

HW:

Helms' testimony today before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, indicating early CIA unhappiness with the doings of their former employe, Mr. Hunt, on behalf of his new employers in the White House, swings me back to a line of speculation I advanced some months ago and which understandably you did not buy. It was that the Watergate breakin was so bungled and its perpetrators so self-assured that there was reason to think it might have been planned that way. Thanks to Helms, we now know the CIA was fully aware of what was going on as early as the Ellsberg burglary in LA in 1971. To assume they did not keep an eye on these doings and take measures to protect themselves is illogical. As a bureaucracy enjoying much autonomy and protection through secrecy, it may be assumed they could envision their future ~~as~~ working for the German General Staff and its commander in chief as less than promising. If you were in such a spot and saw the forces threatening your very existence ~~as~~ taking a collision course with disaster would you be likely to interfere except to make sure you did not get caught at the same time? Would you not be alert to recognize and exploit any potential trap your adversary might set for himself?

Two things never have been explained about the discovery of the breakin: 1. Why was the second guard not on duty or replaced by another? 2. Why was the tac squad in street clothes working overtime at 2 a.m. when their normal shift ended at midnight? There was very careful sidestepping around this last question, particularly, at the second day of the Edwin committee hearing, as well as on the first day when Sgt. Leeper was on the stand.

jdw 21may73