Something unusual happened last night and so you can better understand how I feel and why I plan to do what I will do, I'll background it.

After supper last night I got quite tired. I cleaned up a little of the day's mail, gnew I couldn't sleep because there was too much on my mind but decided to go to bed early. I took one of the pills the doctor gaveme when I couldn't sleep from the pleurisy several months ago and had just dozed off when Martin Waldron, from whom I'Ve not heard through all the controversy of recent months, phoned to say he wasted to come and see me today. I told him Lesier was coming. Lesier had been to see him and seemed like a nice guy. We talked a bit about what CBS can do and will and then he came to the point. He had already made arrangements from coming here today anyway! It later turned out because his Times assignments give him no choice.

His man is and should be quite proud of losing 100 lbs., too.

And he said it would make no difference that he was coming when he knew Leiser had made an appointment to be here. Martin will be here before Leiser and will leave later. Unless I offend him first, I think. He can't come any other time and he can't come later and stay over because he has to go to Kansas City tomorrow.

I'd probably have come to the same decision without it but when he said CBS showld pay me because I'm a reporter and reporters get piad, he provided the simplest answer to the question I knew I had to answer.

I could not go back to sleep and knew it so I stayed awake, though about it, drank a little to help me relax and it was after midnight when I got back to bed, able to fall asleep sconer, easier and better because of the decision I reached.

Martin's assimment is to do a story the Times can use as justification for a demand for a reinvestigation of the JFK assassination. This is what Martin has been supposed to come here for at my suggestions, not his editor's, since 11/73. So, it is something I havek long wanted. I went to the Times on it in 1966 and was promptly doublecrossed. The Times is one of the four possible sources of the FBI's getting a copy of WW II before it went to the printer. I took that ms to Salisbury in the hppe it would turn the Times on.

So, what I decided is to make the Tomes two alternative offers unless I can learn from the Enquirer before tartin gets here if it has decided on the uses of PM. If there is a negative I'll make that as my first offer. I'll offer the right to use what I have published and copyrighted in return for credit that will tell people how to get the books. And I'll offer what the Times refused to use when it was news, the executive session transcripts I've gotten under FOIA. I haven't decided whether to suggest that the in-court DJ record on JFK/FOIA is newsworthy enough for the Times because I have a large part of that in the new book.

I will want to make two tapes, one for Martin to take to the national editors, who would find some of my reasoning and offers and feelings about the Times' national desk and me in the past on it and one for me. (I plan the same thing a different way and for a different reason with Leiser.)

These poephe still don't understand that there are some of us who do not believe it is good p.r. to get you name in the paper for raping an infant as long as your name is speller correctly. There is a long history of my offering the Times good stories that became news without the courtesy of a callback. I'll tick a few of them off, with a little teasing about stories not yet out that I offered. I don't think they'll like it but if the Times wants a basis for calling for a new investigation, they can use the crap available or, as Martin says, I'm a writer, too, and writers should get paid. I also don't care if the Times likes it...JL may remember that the Times refused to do a story on the contents of the Ray appeal, which were newsworthy by any normal standard. Martin, who does not know I gave that to Weaver on what amounts to an exclusive, does know what came out in Memphis. He was there. We'll see if it is any worse for the Times national desk to have what it regards as reason to dislike me. Van it be worse?