which we have seen only a couple that were of no official interest in this or any other official investigation, all relevant to this committee's investigation; and

c) "...the parameters of...other...operations...contemplated."

What else Nixon's spokes planned, whether spying, dirty-works or both, was never ask anywhere by anyone, official or press, in any proceeding or interview. No word of any leaked. No participant ever breathed a word.

These participants could have been immunized against punishment and asked. This is precisely the phoney defense Petersen, Silbert and their associates advanced when it became apparent that the initial prosecution was no more than another in an unended series of whitewashes.

But nobody ever did it!

Nixon and his henchmen read these signals immediately and clearly.

Nixon was and remained so nervous in his public appearances that he sweated profusely and repeatedly misspoke himself - until there was no doubt that this committee was not going to conduct a real investigation, that it would be content with doing little more than repeating what was already public but on TV so it would be well publicized. When the TV interest declined, the committee just pooped out.

Seeing all these high officials who had done so much wrong confessing some of their transgressions against law and society and seeing others stonewalling it, confessing nothing and fighting back, was a live, real-life soap opera. ^{TV} It was first-rate fare.

But it was not investigating, it was not informing the people and it was not laying a real foundation for the committee's primary function, recommending legislation to end this corrupting of the entire political process and with it the corrupting of representative society.

Because these hearings were such sensational TV programming, like a real-life ^{"Mission Impossible"} ~~Congress~~, the nation was deceived into believing that it was a real investigation. By now the reader should be aware that it was considerable less than this in performance and in content.

This failure, design/~~xxxx~~ and intent, not incompetence, was another and one of the major assurances of Nixon's unimpeachment.

But because these hearings were by their nature and cast of characters so sensational, there was the national deception that they were a real investigation.

They were the opposite.

This except from the non-investigation by the non-questions of the not-unwilling Hunt is but one example - an example in an essential area, however.

Watergate

The only thing the ~~Ervin~~ committee did well was ~~cover~~ covering up.

Unless one considers its TV performance.

That was indispensable in the continuing of the covering up that began with the White House and involved all the agencies of justice, prosecutorial and investigatory. The ~~Ervin~~ committee made effective use of TV. It came across like Gangbusters; and the people believed their servants in the Senate were doing their job well. But in actuality, ~~despite all that was taken to the people because of these sensational hearings, all that most people came to know only because of this super-spectacular on the tube, that~~ ^{the} excellent ^{eye of the} performance was ⁱⁿ part of the hiding of the basic fact and the essential truth. It was a process in which the committee devoted itself to dramatizing the old that had leaked been and burying as much as it could of the "new" evidence.

~~This if not alone is the major reason "Nixon was able to survive." The committee that was supposed to investigate and expose did not investigate and did not expose. Instead it became a kind of adjunct of the press, performing a reportorial function with superficial competence, considerable attractiveness and with world-wide attention.~~

A case of this nature can be proven against the committee with almost any of its witnesses and almost any part of its hearings. It was by no means uncommon for more to have been available from a moderately diligent reading of the press than was in its testimony. Of these many possible illustrations, few are more comprehensible and significant than its handling - by which I mean mishandling - of the CIA witnesses.

Here the Senatorial heavy-weights and their swollen staff that when it did well leaked what was being suppressed performed the next-to-impossible, suppressing what was public. Because its witnesses had identical ^{objectives} ~~interests~~ suppression in their own and not always identical interests - and because these were all witnesses trained to dissemble - the witnesses collaborated. But even then it could not have happened had not the media allowed it to happen by simply not reporting what it could and should have reported, what was readily available to it.

Whoever in the media did not play the game was favored with no juicy leaks

They all walked on eggs.

They broke none.

~~So, Nixon had no greater mess in the White House than he had made there.~~

The character of these witnessds was unique. No Hollywood superdooper, no Broadway play, no TV spectacular, had ever boasted such a cast:

The former Director of Cenral Intelligence;

Two former Deputy Directors, Central Intelligence, both generals and one then the Commandant of the fable "arine Corps;

Hunt,

~~One~~ secret agent who had helped overthrow a friendly, democratic government, had tried without success to overthrow another one at least, and had lusted to assassinate the head of another state;

another *McLoud,*

~~One~~ secret agent who had been involved in some of the more delicate of CIA's proper missions and had been caught in the act of breaking in;

*(one of these only was a
not rep. of this who part
reported in New Yorker*

get

And four Cuban operatives also caught, all with story-book pasts. *(one of these only was a not rep. of this who part reported in New Yorker)*
~~Of these, at most one was not involved in the fiasco of the Bay of Pigs.~~

~~And of these, if~~ we will never know all who were in some way involved in the official investigation of the assassination of President Kennedy, my investigations prove that no fewer than three were, with more likely.

And this is to say nothing about the uninvestigated ^{*Cobson*} Hunt effort to exploit ~~it~~ that crime for the most sordid political purposes by faking secret cables designed to make it appear that President Kennedy had been behind the assassination of South Vietnamese Dictator Diem and his ~~strong-trooper~~ ^{*in-ten's*} chieftain brother, ~~Nhu~~. The natural consequences of ~~Hunt~~ ^{Hunt's} this infamy, performed as part of ~~his~~ Nixon spookery, was to establish a manufactured motive for the JFK assassination, retribution for the Diem-Nhu assassinations.

All this and Nixon's connections with it the ~~Ervin~~ committee managed to avoid putting together and putting into the proper and necessary context while simultaneously avoiding the obvious investigation. At the same time it avoided the equally obvious and no less essential investigation of the wholesale illegalities and improprieties of the CIA.

7
Hiding and protecting as the ~~Bain~~ committee did in CIA- Nixon areas was a truly virtuoso performance requiring and getting the collaboration of an enormous cast of players. It was a script no playwright would have dared.

And they pulled it off.

Examination of the testimony and comparing it with what was not ~~gone~~ ^{with this Hunt excerpt merely one example} into when it was taken - what was suppressed ^{),} tells the ghastly story of how the country has no protections at all when all those who have ~~the~~ protective responsibilities combine to hide, whether for some self-conceived high purpose like "national interest" ^{personal involvement or from fear.} or from ~~simple, professional incompetence.~~

^{It meant} More than the protection of Nixon and his gang were the result.

~~There was still another~~ jeopardy to the whole system of society.

Totalitarianism was advanced by it. And those who did advance totalitarianism by these malfeasances, non-feasances and misfeasances are among those who had most loudly proclaimed their unending dedication to a free society.

~~Extra space. Pick up analysis testimony~~

An earlier example parallels and relates to what Baker here suppressed. It is the official Nixon Gestapo plan, an Ameriform version he did approve. It came to be called the "Huston" plan because former YAF leader Tom Charles Huston was his coordinator of it. It was Nixon's plan. It provided for the official doing of just about everything Hitler did, except for the crematoria and concentration camps. The Hunt/Liddy gang later did many of these things. The Huston plan included unlimited burglaries, surveillances, bugging, tapping, mail interceptions, interferences in all basic rights. And even the burglaries of foreign embassies, what the Nixon crew did and the various committees, knowing it, as we have seen, suppressed.

