4/7/75

Mr. Robert Kaiser
449 N. McCadden Place
Los Angeles, Ca. 90004

Dear Bob,

When you were here and interviewed me I stipulated that the interview be on tape and that after you submitted your Rolling Stone piece you give me the tapes. Reading the piece tonight reminds me that this promise you have not kept. However, after reading it, I suggest that you dub a set of cassetttes for yourself because I think that in time you will either need them or be embarrassed by not being able to produce them or the originals.

With other than newspaper reporters my practise on this is undeviating and long-standing and the reasons are in these other interviews explicit as they were with you. There have been newspaper interviews I asked to be taped and the tapes given to me after use.

My record on this is so clear it extends to the FBI and in writing. I ask them that we both tape. Naturally, they declined, also in writing.

If this is no more than an oversight on your part, I'd appreciate the cassettes by registered mail marked "electronic tapes" so there can be no accidental erasure.

You should know that I was in correspondence with others in that period and this promise you made is recorded in that dated correspondence.

You should also know that after reading this piece and the boxes I phoned Jim Lesar, who had skimmed it, and he agrees we should consult counsel other them Jim. I am leaving t is up to him. This is one time I intend to explore the matter with recourse the objective. In the past I have not.

Prior to asking you to propose the sale of ancillaty rights to Whitewash IV to Rolling Stone through you (see my letter to you of January 4) I did make the same pre-publication offer to them through another. So, the offers are long before your plagiariam and theirs recorded and dated. If you would care to attenpt the refute this belief that you in fact plagiarized it would be helpful if you sent me a copy of your check in payment for the transcript to the National Archives. This would not be proof that you did not plagiarize or that you and/or Rolling Stone were less than malicious (I also have the awrlinr letters), but it would give me reason to believe that you did not steal this work from my book rather than getting it from the Archives after I broke it loose (which you also failed to report). The fact is that I saw nothing in your piece on it that does not come from the back cover or what I told you when you were here. What makes this more interesting and I think more important for the future is that you did not spot the other relevant content, relevant to your piece, that is, as it is published by Rolling Stone. Maybe if they edited, your personal position can be better.

You made other mistakes, ranging from other things you clipped to saying exactly the opposite of what I told you. At this point I do not believe it would serve my interest in listing them or bracketing them with the case for malice. While I assume there can have been editing, I do not assume it accounts for all.

The rest will await the future. I am being honest with you, as you were not with me or about me.

If the editors of Rolling Stone did not tell you, I warned them months before you were here of the pitfalls. I did trust you. Alas, my prediction to them was accurate.

This devil loves - and preserves- scripture. Even on what is, as you put it, "new" evidence to which you attributed "new " sources/ Your largest play of this "new" dates to 1965. Other of this "new" and your attribution is something on which I worked jointly with CBS years before you and your "new" source. Eh, well,