

required for responsibility and discrimination on this complicated subject and with these complicated people of complicated motive. So I do have an interest in not having all the work I've done, countless thousands of hours, ruined by a spectacular nothing. Nor do I want any pressures of this kind in the current litigation, which is progressing well without any help from CBS or any reporting by anyone. This, too, is an enormous and costly effort I believe it is not unreasonable to want to be left alone so it can work its way to as natural an end as the court and the power and the disposition to use that great power against me will permit.

In time, as you know, I will be making all of that available.

As you also know I have my own way of measuring CBS in this. I gave them much. They were too yellow to use it. It was solid, official evidence, not just my own opinion. I did give them copies. Naturally with this experience I have not provided any copies since. In time I will, not pieces but whatever I get in the end.

In this I am not suggesting suppressing anything. I am saying that it just is not possible to not intrude wrongly into the processes of justice with such an interview and I am saying that the interview itself will be without journalistic value or substance and will be a sideshow-freak approach regardless of intent.

I intend nothing personal with the following comment. I speak fact only. For all its wealth, power and influence CBS has been dishonest in its journalism on the political assassinations. It not only has turned fact around and refused to air what by any legitimate journalistic standard was news it has never, for example, asked me if I have anything newsworthy it can have. Often the answer might have been "yee." It might be now if something on which I'm working, the sale of a piece for fairly prompt appearance, comes to nothing. (Any ideas along that line?) It is something pretty definitive on JFK and never published. Very simple, too. Uncomplicated. I have a chain of possession on how I got it, as properly as one can get anything. No tricks. No leaks. Covering letters, checks in payment, etc. And some of the records are even handwritten. These are all copies of originals.

Ray has not fired me. He has not broken with Jim. He has to be in the hands of irresponsible and incompetent lawyers in his pending civil action. He has not been in touch with me on it but I do know his formulation. I'll have copies tomorrow. It is not good and it speaks very poorly for those who would file it. It is, in fact, incompetent, often irrelevant and in places from what was read to me unfactual. He is not only in a position that drives one to try anything, he also lacks first-hand knowledge and is, without the best of underinformed reporters having any way of knowing, what he has been told by the undependables, some with the poorest records for integrity.

I don't know if he'll ask my opinion or listen to it as he has in the past. But I strongly encourage you to abandon this because the best one can hope for out of it is more whoring around. It can't possibly be helpful. At this juncture, with what I cannot now tell you about but is very real, it can be exceedingly bad. Neither you nor I would want to engage in what can be as bad as even good intentions will leave this kind of interview. In time you'll know. It is very current. It involves courts.

My specific knowledge on the surveillance does not involve you but also is not complete. My source does not know you or of you and the files are quite extensive. I was not being paranoid. I have pretty much assumed this but not its extent. We have walked much together but you have never seen me look around. You know how free I am on the phone and in letters. However, there is surveillance not as an exercise but because it can yield information. Sources is one, knowledge is another, and then there are plans and other things. Litigation is not self-indulgence or meaningless. It is one way of accomplishing legitimate objectives with some promise of its being a dramatic way. My concern with this is not my past, which would have to be seriously misrepresented for it to defame me in any way. And my concern is with freedom. And why the hell all this extensive surveillance on one who writes non-fiction if the official story of true?
best,