John Dean, who had been in on this and had worked out a subsequent program with John Mitchell - for "our domestic intelligence operation" ^{xeroxes of} (3H1335-45) took the entire White House on these fascist operations with him. ^{He} gave them to Judge Sirica, who gave them to the committee. ¹⁶ (3H1060) Senator Lowell Weicher who more than anyone else on the committee deserves praise for effort, opened the afternoon hearing of

Tuesday, June 26, 1973 - his first opportunity to question Dean - by asking Dean about what in his opening statement Dean had described as "the project...to restructure... intelligence...The revised domestic intelligence plan...for the President." (3H1055ff) The documents were unidentified when they were, on Weicher's insistence (3H1059), entered into the record (3H1062), without any meaningful description.

It is Baker again who was super-cautious over this phoney preoccupation with fake "national security." He proposed and Ervin agreed ~~in~~ "absolutely" that Dean confer with his lawyers "on these documents" with no further reason or explanation. The committee then recessed so it could be done. (3H1061)

The "identification" of these really important papers is no more than "true copies with certain deletions of matters relating to foreign intelligence, as being true copies of the ~~indium~~ documents you delivered to Judge Sirica." (3H1061)

This could mean something, at most, to Dean and Sirica only. Not to those at the hearing, not to those who watched on TV, or to the small number who who read the transcripts. When Dean said they were those documents they were marked Exhibits 35 through 42 (3H1062). Parts are printed, expurgated. (3H13 (3H1319-38)

The transcript here is deceptive. There was another of ~~which~~ there is no description anywhere. The court reporter and the committee's editor combined to omit even the fact that Exhibit 43 was entered into the record. It can be a single sheet or an entire file cabinet of papers. There is no way of knowing from the transcript, which makes no mention of it at all. But because more attention might be attracted if there were no accounting for Exhibit 43 at all, the table of contents (3Hv) notes inconspicuously that it was "submitted for identification only, not for publication, and will be retained in the files of the committee."

There was no genuine questions of "national security" or "foreign intelligence" in any of these exhibits except for the unknown Exhibit 43. I have compared what the committee did not suppress with what had been leaked and published three months earlier. Newspapers Two ~~editions~~ only - and there were more stories on this - The New York Times of June 7 and The Washington Post of June 27 - printed more than the committee did!

Incredible as it may seem, this committee actually suppressed my masking in xeroxing what newspapers printed three months earlier!

It begins with the very first entry of the very first of these exhibits (3M319) where everything in the basic plan headed "OPERATIONAL RESTRAINTS ON INTELLIGENCE COLLECTION" (and this is truly Orwellian because it was not "restraints" that was suppressed) is unblemished white space. There is no text at all until "B. Electronic Surveillance and Penetrations. (pp.26-28)" (3M319)

This committee that was to expose suppressed the content of the first 25 pages of Nixon's plan for a police state.

Other leaked documents it ignored entirely. I had copies that were stolen. One part that was masked later became a cause celebre beginning with the January 12, 1974 issues of the same two papers. It was the story of the Pentagon spying on Secretary of State Kissinger!

They really stole his most secret files, as a long series of news stories disclosed thereafter.

How conspiratorial can even a Nixon administration get when a Secretary of State denies the military the knowledge of policy it feels it requires to defend the country or when he believes the security of the country requires him to keep secrets from the military?

And what kind of "investigation" suppresses so much, this and that of which it is not typical, the administrations plans against its own citizens?

The "Huston" plan of Nixons specifies what his Hunt-Liddy gangsters did on a smaller scale.

There is a book-length chapter analyzing this police-state plan of Nixon's in the book that grew to long. Because I did not want to rely on newspapers versions and before the transcripts were printed I asked a Senator/^{friend} who is both a moderate and a strong opponent of any authoritarianism to obtain xeroxes of only what the Times and Post had printed and in which there were typographical errors. He assigned a member of his staff to ask the committee. The staff member was refused copies of the public record-

(Were there any question of the relevance of all of this to impeachment and to the Watergate committee's assigned responsibilities it was officially ended July 19,1974 when the House Judiciary Committee issued its draft of impeachment charges and in connection with it published all these suppressed documents."

10
even though it had already been published not less than a half-million times!

The Senator tried in person. He also was refused!

Perhaps there may have been a legitimate "national security" factor in suppressed Exhibit 43. I know of no case and I have personal experience with many, including in litigation, in which this invocation of "national security" was legitimate. I have had many pages of such documents delivered to me after the fake incantation. But if it could have been true of Exhibit 43, could it possibly have been true of what had been so widely published?

This is an insight into the actual workings of the committee that is so completely opposite its public image so carefully cultivated on TV, where the eye-brows wobbled such indignant outrage. Behind the scenes this committee was one of the larger-scale suppressors, which in itself enable Nixon's unimpeachment.

10 * It is necessary for those not familiar with the way it all worked to understand what Baker accomplished for Nixon in his self-aborting of his questioning of Hunt and for what he later did.

When Hunt said without any effort to hide that his notebooks held what would expose the whole Gemstone operation, those other unidentified operations he had been part of and those planned, instead of dropping it Baker should have gone into each of these because each was apt of the committee's job. These notebooks held the names, addresses and phones of other people Hunt used, but no single question was asked about them, either.

When Hunt had said no more than that he wanted to consult with his lawyer about whether there "might" be "national security aspects" in his response to a question having to do with lawless operations, before he could consult and reply -without waiting to see if there even might be a question in the lawyer's mind, Baker suddenly ~~got into a rush~~ felt the urge "to conserve time" and "to provide against embarrassment to you" - a self-confessed felon engaged in the most subversive illegalities Baker was supposed to be investigating - and afraid of "national security considerations" - all before the lawyer could have an opinion that the committee did not have to accept in any event.

Instead Baker withdrew the question.

In this way the quick-thinking Baker accomplished two objectives: he kept all of this

testimony that Hunt could and should have given, only part of which is in earlier chapters of this book, from being in the record and from being available to the nationwide audience and he retained personal control of what he could thereafter use in whatever way he saw fit.

Hunt had testified that the CIA was engaged in illegal "domestic activity" and that it always had been -that it never "stayed out of domestic activity." (9H3756)

Baker had asked him to elaborate.

And then Baker, not Hunt and not on Hunt's lawyer's request, decided against it.

This means only an affirmative desire to suppress. It came to mean a desire to deliberately deceive, misuse, defame and corrupt, while keeping it all out of the public record.

This, remember, was September 26, 1973. There came a time when Baker released his own report, after much leaking of deliberately falsifications of it. The date becomes important.

As with the Colson cooperative enterprise, it should be addressed as close to chronologically as possible.

