

JDW, re CBS situation

9/22/75

This was a day on which, again, I could not work continuously on FM. If there had to be such a day, today was a good one for it because I began tired and became uneasy during the letter-writing relating to the CBS developments.

The interruptions were endless. The last was over an hour with a Houston reporter. Some filled me in on what to expect from Houston Security Associates. (This guy knew little about them except they are not productive of news and are arrogant. So I filled him in. He'll cover and tape their coming announcement.)

There has been a great accumulation so, because it also has to be tended to, I spent all free time on it.

I had no trouble deciding to refuse to appear on the CBS show. But I am aware that this refusal is not good for me personally. With this awareness, however, it is interesting that I did not think of the personal cost because it really isn't relevant. One can get rich by stealing but among honest people there is no problem not stealing.

Why, then, am I uneasy over it?

I haven't really thought it through. I'm going to follow Ldl's advice and change what is on my mind with Archie "unker and then go to bed and get an early start.

I guess it is the possibility of some kind of CBS retaliation of some kind or a nasty reference to it in their handling of it. If they do, and I think they will.

I also did not think of this until late in the day. I then decided that either the researcher will attempt to see to it that treatment is honest if there is any or perhaps Rather might.

One thing that did occur after the fact is that whether or not my reason is believed it may deter other and planned dirty workings some of which are already on tape. And I think Rather may go over the preparations for him, if there are any more, with more care.

I do know that this is not a good time when I'm trying to bring a book out and I suppose this can figure in my uneasiness.

What I am fairly confident about is that the loss of the publicity is not a factor in how I felt. I'm used to not having and when there was no new book I've shunned it except for a single press conference on the filing of the first FOIA suit more than five years ago.

It is a strange sensation not to be able to figure out the cause of this feeling of uneasiness when just about all that might does not appear to.

I hadn't thought of it but perhaps it is not isolated and is part of the overall situation, particularly the delays with the book.

It can't be over the supposed attempts to assassinate Ford. All those are no-shoots or can't shoots.

I never realized how many Californians are so opposed to Reagan that they'd help Ford by non-assassination.

The advance dope on Securities Associates is that they have solved the JFK assassination with published material plus a little imagination: Hoover did it. The published material they'll represent as their own diligent investigation. They are to make the announcement in 10 days or less but they are not announcing their announcement. Only forecasting it.

Lonnie Hudkins has turned in a stiff story for his tomorrow's editions. On Oswald and the CIA in Mexico, only with perhaps a non-Oswald Oswald in Mexico. He read it to me today. It has a sore throat saving JFK from meeting his end a month earlier in Atlanta. If as he says he comes this week he'll tell me more. He had told me much of this earlier but not the assembled version. He says that Bill Alexander was the source of the leak on the Oswald note to Hosty. Be interesting if this gets around and someone remembers that Alexander was before the Commission, too....Lonnie says the CIA had the country divided into 35 regions for its domestic work. If the Houston Chronicle would not carry a story quoting Rankin on how terrible

Texas are leaking all this stuff maybe Lonnie's paper won't carry his about all those meetings Oswald had in Mexico, which is not in Maryland. Reasonable and logical, isn't it. But then the Houston reporter doesn't like Jaworski. Best.