

AFFIDAVIT OF GREGORY STONE

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA)
 : ss.
CITY OF WASHINGTON)

Gregory Stone, being duly sworn, deposes and says:

1. I assisted Allard K. Lowenstein in many of his endeavors over the last decade of his life and am the co-editor of a book concerning his career.

2. I make this affidavit with knowledge that it will be provided to Grove Press and Richard Cummings prior to the publication date of Mr. Cummings' book about Allard K. Lowenstein. I hope that this affidavit will help convince Grove Press to eliminate from the actually published book the many false and misleading statements about Allard K. Lowenstein -- only some of which I mention below -- contained in the draft of the book which I have partially read.

3. I also strongly desire to persuade Grove Press and Mr. Cummings to remove from the book prior to its publication all statements attributed to me, either by quotation or otherwise. This wish arises partly out of the nature of my understanding with Mr. Cummings at the time of our interview and partly out of my present estimate of his journalistic purposes and standards.

4. I first spoke to Mr. Cummings in June of 1981 at the urging of Allard K. Lowenstein's sister and perhaps others.

My understanding at that time was that Mr. Lowenstein's family was assisting him in his research and advising others to do so also. Ostensibly, the primary purpose of the interview was to provide background on aspects of Mr. Lowenstein's career of which I have knowledge, and to suggest other sources of information and potential interview subjects. I did not approach the interview with an adversarial attitude or in a highly suspicious or legalistic frame of mind. When Mr. Cummings asked to tape record part of my remarks, I did not object, nor did I take the kinds of precautions I would now consider important in talking with Mr. Cummings. In line with the "background" nature of our discussion, however, I think that I specified, with Mr. Cummings' assent, that my remarks in that session were not for quotation. We may also have agreed, though I am less clear about this, that they were likewise not for attribution. The tape of that interview might shed light on these matters.

5. As mentioned, the interview was primarily an overview session, sketching out the skeleton and themes of Mr. Lowenstein's career. Mr. Cummings told me then, and also afterwards, that he planned to stay in touch for additional information as his work progressed. I said that would be fine. In fact, however, this was my first and last interview with him, as he never requested any follow-up.

6. In the course of our discussion, I provided Mr. Cummings with the names of other individuals who could give detailed information on areas we touched on briefly. The inaccur-

racies contained in his draft book suggest to me either that he didn't speak with many of these people or that he ignored much of the information they gave him.

7. When I saw Mr. Cummings' Evergreen article in the Spring of 1984, I called him on the telephone. I registered my dissent from many of his assertions, asked about the sources of his "CIA" charges and innuendos, and expressed outrage at the standards and tenor of his article. To guard against future misuse of my own words, I also requested a copy of his interview with me, offering to reimburse him for any costs involved. I reiterated the request in a letter a few days later, to which Mr. Cummings did not reply. I hereby demand again that I be provided with a complete copy of that tape, and I urge counsel for Grove Press to listen to the tape in reviewing this affidavit.

8. The draft book states that the race which Mr. Lowenstein made for Nassau County Democratic leader in 1971 "was surprisingly close, considering his lack of organization outside of Long Beach, but Lowenstein lost, and it was, as his aide Greg Stone put it, a 'good example of Al doing something ludicrous.'" (emphasis added) I was not, first of all, an aide of Mr. Lowenstein's at the time of this race, nor was I on Long Island when it occurred. More importantly, even if I did say the words contained within the quotation marks, my meaning has been sharply distorted. What I may have told Mr. Cummings was that a race for county leader was "ludicrous" in the sense that, as Robert Kennedy once said, Al Lowenstein's running for Congress was like the pope running

for parish priest. Someone of Allard K. Lowenstein's stature and abilities should have been in the United States Senate or even higher office, as most of those who knew him would agree. Mr. Lowenstein made the county leader race, in my view, primarily in order to: 1.) help reform the Nassau County Democratic Party; and 2.) assist his many local supporters and friends in the party who implored him to make that race. Both of these purposes seem very reasonable to me, as should have been clear in any discussion I had of the subject. My views of this matter have been violently twisted by Mr. Cummings and I believe that a review of the taped interview will bear this out.

9. Contrary to Mr. Cummings, Mr. Lowenstein never "called up... Greg Stone... to tell (him) what should be done when he died." (emphasis added) The subject never came up on the telephone, much less in any call Mr. Lowenstein placed for that purpose. Moreover, I doubt that I ever told Mr. Cummings it did, as the tape of my interview should confirm. The subject of funerals did come up at odd moments, and was treated in a low-key way, at times with humor. The image of morbid despair painted in the above passage is foreign to my experience of Mr. Lowenstein and very offensive to me. Negative references of this kind by Mr. Cummings often distort the basic tenor of Mr. Lowenstein's behavior and personality.