First there was an attempted Republican allegation that under LBJ and with the CIA ^{doing it for him} there was a Democratic Watergate. It was an unimaginative invention that attracted attention for several days. What was imaginative was Baker's arranging an exclusive leak to The Washington Post of the fake. This put the Post and Woodward and Bernstein in a delicate position. If they did not use the story from an authoritative source they could be charged with bias in using leaks selectively, against Republicans and Nixon only. But because they had trouble believing the story, the editors were apprehensive about using it. The Post had followed the policy of not using what it could not get confirmed by at least one source whose credibility was good. Because it had followed this authenticating policy, it had an exceptional record for accuracy on the most delicate stories. However, ~~it~~ also cost the paper several scoops when it could not verify what ^{the caution} it had picked up and would not use unverified leaks, regardless of source.

It had no confirmation of this Baker leak but it feared the accusations if it did

print the story. Its position was more embarrassing because the leak included the accusation that Woodward Had Bennett as a source and in return for Bennett's services protected him by not using stories adverse to his interest. or against his desire. This had been obvious. From my personal experience already recounted it included the CIA, also. ~~and was the earliest confirmation of the obvious suspicion that Hunt was a CIA agent~~ ~~was a CIA front~~ Woodward and Bernstein had both declined to print legitimate Hunt stories I gave them early on, including his domestic-intelligence role and his ambition to assassinate Castro. They also declined to use or to follow up on my evidence that "Allen/Bennet was a CIA operation. Woodward personally claimed he could not find Max Littauer in New York and was unable to find any Hunt connection with the CIA ~~and~~ book-publishers in the United States. Littauer could have been found in a phone directory published and in the standard sources, as a friend who never finished high school did for me when I sked him to copy the relevant pages for me in the New York Public Library.

After some agonizing the editors went ahead with the story. It was published December 20, 1973. Because of the position in which the Post was and because those who followed it up were in a position to come closer to indicating sources who in turn had an opportunity to clarify or add to what the Post printed, they are quoted.

^{banner} ^{small} (Fred. Post)
The December 21 headline in our/local paper on the Associated Press story read, "Conspirator Reveals He Spied on Goldwater In 1964 Campaign." The New York Times headed same day's the/story it had assigned to David E. Rosenbaum "Hunt Said to Tell Investigators He Spied On Goldwater in 1964." The first seven paragraphs of his story report straightforwardly what Baker alleged and its claimed basis: Lil- marked in blue.

This has its inspiration in a Nixon fake, that the FBI had spied on Goldwater and tapped his phones for LBJ during that same campaign. But neither the Times nor AP noted that spying on Goldwater would have Hunt working against his own man. Hunt is farthure to the right in his extreme political views than Goldwater. This Baker yarn is also a direct and unimaginative copy of testimony the committee had taken in public, the reality that Hunt had worked with two ^{Republican} spies inside the camps of the Democratic contenders during the 1972 campaign. "Fat Jack" John R. Buckley and Tom Gregory. They stole exactly this kind of campaign information.

BARBER-CIA

Investigative
Operations
Section
Mr. [Name]

Investigator Water in 1964

Investigative
Operations
Section
Mr. [Name]

Mr. [Name]

Mr. [Name]

Mr. [Name]

Mr. [Name]

Mr. [Name]

Mr. [Name]

Mr. [Name]

Mr. [Name]

Mr. [Name]

Mr. [Name]

Mr. [Name]

Mr. [Name]

Mr. [Name]

[Handwritten mark on the left margin]

[Handwritten mark on the right margin]



From Hunt to Investigator Mr. Hunt in 1964

By [Name] and [Name]

...of the party...
...with Black...
...at the time...

...that in the...
...they...
...and that he...

...inform...
...water...

...were...
...Hunt...
...of the...

...and...
...Hunt...
...the...

...view...
...Hunt...
...of...

...of...
...Hunt...
...the...

...Hunt...
...the...

...Hunt...
...the...

...Hunt...
...the...

...Hunt...
...the...

...Hunt...
...the...

...Hunt...
...the...

...Hunt...
...the...

...Hunt...
...the...

...the...
...the...
...the...

...the...
...the...
...the...

...the...
...the...
...the...

...the...
...the...
...the...

...the...
...the...
...the...

...the...
...the...
...the...

...the...
...the...
...the...

...the...
...the...
...the...

...the...
...the...
...the...

...the...
...the...
...the...

...the...
...the...
...the...

...the...
...the...
...the...

[Faded text on the left side of the page, mostly illegible]

[Faded text on the right side of the page, mostly illegible]

(Bukley testified October 9, 1973. He was a former FBI agent and at the time he was a Nixon spy inside the Democratic party he was a Nixon employee, chief of the inspection division of the Office of Economic Opportunity. He was never charged for this offense. Instead he was found to be doing exactly the same kind of political intelligence for a supposed non-partisan Republican member of the House Judiciary Committee, Lawrence Hogan, during Hogan's re-election campaign, in July, 1974. This coincided with that committee's deliberations on impeaching Nixon. (11H4435ff; Post 9/26/73; AP 7/17/74)

Under normal conditions this story would have been discounted not only because it is illogical but because it was ~~not~~ the report of what is supposed to have transpired not the way the committee was supposed to work. It was a partisan operation from the reports: the Republican staff only present, in Baker's personal rather than the committee's offices and with the witness not under oath. AP quoted "A Republican committee source" as telling it that "Baker, minority counsel Fred D. Thompson and assistant minority counsel Donald Sanders have been interviewing Hunt in connection with their probe into that area "and other domestic CIA operations."

The time of this alleged but non-existent LBJ "Watergate" was outside the committee's jurisdiction. Even where Haldeman's record was material to its investigation, the committee declined to permit him to be questioned by a Democratic member on his conviction with Nixon for Watergate-type ~~xxx~~ fraudulent activities in Nixon's 1962 campaign for governor of California. The committee was limited to the 1972 campaign.

AP's account also discloses that when these interviews in Baker's office were held, "the majority was not told about it at the time." The majority of Democratic staff was not even told about this until the story was about to appear. (F Post 12/21/73)

Rosenbaum interviewed "Democratic members of the committee staff." They noted that Mr. Hunt was exhaustively questioned before his public testimony last September and he never mentioned gathering information about Mr. Goldwater. Moreover, there were indications that Mr. Hunt never even told his first two lawyers...Bittman and...Sachs, and that he certainly had not mentioned the matter to the special Watergate prosecutor. ¹¹

By the time of this fake defense of Nixon Bill Buckley had taken over Hunt's legal defense:

"Mr. Hunt was accompanied to the Baker interview by a new attorney, William A. Snyder of Baltimore, who would not answer questions today about what had been said at the interview. Mr. Hunt now has still another attorney, C. Dickerman Williams. William F. Buckley, Jr., the columnist, who is a friend of Mr. Hunt, arranged for Mr. Williams to represent him." (Times 12/21/73)

When Rosenbaum interviewed "Democratic officials who were connected with Mr. Johnson's 1964 campaign" they denied the whole scheme and had never even heard of Hunt then.

Apparently smelling a rat, "Goldwater refused to be interviewed" after the story appeared in that day's Post. (Times 12/21/73)

Once Baker manipulated the Nixon "enemy" Post into printing an attack on itself and the Democrats the Post had to do what Woodward declined to do when I told him right after the story first broke in 1972, what he said was impossible. This came out in the Post's story follow-up story. A careful reading of the part of the story the Post front-pages has its source denying what it says its source had told it and downgrading into virtual nothingness the charge it had made against LBJ for using the CIA as part of a surveillance operation, the part that was designed to make Nixon look no worse than LBJ: lil- entire p.1 grafs, marked in blue.

