Dear Jim, Possible tapping, etc. 9/30/75

Neither of these two things may be of meaning or related but I'd best make a written record.

When Martin Waldron pnoned me from Dallas a week or so ago he quoted Hugh Aynesworth in an inherently incredible version of the story Lonnie told me and then published about S-172/S-179. I have long had my beliefs about Aynesworth and have heard nothing but confirmation if not absolute proof from any source. Even Martin suspects he was/is CIA/

From the time I got home there has been no time for any work except going over the paper too fast. Most of the interruption was by phone.

Of what may be relevant Lonnie phoned me to tell me he had had an unexpected call from Aynesworth. Why now? Lonnie's story was printed about a week ago. Since then the paper received a one-sentence denial saying there is no truth at all in it. The paper's reply is that it has never had to retract anything Lonnie ever wrote. (With no libel here accuracy is not relevant, I note.)

When Aynesworth called to chat with Lonnie and learned that the two others present have recollections confirming Lonnie's account Aynesworth asked Lonnie if he remembered not the FBI number but that CIA number. He said it had to begin with an zero because he connected it then with his Newsweekk telex number. (If did not occur to Lonnie until I told him, that was long before Aynesworth went to work for Newsweek.)I told Lonnie that it did not begin with a zero and that I had not asked him any questions about this. (He appears to believe I learned this from Wade from the way he said Wade knew the right number.) Lonnie plans to come Friday.

When I returned the call from the Enquirer, after apologizing for giving the wrong name of the book we talked extensively about the paraffin tests and Gallagher. Meaning the FBI.

While I was resting a bit and going over the paper Jon Newhall called. chiefly about the Enquirer story.Wd also talked a bit about Lane/CBS and Security Associates.

I forgot. After what Martin told me I called Lonnie and encouraged him to refuse to say anything he hasn(t. After his story he heard from the Pike commitee. He told me that with them he had taken my advice and said substantially this.

While Newhall and I were talking, and about what is not in the Enquirer story (about which he wanted to ask some questions) I became aware in the middle of a long explanation that my phone was dead. Totally. When I could gte no response, and I waited and tried, I place the phone back on hthe cradle. After waiting long enough for the call to be placed again I tried to reach the operator. Dead phone, no dial tone. Wither for three afforts, thet asked Lil to try her extensions. Also dead. So I asked her to go to a neighbors and report it with my request for a written explanation after they checked it. In about five minutes, just before she returned, the phone rang. It was the San Francisco operator. It was a bad connection. She broke it while I was talking, placed it again, and it was a clear line again.

Jon told me that Lane had issued a press xxx statement on this telex story in NYC. I noted how great a way that was to keep it exclusive for CBS and the real story as I recalled it: also immediately public, as he recalled.

After we finished talking I phoned repair servive and after conversation with the man who answered the phone asked that forthwith they send someone over to the automated exchange and check my line there. not elsewhere. He agreed that what I reported wass a dead short, that if it had been in the lines after Jon and I hung up I'd have had a dial tone and a live phone. He seemed uneasy. He had an Adkins phone me back. We went t

through the same thing and he finally agreed to go to the locked, unattended exchange for a visual check of my line on the board. He was to phone me back as soon as he did.

He didn't. He didn't even go. Not if he could not get in he could have told me that. I don't buy their story that at night nobody can get in. Aside from those with duplicate or made keys.

About 2 1/2 hours later I got a call from a Mr. Harrison, who admitted this and made the claim of no access. I asked about real emergencies and got no real answer. He agreed there is little likelihood of line trouble causing this. He said he'd have it all checked in the morning. By their security people from Baltimore and would I like to be there. I said no, I had other things to do and this was their business. But I also asked did he really expect that if there was something, with all this talk on the line it would still be there tomorrow. He did not and said so. So, I asked, why do it then and why delay further now, if now were not already too late. It is clear he did not want any personal involvement. If they had all these problems there has to be an emergency key available for real emergencies and they know which employees have them. I suspect the real delay is because of fear of finding something more than a desire to provide plenthy of time for removing it.

"Jim," who I take to be Adkins, had told him of the work I do. I told him I had no reason to believe amateurs could do this or had any reaspn to. That the only ones with this interest are officials. Not only did he not demur, he didn't even deny it when I told him I had reason to believe from the past that there were lines on which no calls were made that were on that board pacthed to live lines. My recollection is that he acknowledged this and said, "no more," not direct quote. Sense.

Unless they posted a guard as soon as I phoned there seems little possibility that anything will show tomorrow. I will ask for a written report .

He did acknolwedge when I said it was irrevelant to talk about voltmeters (they can show the drain only when the line is in use) that what I'd asked for, prompt visual examination could have shown a patch.

The coincidences with the appearance of the Enquirer piece and Lonnie's call are hard to ignore. The apparent uneasiness about anyone looking at the switchboard is a fairly clear sign.

Best,