

Today's Jack Anderson column marks another development in the phoney campaign to blame CIA for WG in which there has been no trick to rotten for Baker.

Example: He leaked the totally false story that Hunt's domestic work was for LBJ. He had to know it was false when he leaked it.

What is fascinating is the unabashed dishonesty of this campaign, as is its possible purposes. My presumption is that Baker's prime objective is Baker's political ambitions that as a Republican are complicated by WG because the presidency or the vice presidency are the only advances for him.

How can a GOP hope to advance today? Only by doing something with WG/ And how can he do anything with that when it is 100% Republican? Only by blaming it on others and thus becoming a hero. In addition, what Baker is doing is defending Nixon, as he has from the first (Example: posing the wrong needs and following them on TV). If he can pin a bum rap on CIA he has done all he can and to the hardcore he will be a hero.

There is undisclosed CIA involvement. There is criminal CIA involvement. Baker has to know of at least some of these things because I have some of the secrets he has. But he is not addressing these things. The reason is that they do not blame WG on the CIA. This means his major interest is not CIA or punishing - even exposing - its criminality.

Instead he goes into what he intends to build into blaming them for WG, as in this leak to Anderson.

The first "proof" is a factually correct statement followed by an irrelevant substantiation: Walter's claim to having grown disenchanted and out off is false. Walters did perjure himself on this. But the proof is not in CIA shrink Malloy's having met "secretly with Hunt on the Daniel Ellsberg case as late as October 27, 1971." There could have been many reasons for this, innocent explanations. But Ellsberg is not the break-in.

Another example is Baker's claim that Helms got Hunt his Mullen job. This is worse than plain falsehood. It masks the earlier Hunt-Mullen connection of which there is and has been no possibility of doubt. I have the proof.

"Hunt's seeking out Barker in 4/71," months before going on the White House payroll." Aside from the possibility that the reason really could be the one both Hunt and Barker gave, that it was the 10th anniversary of their "Day of Pigs" association, this masks the unreported fact that there were plans earlier than for the Plumbers. Of this I have a prima facie case and it was to be masked as a public-relations operation. Baker has at least evidence of this, if not complete proof.

Bennett's report on B&K: Bennett was also close to the Nazi Mafia. His report is a natural for him and more, it led to nothing at all. Is it rational that its failure means there was a hidden CIA purpose, Baker's belief?

No other explanation of the Hunt/Beard operations makes less sense than Baker's.

That Mort Jackson had "close CIA connections" is neither new nor surprising considering that it is public knowledge, not recalled by Anderson, that he had been CIA. Means nothing.

The orders to the FBI not to question CIA people also is not new and was because the White House ordered it not because the CIA was sneaky. Of this there is no longer basis for doubt.

What becomes more interesting is that Anderson lends himself to this kind of game.

The CIA is always fair game. Any going after it attracts the young to Baker. It can do nothing in part because it bears other guilt and can't expose that. Baker is not disclosing its real guilt. This keeps it silent.

This whole matter is still another of the examples of the refusal of the press to do any real WG investigation of its own and of its uncritical willingness to use any leak that makes interesting copy.