There is no comment in this unsigned article. However, by quoting Baker it leaves no doubt that Baker's activities were ~~unauthorized~~ outside any proper committee authority and beyond any authority he had: lil-marked 1

The most that could be attributed to Hunt seems to have been getting copies of what was released to the newspapers and had no connection with LBJ or ~~the~~ ^{his} campaign: marked 2

What Hunt was really doing then followed: marked 3

One editor of the Post believed this published "assistance" to the CIA had to do with books about Vietnam. In those days it could have meant only one of two things, neither of which could have required anything like "10 or 12 employees." The CIA did want books promoting the government line on the war published. It did not want those espousing contrary views to appear.

Hunt Had Minor Role in '64, Hill Unit Told

COMMITTEE, From A1

"I knew that we were getting Goldwater's speeches . . . the stuff that was going to the press," Cooper said. "How the hell it got there, I don't know." Cooper said he "never had the pleasure" of meeting Hunt.

Hunt was questioned primarily by the Republican minority staff. Sen. Howard H. Baker Jr. (R-Tenn.), the vice-chairman, has expressed a continuing interest in the possible role of the CIA in the Watergate affair.

Baker said last night, "I have no present plans to pursue this line of inquiry." According to a source close to Hunt, the main topic of discussion between the minority staff and Hunt has been CIA domestic operations.

Baker acknowledged that such inquiries, unless related to the Watergate affair, are beyond the scope of the select committee's mandate from the Senate. "There's no jurisdiction unless you stretch the point," Baker said.

Elizabeth McIntosh, a former CIA employe who worked with Hunt in a downtown Washington office in 1964, said yesterday that she understood that Goldwater speeches were not delivered to the White House but instead were delivered to CIA headquarters in Langley, Va.

"It was just to keep in touch with what was going on," Mrs. McIntosh said. "If it had anything to do with the White House, I'm sure he (Hunt) would have told us. He would have bragged about it."

She said that Hunt was part of a CIA cover office at 17th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue that consisted of

10 or 12 employes who maintained contact with publishers who were assisting the CIA. Hunt told the committee staff that he worked for a CIA branch called the Domestic Operations Division which was set up in the early 1960s.

Hunt told the committee staff that the actual pick-up was done by a secretary named Connie Hicks. Miss Hicks, who is now married and is Mrs. Mazenoy, of State College, Pa., said last night in a telephone interview that she did perform courier work when she worked for the CIA, but that she could not recall picking up any materials from Goldwater headquarters. She said she had never taken anything she picked up to the White House or the Executive Office Building.

"I might have picked it up from someone else, like in a hotel room," she said. When asked if she recalled a daily pick-up from any person in the same place during the period of the campaign, she said she did not.

Referring to Hunt's reported testimony on her role, Miss Hicks said, "I'm sure he wouldn't have said I had done something if I hadn't . . . I consider him to be a man of great integrity."

Hunt reportedly told the committee staff that immediately after Goldwater was nominated in 1964, he was told to pick up all publicly released information at Goldwater headquarters and take it to the White House to Cooper. Hunt reportedly said that he objected, as a Goldwater Republican, but was told to do it anyway.

Goldwater said on Wednesday that he knew of

Hunt's testimony, although not in detail. Goldwater said that he had no indication that the "surveillance" discussed by Hunt involved bugging, or any investigation into his private, financial or domestic affairs.

Another committee source said that Hunt had not indicated that wiretapping or eavesdropping was used, or that the "surveillance" involved anything more than the pick-up operation from Goldwater headquarters. At least two sources said that Hunt "volunteered" the in-

formation about the information without being produced to discuss it.

According to a committee source, Hunt provided little detail about the operation except that it involved "press releases, travel schedules, that sort of thing." This source said Hunt testified he was also suppose to get "other information" but that Hunt gave no details as to what it was or how it was to be obtained.

Rep. Lucien N. Nedzi (D-Mich.), chairman of the House Armed Service Intel-

ligence subcommittee, said yesterday that he had asked the CIA for any information on Hunt's activities as described in his secret testimony before the Watergate committee.

Nedzi, who said he was "dubious" of the testimony as reported in Wednesday editions of The Washington Post, said that the CIA was searching its files for information. From early indications, Nedzi said, "There is no one in a position of authority who can substantiate the story."

Hunt's Role in 1964 Minor, Hill Unit Told

12/21/73 Post

Watergate conspirator E. Howard Hunt's alleged "surveillance" of Sen. Barry Goldwater (R-Ariz.) during the 1964 presidential campaign consisted of having a secretary pick up press releases, speeches, travel schedules and other materials at Republican headquarters, according to reliable accounts of Hunt's secret testimony to the Senate select Watergate committee.

Although Hunt's activities carried out while he was a CIA agent, were originally described to The Washington Post as being a "surveillance" operation of Goldwater on orders from then President Lyndon B. Johnson, the source of that information declined initially to provide any details.

Yesterday, the same source, who cannot be identified, under a promise of

confidentiality, acknowledged when questioned again that Hunt had described a pick-up operation from Goldwater headquarters to the Watergate committee staff and had provided few details.

The source also denied saying that President Johnson had initiated the order for the operation.

According to reliable accounts, Hunt testified to the committee staff that the speeches and press releases were delivered to Chester L. Cooper, a White House aide to President Johnson who worked on foreign policy matters.

Cooper last night denied any knowledge of a CIA "surveillance" of Sen. Goldwater during the time he was the Republican nominee for President.

See COMMITTEE, A6, Col. 1

Hunt Had Minor Role in '64, Hill Unit Told

WASHINGTON, Nov. 11

I know that we were getting Goldwater's speeches... the staff that was going to the press," Cooper said. "How the hell I got there, I don't know." Cooper said he "never had the presence" of meeting Hunt.

Hunt was questioned privately by the Republican priority staff. Sen. Howard W. Baker Jr. (R-Tenn.), the vice-chairman, has expressed a continuing interest in the possible role of the CIA in the Watergate affair.

Baker said last night, "I have no present plans to pursue this line of inquiry." According to a source close to Hunt, the main topic of discussion between the White House staff and Hunt has been CIA domestic operations.

Baker acknowledged that such inquiries, unless related to the Watergate affair, are beyond the scope of the secret committee's mandate from the Senate. "There is justification in the fact you stretch one today," Baker said.

Elizabeth Atchison, a former CIA employee who works with Hunt in a downtown Washington office in 1964, said yesterday that she understood that Goldwater speeches were not delivered to the White House but instead were delivered to CIA headquarters in Langley, Va.

It was just to keep in touch with what was going on," Miss Atchison said. "It was something to do with the White House. I'm sure he (Hunt) would have brought about the word have brought about

She said that Hunt was part of a CIA operation that took place and passed the White House. She said that

10 of 12 employees who maintained contact with publishers who were assisting the CIA. Hunt told the committee staff that he worked for a CIA branch called the Domestic Operations Division which was set up in the early 1960s.

