

Greg Stone  
PO Box 85065  
Los Angeles, CA 90072-0065

9/19/88

Dear Greg,

The LAPD tape you marked "Weisberg/Kevin 6/68" and the I-1904 index card referring to me as "a author" the 6/27/68 interview form of that date came today. I can't remember how I filed what we exchanged earlier on this or what I did with the earlier tape, that I did listen to.

I tried to play this tape and got no sound. I'll let it wait and try again. I tried to play it at the beginning of the labelled side and then, when I got nothing, I fed it past the place to which the tape had been run. I'd appreciate it if there are any more if you'd mark the end so I'll know where to start and where it ends.

Did you read this LAPD form? It describes me as born 1/11/11, giving me more than two years more than I've had, as weighing 140, which took quit a bit away and as gray haired, something that still hasn't come to me.

However, it is substantially correct in the body. However, I can't understand ~~them~~ the basis for their emphasis on what amounts to panhandling by me. I've never done it and had no reason to depart from this practise then, absent their desire for me to go there, in which I had no personal interest. I was, in fact, in LA the end of October and early November that year and did not look them up. I went out to make a couple of speeches, for which I was to have been paid, Bud Fensterwald asked me to make a side trip for him, giving me \$100 for it, that was far short of my actual costs and I never asked him to return my out-of-pocket cash. I've never been any other way.

This report makes it clear that I took no initiative, saying they contacted me by phone, which is true. First it was through Art Kevin. They then asked me to phone, giving me the phone number through Art, and I did. It is quite possible that Art was then in touch with me on their behalf than they were, I don't know now.

But at that time I am confident I had no work I wanted to do out there and am quite confident that in addition to what was stacked up at home I wanted to spend all the time possible in New Orleans, where I was trying to trace Oswald's activities.

This kind of bias/hangup is obvious in the last sentence of the report where, speaking of my preserving the confidence Jones Harris had asked, they question my "sincerity" because I did not "ID him regardless of the consequences whether they be monetary or if only they would lose an informant." What basis could he have had for even suggesting that there could have been monetary consequences? I never got a penny from Harris, never asked for even one and, in fact, I spent money for him I had trouble recovering. There is not even a reasonable basis for suggesting any kind of consequences. It was simply keeping my word, no more in any way.

I had so little interest I didn't even keep that guy's number in my rotodex. I never went to CA for any reason other than appearances, mostly electronic, and I was not anxious to return for any reason I can think of about 6/68. There was no work I could do there and I had no personal reasons. Moreover, California had a unique record of gypping me on personal appearances and costs and I could not then sustain more of that. So, aside from groping for some reason to defame me, perhaps based on something they'd asked of me, I can see no basis for their statements. I think Houghton also did something like this in his book.

Thanks and best wishes,

*Heald*