

7 Winder Court
Rockville, Md 20850
8 July 1974

Editor
Washington Star-News
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir:

1. Reference is made to your editorial " CIA and Watergate " of July 5, 1974, page A-8, which states:

" The (Baker) report also asserts that a CIA operative named Pennington broke into the residence of Watergate burglar James W. McCord, Jr... and destroyed documents that might show a link between McCord and CIA."

①The Baker report I have seen makes so such allegation--that " Pennington broke into" McCord's residence. Breaking and entering is a state offense and in this case could as well have been a federal offense. The Baker report makes no such allegation, there is no testimony of any such offense, and it is untrue. There was no breaking and entering, no burglary, and no destruction of evidence. This 80-year old gentleman, Lee Pennington was a personal friend; he came over to bring food to my family; they invited him in; he destroyed no evidence; and in fact the documents in question--the papers in my CIA retirement folder were still there when I returned home three days later.

2. By your quotation, you have committed criminal libel. You added two elements not present in the Baker report--breaking and entering and destruction of evidence.

3. On June 17, 1972, I recorded on the Metropolitan Police records the fact of my CIA retirement--there was no effort made to hide that fact, just the contrary I made it public, so the basic assertion made in your editorial, of trying to hide a former employment by CIA, is also false.

Baker's report is also false in other respects.

4. A copy of this memorandum is being sent to Lee Pennington since he is planning legal action against your publication. I also am studying the legal ramifications of your article regarding similar legal action.

Very truly yours,

EXECUTIVE REGISTRY FILE

W-5
James W. McCord, Jr.

cc -- Lee Pennington
Senator Sam J Ervin, Jr.

Added distribution: Senator Stuart Symington
Representative Lucien N.
Director. CIA Nedzi

CIA and Watergate

While the CIA-Watergate-Nixon story handed out the other day by former White House aide Charles Colson is patently absurd in its larger dimensions, a report released since then by Senator Howard Baker of the Watergate Committee indicates there may be at least a few kernels of truth in it.

The Baker report in no way substantiates Colson's implication that the Central Intelligence Agency was behind Watergate and that President Nixon was scared to death of the agent. But it indicates that the CIA has told all it knows about Watergate the Ellsberg break-in.

The report establishes fairly conclusively that the Washington public relations firm for which Watergate conspirator E. Howard Hunt worked before he started burgling and bugging the White House and the Nixon reelection committee was a CIA front.

The report also asserts that a CIA operative named Pennington broke into the residence of Watergate bur-

glar James McCord Jr. shortly after the Watergate break-in and destroyed documents that might show a link between McCord and the CIA. And then the agency tried to steer the FBI off the scent by giving investigators information about a different Pennington who formerly worked for the CIA.

The report says the CIA destroyed tape recordings of conversations of top CIA officials with President Nixon and high White House aides. And there was that silly red wig that the CIA furnished Hunt, along with false identification papers, a voice changer, camera and tape recorder.

The relationship of CIA to Watergate and the other covert operations that have come to light in the investigations bears further scrutiny by appropriate governmental authorities. It is evident that CIA was messing around in domestic affairs, and whether the involvement was large or small, domestic affairs are none of the agency's business.

Bust for Bhutto

It is unfortunate that Pakistani Prime Minister Bhutto's much-heralded "mission of reconciliation" to Bangladesh (formerly East Pakistan) turned out to be something of a bust.

The prime minister was warmly greeted on his arrival in Dacca on his first visit since the Pakistan-India war of 1971 which resulted in the independence of Bangladesh. His send-off at the end of three days of talks was a good deal less cordial. Despite all the talk about letting bygones be bygones, Bengali officials made no secret of their disappointment at the lack of any real progress on substantial issues. According to the foreign minister, "we found a total lack of response to the

amounted to nearly an equal amount, part of which was owed by what was then East Pakistan.

But apart from haggling over money, the real failure of the conference in Dacca was a continuing flat disagreement over the fate of some 400,000 non-Bengali Moslems, known as Biharis, who were trapped in Bangladesh by the war. Since they generally supported the Pakistani cause they have been virtually outcast by the Bengali state, living in desperate conditions, wholly alienated from the economic life of the country. Bangladesh Prime Minister Sheikh Mujibur Rahman wants these unfortunate and unwanted victims of the war repatriated to West Pakistan, from

James J. Kilpatrick: Why a New

A special Senate committee known as the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs recently wound up three days of hearings. To quote from a news account, the hearings concluded "with a sweeping accusation of Nixon administration indifference to a national nutrition policy."

"Isn't there someone at the White House or somewhere in the federal government who knows we face a serious nutrition problem?" asked Sen. George McGovern.

The senator's question was prompted by the report of an advisory panel charging that (1) nobody in the President's office is in charge of nutrition policy, (2) no machinery exists for nutrition planning or program management, and (3) the executive senses no urgency to create such machinery. The panel called for formation of a high-level food and nutrition board and an Office of Nutrition to implement and coordinate programs.

NOT LONG AGO I commented upon the defeat of a bill opposing federal subsidies and federal guidelines for the development of state and local

policies on land use. The bill struck me as an instructive example of the fundamental differences that divide liberals and conservatives on the role of government in the United States. McGovern's proposed Office of Nutrition offers another such example. It seems to me fundamentally wrong.

I am bound to ask, in genuine puzzlement, how the name of the founding fathers a "national nutrition policy" got to be the business of the federal government? In my own troglodytic view, the notional delusions comprehend.

Those of us on the conservative side have read the same reports on hunger that our liberal friends have read. There is little disagreement on the dimensions and the seriousness of the problem. Many millions of Americans indeed are lacking an adequate and balanced diet, and as food prices climb, their plight grows worse. Liberals have no monopoly on compassion. I would hope the concern transcends ideological lines.

BUT WHEN it comes to formalizing policies and implementing programs, our views

C. I. Sulzberger: Gerald Ford

Should Vice President Gerald Ford ever be propelled to the White House by fate, an implacable Congress or the blind Goddess of Justice, he would continue to apply U.S. foreign policy along present lines and would do everything in his power to retain Henry Kissinger as secretary of state.

The vice president is understandably reluctant to discuss

could be by oppo- Bentler sees in ment t Nutriti colum: by resp sonate the ha other fretim Nixon regard: It is the co the po crime not re "Lafare" grant to the many primar the pu only so respon local p

In the bill, s tion c federal deal i tion of conser source under

for some 15 years. He spoke to seminars arranged by the latter at Harvard on three occasions. "My association with him," the vice president adds, "is close and personal."

Therefore it has been particularly easy for him to receive the briefings Kissinger regularly gives him in Washington. Ford stresses that Nixon personally arranged that he should be particularly well in-

the offi "Use tary of a mo: munic phone amba here in ings W secret confi period