Hunt told the committee staff that the actual pick-up was done by a secretary named Connie Hicks. Miss Hicks, who is now married and is Mrs. Massey, of State College, Pa., said last night in a telephone interview that she did perform courier work when she worked for the CIA, but that she could not recall picking up any materials from Goldwater headquarters. She said she never taken anything she picked up to the White House or the Executive Office Building.

"I might have packed it up from someone else, like in a hotel room," she said. When asked if she recalled a daily pick-up from any person in the same place during the period of the campaign, she said she did not.

Referring to Hunt's reported testimony on his role, Miss Hicks said, "I'm sure he wouldn't have said I had done something if I hadn't. I consider myself to be a man of great integrity."

Hunt reportedly told the committee staff that immediately after Goldwater was nominated in 1964, he was told to pick up all publicly released information at Goldwater headquarters and take it to the White House in Capitol Hill. He reportedly said that he accepted as a volunteer to publish, but was told to do so anyway.

Goldwater said on Tuesday that he never received any information that he should be doing

Hunt's testimony, although not in detail, Goldwater said that he had no indication that the "surveillance" discussed by Hunt involved bugging, or any investigation into his private, financial or domestic affairs.

Another committee source said that Hunt had not indicated that wiretapping or "eavesdropping" was used, or that the "surveillance" involved anything more than the pick-up operation from Goldwater headquarters. At least two sources said that Hunt "eavesdropped" the in-

formation about the information without being provided to discuss it. According to a committee source, Hunt provided little detail about the operation except that it involved press releases, travel expenses, that sort of thing. This source said Hunt testified he was also supposed to get "other information" but that Hunt gave no details as to what it was or how it was to be obtained.

Rep. Lauren N. Nead, D-Minn., chairman of the House Armed Services Panel, said that he had no information about the operation.

Confidentially, several sources said that Hunt had written a pick-up operation from Goldwater headquarters to the Watergate committee staff and had given them a list of names, addresses, speeches, travel schedules and other materials at Republican headquarters, according to reliable accounts of Hunt's secret testimony to the Senate select Watergate committee.

Although Hunt's activities carried out while he was a CIA agent, were originally described to the Washington Post as being a "sovereign" operation of Goldwater on orders from then President Lyndon B. Johnson, the source of that information declined initially to provide any details.

Senate subcommittee said yesterday that he had asked the CIA for any information on Hunt's activities as described in his secret testimony before the Watergate committee.

Nead, who said he was "dubious" of the testimony reported in Wednesday editions of The Washington Post, said that the CIA was searching its files for information from 1961, in addition, Nead said, "There is no one in a position of authority who can speak to the way

Confidentially, several sources said that Hunt had written a pick-up operation from Goldwater headquarters to the Watergate committee staff and had given them a list of names, addresses, speeches, travel schedules and other materials at Republican headquarters, according to reliable accounts of Hunt's secret testimony to the Senate select Watergate committee.

The source also said that President Johnson had had nothing to do with the operation.

According to reports in court, Hunt testified to the committee last July 15, in speeches on government were delivered to Chevrolet, Cooper a White House aide to President Johnson who helped in the operation.

Cooper has been named in a report by a CIA source that a top White House aide had been involved in the operation.

Hunt's Role in 1964 Minor, Hill Unit Told

Watergate conspirator E. Howard Hunt's alleged "eavesdropping" of Sen. Barry Goldwater (R-Ariz.) during the 1964 presidential campaign consisted of having a secretary pick up press releases, speeches, travel schedules and other materials at Republican headquarters, according to reliable accounts of Hunt's secret testimony to the Senate select Watergate committee.

Although Hunt's activities carried out while he was a CIA agent, were originally described to the Washington Post as being a "sovereign" operation of Goldwater on orders from then President Lyndon B. Johnson, the source of that information declined initially to provide any details.

Yesterday, the same source, who cannot be named, said that he had no information about the operation.

11/11

Hedzi apparently had conducted some investigation because he reported that "unt's CIA file shows him to have been ill during this period. Hunt was hospitalized from October 12 through 16 and then was granted leave until December 8. That this was really a medical leave and not a dodge for spooking is confirmed by medical reports and X-rays. Hedzi's skepticism was increased by the fact that in some 270 pages of testimony taken from Hunt in June, before his Watergate committee testimony and when Hunt faced a sentence of up to 35 years that would be reduced if he were cooperative, he "appeared to desire to reveal everything" but made no reference to any political espionage activity in 1964 even though he volunteered page after page of reminiscences about his CIA career. (Star-News 12/21/73)

The Post found and interviewed Hunt's "spy." She had no recollection ~~affix~~ at all of what by now had diminished to no more than getting the texts of public speeches Goldwater made: marked 4

She was a Hunt faithful: marked 5

There followed a description of what Hunt is said to have said he "picked up" and for which he allegedly needed a CIA "courier"- "all publicly-released information at Goldwater headquarters."

"Another committee source" told the Post "that Hunt had not indicated that wiretapping or eavesdropping was used...~~XXXX~~ two sources said that Hunt 'volunteered' the information about the information [sic] without being prodded to discuss it. According to a committee source Hunt provided little detail."

House oversight committee chairman Nedzi had heard the tale and "had asked the CIA for any information on Hunt's activities as described in his secret testimony....Nedzi... was 'dubious'..." He said there was no confirmation from the CIA.

~~15A~~ This was not because the CIA could not confirm the part about the "book" operation or about the clandestine office. I had no trouble at all locating it. In a transcript of a Hunt conversation I had he also had given the location of ^{"CIA cover} this/office " as "at 17th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue" but it was west of the corner, in that block.

15A Post Staff writer Robert C. Baynard took the Post to task for what he did not describe as allowing itself to be misused by Baker or as what can be called Baker's personal Watergating. In it he also exposed Goldwater's part in still new Republican dirty-works which he also did not characterize. Baynard was unsympathetic to the Post's compromised position which had been deliberately contrived for it: lil-marked 1 (Post 1/17/74) His presentation of "the other side" ignored this and addressed the second-source policy only: marked 2

There was not Baker's only overt defense of Nixon. He sought to exploit ~~one of these~~ suppressed parts of the "Huston" papers to the same end. "Because this ^{is} ~~this~~ Liminger flap

^{clear} did come out much later it is ~~known~~ that Baker was up to another dirty trick because ^{there} ~~is~~ simply can't have the meaning he attributed ~~to it~~. The Post page-one ~~had~~ on his in his "ISSUES and answers" documents to a nation wide audience December 30.

Robert C. Maynard

It Takes ^{part} Two to Tell The Tale

One of the principles that has characterized The Washington Post investigative reporting on Watergate from its inception has been a rule that nothing told a reporter by one source is to be published until it can be confirmed by yet another independent source. "If one person will tell you," said an investigative reporter, "then it's not very hard to get it from another. There are no secrets in Washington."

