

May 18, 1992

Mr. David M. Keck  
868 Chelsea Lane  
Westerville, Ohio 43081-2716

Dear David:

Thanks for your letter. I no longer have the time to respond to so many letters, or every point in each letter, but here is a bit.

Crenshaw's book came off the press a few days after mine, but he had a superior publicity department in place and they did a good job for him. He has since tried to help me, as my book is the more important as a gathering of not only what he has to say, but the others, so your remark is abusive in that regard.

As for Harold (please do not repeat this) he is very frail and unwell. Not only studies, but my own experience with those who have had triple by-pass operations effects their reason. He has been colossally wrong on some points. I know him well, and we have all been trooped down to that Vietnamese restaurant. I went to see him several times in the hospital here. The quartz in my back yard is from his yard. Harold will, if he knows you, tell you what he thinks happened, and we are all basically together in that. Merely because you have had contact with Harold doesn't make you an authority.

With regard to the spelling of Nemmings/Hemings, I have seen it both ways. As you know, in those days, a lot of things were phonetically spelled and to dictate right and wrong today about what happened then is out of order. Is it a non sequitur for you to say that he would not have an affair with a slave and in the same breath indicate that he wouldn't have done it because he didn't agree with slavery? Then why did he have a 150 slaves? Talk is cheap.

In addition, you seem to be saying that to not have proof that he had the affair is to say that he did not have it. The weight of the evidence and many stories indicate that he must have had the affair. After all, not a single communication exists between him and his wife.

I note also that you seem to be judgmental and typify the fact that a man has more than one woman is immoral. What basis do you have for such a ridiculous idea?

Can you prove any part of the Exner story?

A president is protected in his private affairs by those around him and there is simply no possibility that National Security is risked by any liaison. That is a prima fascia ridiculous concept. Why? Nobody would dare blackmail a president and the proof of it is that it never happened while any president, including Kennedy, was alive.

You make a statement that we attempted to get my book out "before something we could prove comes out" What is that you can prove? Don't you think there is a massive historical achievement in my interviews, which are not seeing the light of day or getting any national exposure because of the co-option of this case by Time Inc and Time/Warner?

You then garble badly whatever it is you mean in the second graf page 2. "...that indicate because Kennedy was so charismatic, it must have had more meaning than to be shot by accident or otherwise." I assume that you are passing judgement that his value was as a charismatic leader. His value was as a great man and leader, and yes, the death of him or Jesus Christ can have more meaning than the passing of a bum or a criminal. Lots of us have more or less value than others. You, for instance, have more value than a serial killer, hopefully. But you then seem to say that my politics interfere with my view of this case. Listen, I was close to things in Washington, and this murder was condoned by the Republican Party and it was perpetrated by radical right Republicans. I have great respect for conservatives as such, but what happened here is another story. I hope that when you teach you clarify your meaning a little better.

Now you speak of my Kennedy gushings. So this is where you are really coming from. If you didn't love the man, get out of this investigation and leave Harold and the rest of us alone. We don't need buffs and hobbyists in this. My repeating of the history of his presidency has brought great praise from those who understand its meaning.

The Hurwitz information seems to be without any value. What is your meaning?

Having had one meeting with "Harold" you must feel quite familiar with him to try to impress me with that and be so presumptive as to use his first name. Then you get real preachy in your letter. Let me tell you, I am one of the few people who is straight or honest in this, spending tens of thousands of dollars to hire police and others, to help Harold and so on. Who helps me? The bottom line of most of these people is the dollar. Is deliberate misrepresentation.

H. H. Stone