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FOR AMBASSADOR HBJMS FROM MAURY

1. ON 7 DECEMBER LYLE MILLER AND I HAD THREE-HOUR MEETING WITH SENATOR BAKER IN RESPONSE TO HIS REQUEST TO REVIEW PERSONALLY COLLECTION OF SENSITIVE DOCUMENTS RELATING TO WATERGATE WHICH HAD BEEN SHOWN TO STAFF OFFICERS OF AGENCY OVERSIGHT SUBCOMMITTEE, ERVIN COMMITTEE, AND THE SPECIAL PROSECUTOR BUT NOT RELEASED FOR INCLUSION IN ANY COMMITTEE RECORDS. ALSO PRESENT WAS GEORGE MURPHY, JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY STAFF, WHOM BAKER HAD SEQUESTRATED TO ASSIST IN REVIEWING SENSITIVE WATERGATE MATERIAL.

2. BAKER READ ENTIRE INCH-THICK COLLECTION, FOCUSING PARTICULARLY ON LUKOSKIE HANDWRITTEN MEMO OF 10 JULY 1972 WHICH BAKER INTERPRETED AS INDICATING BENNETT MIGHT HAVE BEEN REPORTING TO AGENCY CASE OFFICER INFO ON CIA OPERATION RELATING TO WATERGATE BEING RUN THROUGH MULLEN COMPANY. WE EXPLAINED FACTS REGARDING MULLEN COMPANY RELATIONSHIP AND LUKOSKIE’S PRESUMED CONCERN OVER PROTECTION SENSITIVE
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Mullen Company slots which might be in jeopardy as result of Hunt involvement with Mullen, possible disclosures in course of Hunt’s defense, leaks from FBI, and, perhaps most important, compromise resulting from serious security problem arising in Wft area with which you familiar. (Subject in this case was familiar with details of Mullen cover provided agency in Wft area, including then current incumbents of Mullen cover slots.) You will recall that in handwritten memo Lukoskie had referred to “Wft flap” and it was because Baker had reacted sharply to this that we found it necessary acquaint him with this especially sensitive element in the case.

3. Following considerable discussion of this and several secondary questions, I pressed Baker hard on just what was eating on him, recalling that agency officials concerned had given sworn testimony or affidavits of no improper involvement and this contention had been substantiated by intensive investigation four oversight subcommittees. I quoted Nedzi’s press statement following your recent conversation with him that there was not a “shred” of evidence of any agency involvement. Baker replied he completely accepted sincerity my statements and earlier personal assurances from you, but he could not fully agree agency not involved. When pressed further he confided
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THAT HE HAD RECEIVED, WITHOUT SEEKING IT, INFORMATION FROM SOURCE HE
CONSIDERED RELIABLE WHICH WAS THE BASIS FOR HIS CONTINED SUSPICION.
He explained he did not have provide us with either specific information
or its source. I said this extremely serious matter and even though
he could not provide details we would at least hope he could submit
question to which we could respond in an effort to satisfy his concern.
He said he would try to do this.

4. I went on to say there many irresponsible and malicious allega-
tions about agency and watergate, and one would do well to study
motives which might inspire them. For example, I suggested that de-
fendants against prosecution were running scared and might find it
useful to use agency as smokescreen or red herring. Baker conceded
this possibility, but Miller and I share impression that he reacted
rather defensively, hastening to emphasize that press stories that
he had "prepared a 22 page report on CIA activities" was completely
unfounded.

5. In conclusion, Baker said he had had great difficulty in
absorbing all relevant facts from mass of documents he had waded
through, and asked that we work through Fred Thompson, minority
counsel, Ervin committee, and Murphy to try to put the essential facts
IN A MORE COHESIVE NARRATIVE FORM TO WHICH WE AGREED. WE ALSO AGREED TO HIS REQUEST FOR A PERSONAL INTERVIEW WITH LUKOSKIE.

C. ON 11 DECEMBER LYLE MILLER ACCOMPANIED LUKOSKIE FOR FOLLOWUP MEETING WITH BAKER AND MURPHY, DURING WHICH MURPHY PLAYED MORE ACTIVE ROLE AS INTERROGATOR, AND THE FOLLOWING ADDITIONAL POINTS EMERGED:

1. IF A. BAKER HAS INTERVIEWED MARTINEZ AND FINDS DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN MARTINEZ AND AGENCY ACCOUNT OF MARTINEZ' CHANCE ENCOUNTER WITH HUNT IN MIAMI WHICH WAS REPORTED TO HEADQUARTERS VIA ESTELLINE, BAKER IS MAKING THE MARTINEZ TRANSCRIPT OF THIS INTERVIEW AVAILABLE TO US.

2. BAKER WILL GET INTERVIEWING BENNETT 17 DECEMBER ON BASIS OF ABOVE MENTIONED LUKOSKIE MEMO.

C. BAKER RAISED NUMBER DETAILED QUESTIONS AND ACKNOWLEDGES THAT ALTHOUGH OUR ANSWERS WERE REASONABLE HE STILL IS TROUBLED. AT ONE POINT HE EVEN CONCEDED THAT HE MIGHT BE "GETTING PARANOID" ON THE SUBJECT, BUT INSISTED ONE MAJOR ELEMENT STILL DISTURBS HIM--JUST AS WHITE HOUSE SHOULD HAVE IMMEDIATELY LAUNCHED INTENSIVE INTERNAL INVESTIGATION FOLLOWING WATERGATE DISCLOSURES, SO SHOULD AGENCY HAVE DONE SAME.

D. IN EVALUATION FOREGOING NOTE PARALLEL WITH YOUR 6 AUGUST MEETING WITH BAKER AS DESCRIBED IN YOUR LETTER OF 4 OCTOBER. IN
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YOUR 29 OCTOBER LETTER YOU WONDERED HOW MUCH OF THIS SUSPICION IS
BEING GENERATED BY THOSE WHO MAY BE HEADED FOR INDICTMENT. BAKER'S
APPARENTLY DEFENSIVE REACTION TO THIS SUGGESTION WHEN TALKING TO
MILLER AND ME MAY BE SIGNIFICANT. ANOTHER HYPOTHESIS IS THAT BAKER'S
MYSERIOUS INFORMATION MAY BE FROM MILLS COPLAND (SUB DIR OF 21 NOVEMBER). WE HAVE NO INFO ON WHETHER COPLAND EVER WRITED
BAKER AS PROMISED TO CONCEDE HIS INFORMATION BASED ON SPECULATION AND
GOSSIP.

7. WOULD WELCOME YOUR VIEWS ON ABOVE OR ANY OTHER THEORIES ON
WHAT'S HUGGING BAKER. MEANWHILE WE MAY ENLIST HELP OF SYMINGTON
OR STENTON IN SPOKING OUT SUBSTANCE, IF NOT SOURCE OF BAKER INTO
F2 IMPET.
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