As a result of that principle, very little of what The Post has printed about Watergate has ever been successfully refuted by the Nixon administration. At the same time, stories that later turned out to be true were withheld from publication because that second source couldn't be found.

The News Business

But the best of principles often go awry, and this is the anatomy of one such story, pieced together as best it can be without violating those all-important confidences.

From the outset of the Watergate hearings, a familiar refrain among the embarrassed Republicans on Capitol Hill was that they would eventually prove that the Democrats were as guilty of "dirty tricks" as the Republicans.

During John Dean's painful week, several Republicans warned their Democratic colleagues to contain any temptation to smirk, for their embarrassing time was soon to come. When it didn't materialize by the August recess, notice was served that time would be set aside immediately after the recess for "Democratic dirty tricks." Nothing comparable to the Watergate break-in materialized.

Then, as if out of the blue, a four-column story marched across the front page of The Washington Post of Dec. 20, its headline declaring: **Hunt Tells Senate Panel He Spied On Goldwater in '64 on LBJ Order.**

The story told of E. Howard Hunt, working with other operatives of the Central Intelligence Agency, spying on Goldwater "well before his nomination." It said he acted at the instruction of President Johnson, passed to Hunt through an intermediary.

Let himself as saying, "I knew 10 years ago what was going on" and he added that ~~one~~ of his within the CIA and FBI had told him he was under the surveillance of both agencies during his disastrous campaign.

There at last, it seemed, was the stuff of which bipartisan scandal is made. That Hunt, the principal actor responsible for so much of Watergate, was also involved made it all the more compelling a tale.

Unfortunately, the bubble was burst 24 hours later. The headline then was: **Hunt's Role in 1964 Minor, Hill Unit Told.**

The second day story acknowledged: "Watergate conspirator E. Howard Hunt's alleged 'surveillance' of Sen. Barry Goldwater during the 1964 presidential campaign consisted of having a secretary pick up press releases, speeches, travel schedules and other materials at Republican headquarters, according to reliable accounts of Hunt's secret testimony to the Senate Select Watergate Committee."

So, those who were expecting the long-awaited unfolding of the Democratic version of "dirty tricks" were to be disappointed once again.

Some editors have defended the first Post story against the charge that it was based on a single source by saying that the unnamed source was one, and Goldwater was the second. Therefore, it has been argued, the story didn't violate the paper's wise principle of requiring two independent sources.

The trouble is that Goldwater apparently was not an independent source, but received his information from the same person The Post quoted. Apparently, Goldwater learned of the Hunt disclosures from a source within the committee and tipped an editor of The Post. The editor passed the tip to a reporter who wound up facing Goldwater's source. The reporter then went to Goldwater for more elaboration.

Thus, The Post was in the posture of reporting two sources for the story, when in fact it had only one, a violation of its own rule, a rule that had served it well for more than a year.

An explanation has been offered by Post editors and reporters, and it is that there was no way to tell for certain that Goldwater's source was also The Post's single source.

The business of printing stories based on anonymous sources is a dicey one under the best of circumstances. In Watergate, it is an incredibly tricky game. Those who know it best develop a smell for a bad pitch.

In this story, waiting a day to check further and to learn — as it later became possible to do — the content of the transcript would have prevented The Post from having to back away from the story in 24 hours.

None of this is to suggest for a moment that sordid campaign practices among Democrats are not yet to be revealed. Whether they come anywhere close to surgical gloves on the hands of former CIA agents in a Republican headquarters remains to be seen.

story was headed

~~December 30 approach was~~ "Watergate Explainable, Baker Says." (Post 12/31/73) The story begins: Lil-1st four grafs, marked in blue

How spying on Kissinger by the Pentagon or the tapping of 17 Kissinger employees or and reporters could "justify or explain" Nixon's crimes of in those specific instances make right his wrongful by-passing of the authorized federal agencies Baker did not go into and, when he could and did hide behind the "matter of grave national importance. Because these affairs did become public knowledge without detriment to any serious "interest" of any kind and because the House Judiciary Committee published extensive documentation on them in July 1974, the claim Baker and his committee made for them is worthless. For the committee it was an excuse for suppression. For Baker it was a gimmick behind which he could hide a new step in his pro-Nixon efforts.

Baker was asked about his comment relating to CIA during the hearings, "There are animals crashing around in the forest. I can hear them but I can't see them." His response was cryptic, "I do know of other circumstances that I think ought to be investigated and they ought to be disclosed to the country. Some of them do involve national security," like that "grave" one. He said this is the one Nixon invoked in his November 17 nationally-televised appearance before the Associated Press Managing Editors' Association. In direct language this means that Nixon's claims to "national security" urgencies was also false because the skies did not fall on public disclosure. There was damage to those who do dirty things in secret, their dirty works being exposed. The facts made no difference to national security.

Baker went even further, if with consummate delicacy, in taking the White House side over a then-current dispute, the committee's subpoena for evidence Nixon suppressed. Baker's description of the subpoena was "extraordinary." Much of this subpoenaed evidence was obtained by the House Judiciary Committee, which began systematic releases of thousands of pages of it in July 1974. Nixon earlier released transcripts of some of the tapes. What is "extraordinary" is the content, not the subpoena. Even the partisan House Republicans did not allege irrelevance.

Also extraordinary is the failure of the press to explain what Baker was up to in his apparent defense of Nixon ~~the~~ he was supposed to be investigating.

More grist for the Baker-Nixon mill was CIA supplied. It destroyed evidence it claimed was not evidence because, it also claimed, it was not relevant to The Watergate. on January 29

Baker had Helms shuttling back for his ambassadorship in Iran two weeks after NBC and CBS/ reporters (Post 2/15/74) /news/broke the story of this destruction of tapes./Published accounts leave a choice between CIA lying and its being its own worst enemy. These accounts quote Helms's successor Colby. (Post, Times, SFChron, WPost/1/30/74) That Baker confirmed having spoke to Colby just before the story was used and with the CIA not benefitting from its use seems to pinpoint the source of the leak.

Colby confirmed that the CIA made and kept tapes. He also claimed that ~~the CIA~~ ~~we~~ "we had periodic destruction of our tapes." This "routine" destruction of January 18, 1973, just happened to be the day after Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield wrote the the CIA and other agencies in anticipate of the Senate investigation to ask them to preserve all potential evidence. While the CIA's acknowledgement of the Mansfield letter was ~~signed by the CIA on the 17th~~ "signed by the CIA on the 17th" or the day it was written and the day before the tape destruction, a CIA spokesman at first claimed that the Mansfield letter did not arrive until four days late, the 22nd. When the CIA learned of the earlier date it withdrew this statement and said ~~it would~~ it would "diligently try" to pin down what happened.

Neither this nor the CBS report that the CIA's secret taping may have included conversations with Nixon (AP 1/30/74) made the news again. Except for a one-time "edzi story. (Post 2/22/74)

It was his "judgement" after examination of a "voluminous" files delivered by the CIA February 21, including logs, notes and memoranda, that no Watergate or Presidential conversations were involved.

"Someone is trying to blow smoke around," he said after this examination and that of dozens of witnesses, including CIA officials.

News account did not remark on the coincidence in the timing. The destruction of these tapes at the time of the first Watergate trial, late January 1973. On February 14, 1974 the CIA told the Post's Laurence Stern "that the Jan. 18 date ~~is~~ 'may not be

(Baker also issued a ~~strong~~ strong denial - of what had not been reported. Democratic Senator Daniel Inoye wrote to ask him if Colson were cooperating with the Republican minority ~~which~~ after having avoided testimony by the claim to Constitutional immunity. (Post 3/27) I add emphasis to highlight ~~the~~ Baker's wrong emphasis, ~~denials~~ ^{his} of what had not been alleged:

"Colson is not cooperating with me or the committee."

The charge is that Colson had met "quietly and on numerous occasions" with Thompson, not Baker, and of Thompson-Colson "collaboration," not Colson's with Baker or the committee.

Denial of what had been reported rather than what had not been was never issued.

Senator Weicher, also a Republican, seems to have seen through these devices. When he made a demand that Colson be called as a witness to clear up the "controversy," "A spokesman for Baker acknowledged" March 28 "that Baker and Colson had been in contact but he said the issue was one of 'semantics.'" (Post 3/29/74) Thompson, who had not been "available" two days earlier, was when Baker needed him to take the Weicher heat. "He ~~confirmed~~ confirmed he had talked to Colson "several" times since September 19th including in Colson's own office. Besides this they had been in phone contact. In declining to discuss the substance of these conversations, Thompson described their subject as "totally" CIA. His meetings with Colson in his own office ^{was} without either a committee member or another staff member present.

The "semantics" ^{turned} turned out to be Baker's exploitation of the description "collaborated." Baker admitted the Colson contacts. His spokesman put it this way, "In essence that's what we're saying - that there has been contact but there's no collaboration going on." (Post 3/29/74)

Until Weicher's demand for a full committee hearing one would never have known this from Baker's quoted comments or those of his "spokesmen."

correct' as the time the tapes were destroyed."

That the CIA doesn't keep the records it keeps or doesn't tell the truth about them plus the timely or untimely tape destruction advanced Baker's cause.

March 19

Jack Anderson finally reported what would be obvious in any analysis of what was going on, that Baker "has been dealing ~~with~~ behind the scenes with" Colson "in a joint effort to implicate the Central Intelligence Agency in the Watergate break-in and cover-up." (Post 3/19/74)

While Colson had used his Constitutional right against self-incrimination to avoid testifying before the committee "he has been collaborating quietly with Baker's top committee aide, Fred Thompson, in the separate attempt to shift more of the Watergate blame to the CIA. Colson has also been in touch with the White House on this CIA angle," arousing suspicions their "ploy" was "to divert public attention from President Nixon's own Watergate role."

Baker's staff denied a "diversion" and ~~promised~~ ^{promised} a "report" that would be a "bombshell."

18A
— This promise and other planted plugs for Baker's report preceded his March 24 "Face the Nation" appearance and were plugs for it. With this buildup he used the his "extensive" nationwide TV broadcast to plug ~~ix~~ report.

~~ix~~ About those "animals crashing around" on the ABC "Issues and Answers" program he identified as ~~the Kissinger spying~~ ^{one} Pentagon's spying on Kissinger. But there is and he suggested no CIA connection.

Why would the White House and CREEPS "undertake to cover it up with this elaborate scheme of fund-raising," dangerous as that was to Nixon, if the Watergate was a CIA job? Baker's non-response takes up about an eighth of the transcript of the hour-long show. He was not suggesting a "Seven days in May" scenario."

Baker's own scenario was pretty good. The next day the Post carried a page-one story headed "Baker Probes Possible Ties Between CIA and Watergate." The carryover was about two-thirds of a page. Lawrence Meyer's lead is this "closed-door investigation" of Baker's.

On February 20, Baker's honcho Thompson had prepared a memo itemizing 16 unanswered subjects of requests to the CIA. One of these was for "any previous relationship, contact

or reference in the files to Bob Woodward." Meyer then wrote, "According to Baker, he had received information from a source he declined to disclose that Woodward has agreed with Robert F. Bennett...to be 'appropriately grateful' for information...Woodward and Bernstein, who met with Baker on Jan. 30, said that Baker told them he had information that Woodward has agreed with Bennett to "go easy" on his company and the CIA in exchange for information. Both reporters denied that any such agreement had been made... Bennett denied having told Baker or anyone else that he and Woodward had any agreement... .."

That Bennett was a Woodward source he is quoted as confirming. Only not a deal.

Consistent with his agonizing on TV, where he is an effective performer, Baker denied ulterior motives. "I am not trying to develop a theory," he in Meyer's word "bristled," "I am not trying to bail out the President. I am not trying to lynch the CIA." All he was doing is "pursuing the facts."

He had already given Ervin a "fair sized report."

Next there was the story about a CIA agent helping Mrs. James McCord destroy some of her husband's papers (Post 3/27/74) that, according to electronic news accounts, could "link" him with the CIA. What had to be done when he had retired for a ~~career~~ career there?

It had happened June 21 and 22, 1972. The 80-year-old friend, a CIA contact, Lee Pennington, did help her burn an accumulation after bomb threats. But what really happened and how it could have was not reported.

If the United States attorney's office had been less concerned with protecting Nixon and more concerned with prosecuting it would have obtained a search warrant for against McCord early on the morning of June 17. It never did. McCord had an accumulation of clippings. He is also a security nut, not only a security specialist. I understand from a private source in a position to know that McCord regularly collected the used typewriter ribbons from Republican offices and burned them personally at home. He was arrested with an unburned store on hand. He regarded the papers as a fire hazard if his home were bombed so he told his wife to burn them, and the ribbons.

She threw too much onto the fireplace at one time. The ribbons, instead of ~~burning~~

readily, combined with the packed paper to smoke the whole place up. When ~~McCORD~~ Pennington came in on this and helped Mrs. McCord out he also made a verbal report to Howard Osborne, a McCord friend and director of CIA security. Osborne put it into a memo, he did not give superiors when they asked for all Watergate materials. "because he did not regard this as Watergate material Osborne did not turn it in. A young employee reported Osborne. CIA, needing a scapegoat, forced Osborne into early retirement. (Part 4/2/74)

McCord was worried about his ~~old~~ 80-year-old friend's heart condition and the possibility of what he regarded as Pennington harassment causing a heart attack.

Thompson, with no members of the committee present, hailed McCord ~~and~~ ~~into~~ into a secret session. Bernard Fensterwald, Jr., then McCord's attorney, was present. When I questioned him about this he described Thompson's reiteration of the same meaninglessness he seemed to be reading for a paper he did not show McCord or his counsel. On the third ~~such~~ of these secret sessions Fensterwald told Thompson bluntly that this had to be some kind of childishness and it had to stop. Read what you are using, all of it, or we leave. And if you issue another subpoena, you'd better have a live Senator present or we won't be. Dash, who was present, told Thompson to read the document. Having no choice Thompson did. ^{that in} it was no more sinister than ~~xxxx~~ ^{ment} the ~~excite/~~ ~~xxxx~~ McCord's ~~having~~ records of his publicly reported were burned. retirement/ Thompson sought to make this appear that McCord was trying to hide his CIA past when it was publicly known, when the FBI and the CIA had records of it, and days after it was in the papers!

That ended Thompson's harassing of the McCords. (My notes 3/28/74)

McCord charged Baker with planting these prejudicial stories in a three-page letter to the Senate Judiciary Committee. Baker denied personally leaking the story. (Post 3/28/74) McCord included the allegation that Baker was "seeking a diversion for the President."

With Thompson alone in some of these "investigations," while reaching inside the mind of another is not possible, ~~then~~ ^{source and} McCord's charges about/intent are not without some confirmation. He did not charge another correlation. This ~~story~~ leaked non-sensation was almost two years old. It was not leaked in all that time, when so much was. ^{it} was leaked

after former Watergate prosecutor Silbert was nominated by Nixon to be United States Attorney for the District of Columbia and the end of the month before the hearings on his ~~nomination~~ confirmation hearings, which began in April. The phoney charges of McCord evidence destruction masked ~~the~~ Silbert's failure to do the obvious, get a search warrant for McCord's home and place of business. In the home he would have found much money easily traced to CREELB and an abundance of expensive, sophisticated CREEP electronic equipment. Had he requested a search warrant he would have had no difficulty getting one. Probable cause was obvious. Had he done it at any time in the succeeding months he would still have found the CREEP money and ~~electronics~~ bugging gear, which neither McCord ~~discovered~~ until several months later.

With the passing of time, despite the press focus on the House Judiciary Committee's impeachment hearings various aspects of the Baker charges that somehow The Watergate was a CIA story, inference they did Nixon in, satyed in the papers and in columns. After Colson snaffled a plea and avoided a trial and after Bast released what Colson had told him it received renewed attention. The Associated Press quoted an unnamed "official course in a May 31 story, saying that "Bennett did pass to his case officer [at CIA and not until July 10, 1972] some information. It was locked at and Helms was one who did look at it. But it was hearsay and, in the opinion of the agency officials who saw it, added nothing substantive to the information that had already been passed on so it was not immediately relayed either to the FBI or the congressional oversight committees."

What Bennett did report three weeks too late to be prompt - if this was his first report to his CIA superiors - we do not know. But what we do know that Bennett could have said, in earlier chapters, is not what had been reported anywhere and is not at all as here described. It is precisely the kind of information Baker pretended he was looking for. It was more readily available to him than it was to me. He was not interested in it because very simply it would have hurt Nixon, not helped him. Helping Nixon, not learning about the CIA, was Baker's purpose. That Bennett had personal CIA and Watergate involvement was publicly available long before Baker's committee existed. Had his real interest been on "information" he would not have joined in ignoring Bennett's depositions.

Best and the rest of this, including the leak to AP, was part of the buildup for the Baker "report."

As there was a warmup for the leak to the AP, so also was the AP story a leak for what was next leaked. There was newspaper discussion of the coming "Baker" report mixed in with what the committee's report would say. Baker was quoted as saying "after reviewing CIA files" that while his conclusions "were not exactly parallel to Colson's they have "some similarity." (Star-News 6/26/74)

Disclosure that - allegedly - "Testimony indicating that a Central Intelligence Agency official recommended" Hunt's employment by Mullen was enough to make ~~a~~ ^{another} page-one story of ~~amazing~~ the fact that Baker would let his report out July 2. (Post 7/2/74) When Helms had testified in a manner that could be construed this way more than a year earlier the alleged fact was not quite a sensation. But that the story's lead begins with the quoted words, words of no real consequence, for a page-one story is indicative of the interest Baker had built in his report.

There was no mystery about its content. Copies were distributed in advance marked in hand-letter capital letters, "In "Embargoed for Release 9 A.M. July 2."

What was news is not indicated as not being in Baker's report. It is written in a way most readers would take to be an account of the report's content. This news was the ~~of three~~ ^{of three} ~~names~~ ^{names} CIA official that are deleted from the report and the statement that Baker "drew upon" their memos in his report. One was Bennett's "case officer," another the "chief of the cover staff" and the third their retired Bo boss Howard Osborn, who had been security director. He had also been McCord's friend.

Two days before the release Redzi was on "Face the Nation." He had read the report. His comment, that he held no "bombshells," is an understatement.

AP's summary of the report after release is, ~~that~~ "There is evidence to suggest the CIA knew far more about the activities of Watergate conspirator E. Howard Hunt, Jr., than its officials have ever disclosed, a long-secret report by" Baker says. (Post 7/3/74)

The Post gave Baker page-one play again with more than a half-page on the inside. The main story begins by saying the Baker report says "The Central Intelligence Agency may have

known in advance of plans for break-ins at the offices of Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist and the Democratic National Committee's Watergate headquarters."

How far from certain the statements in this report is indicated by the ~~xxxxxx~~ eight-column headline on the inside-page interpretative story by Laurence Stern, "Few Conclusions Given by Baker on CIA, Watergate Tie." The headline is fair. The report says little and proves nothing relevant to the thrust of the whole idea that the CIA somehow boobytrapped the almost-guiltless Nixon.

Time magazine (7/15/74) found "disconcerting questions about CIA participation" but "no evidence that the agency either planned or executed the Watergate operation. If anything, the agency was apparently a victim of White House machinations." It also reported that "After reading the report Senator Sam Ervin...said that he had learned nothing new about the CIA role." The old man gave point to his mild comment by what the Baker operation was designed to cover over, that "Watergate came directly out of" CREEP "with the assistance of certain White House aides."

In keeping with the image the potential republican candidate for President in 1976 wanted to project, the image of a young and vigorous man, Baker is shown riding a motor cycle.

The picture tells it as it is. The whole Baker operation was public relations. It was not factual. It was not an investigation. But it was a professional, successful operation of the type that could have been visualized in the Colson-⁺agrunder Hofziger memo on the White House "PR firm" project.

It was a Madison Avenue job, not a Senate report.

It deserved to pass from the news as fast as it did. But the report itself was not the thing. What counted was the months of attention Baker and his unproven imputations received.

There was no way of taking this from the public mind.

And there was no complaint that Baker's report had not lived up to its billing.

In its purpose, to help Nixon while promoting Baker as a derring-do investigator who had the guts to tackle even the sacred CIA, it was a big success.

The report does not really say what Senator Baker knew. In it he pretends he can't say because the bad, bad CIA won't let him. It does not say when he knew anything but he disclosed that in the public hearings without attracting any attention. Rather does his report say he knew nothing about what he had billed it as saying, without indicating that what little he learned after the public hearings - and its relevance to The Water-gate is at best debatable - is what he should have learned before those public hearings. That he did not do this investigating, that he did not direct the large minority staff with which the tax-payers provided him to do that easy and obvious investigating before the hearings, is ample proof that his purposes were not getting to the bottom of everything but were using everything he could to get to the top.

This is the answer to "what did he do about it."