10. "After Jenny left in the summer of 1976," Mr. Cummings writes, "Greg Stone... moved in to work on the Wydler campaign... believing that Lowenstein would win." (emphasis added)

First, though I don't recall when "Jenny left," she was present during part of the campaign that summer, as well as in the fall. During most of the campaign I did not stay in Mr. Lowenstein's house. Secondly, I did not believe at this time that "Lowenstein would win" and had, in fact, advised him strongly against running on the grounds that he wouldn't win. (As the campaign made great strides through the summer and fall, I came to conclude by the end that he had a good chance.) I would be surprised if anything I said to Mr. Cummings will support his version of this matter.

11. "Insisting [in 1974] that he opposed Nixon's impeachment," Mr. Cummings writes, "Lowenstein seemed to be less concerned with what Nixon had or had not done than he was with the effect that the public outrage would have on the elections." (emphasis added) This sourceless claim is nonsense and could only be made in ignorance of Mr. Lowenstein's most basic activities. Mr. Lowenstein worked and spoke for months in support of impeachment, both in New York and around the country. As many can personally testify, moreover, he was completely appalled by Watergate, and the charge that he was more concerned about off-year elections than about that constitutional crisis and its implications is repulsive. I believe that libels of this kind by Mr. Cummings spill over beyond their target and have the effect of tainting many others of us who worked with Mr. Lowenstein in the course of the activities misportrayed.

12. The draft book asserts that toward the end of his life, Mr. Lowenstein "had retreated from his militant opposition

to South Africa" and was "increasingly sympathetic to the whites there." (emphasis added) Based on my work with Mr. Lowenstein and other information, I know that those assertions are false. As his book Brutal Mandate reflects, Mr. Lowenstein was always sympathetic with the dilemma faced by South African whites. He also believed that in order to secure change in Southern Africa it was important to convince whites there that the outside world would not simply become indifferent to their fate once they did away with apartheid. He was never "opposed to South Africa" per se (whatever that means) but he remained adamantly opposed to apartheid, which I heard him publicly debate with South African Ambassador Sole at Yale in 1979 and denounce on many other occasions.

13. The draft book purports to quote me as saying that after leaving his United Nations position "Al consulted all the time with Young, the National Security Council, Vance, Jody Powell, and Hamilton Jordan." That is quite untrue with respect to Vance, Powell, and Jordan, and very misleading about the level of Mr. Lowenstein's access to policy debate in the Carter administration. I am inclined to question if I ever made the statement quoted, and would like to verify it directly in full context. Both during and after his period as ambassador, Mr. Lowenstein was sharply limited in his ability to get administration attention to the diplomatic opportunities which he believed were being missed. This would be quite clear to any author who pursued the matter at all with me or others.

14. Mr. Cummings falsely identifies me in his draft book as "a former student of Emory Bundy's at Oberlin." (emphasis added) It is true that I attended Oberlin College, but quite untrue that I was a student of Emory Bundy's there, or that I ever even sat in on his classes. I don't know where Mr. Cummings got this concept, although it is typical of his lack of checking and factual reliability. I am, however, curious about whether the matter ever came up in our taped interview, and, if so, what was said. I am also curious about whether other remarks I made to Mr. Cummings support, or (as I would guess) contradict other doubtful assertions Mr. Cummings makes relating to me or events we discussed.

15. The draft book states that in 1979, Mr. Lowenstein was "shouted down" when attempting to give a speech at a Mississippi Freedom Conference and never finished the speech. Then, citing the book about Mr. Lowenstein which I co-edited, it quotes from what are identified as remarks at "a separate meeting of his own the following night." (emphasis added) These assertions are false, and the citation wrong. I have heard a tape of the speech which Mr. Lowenstein gave at the Freedom Summer Revisited Conference and have quoted from it, in part, on pages 305-309 of the book about Mr. Lowenstein which I co-edited. The tape clearly reflects that Mr. Lowenstein did finish a speech of approximately fifteen minutes or more, as well as answering audience questions, despite efforts by some to prevent or disrupt him from speaking. A copy of the tape is at the Southern Historical Collection of the

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Moreover, as page 305 of my co-edited book clearly indicates, the quotation which Mr. Cummings uses was from a speech at a conference panel (the speech whose existence Mr. Cummings denies) and not from any "separate meeting... the following night." Far from being the egotistical, self-congratulatory presentation described by a woman whom Mr. Cummings quotes, Mr. Lowenstein's remarks disclose that he was generous in his praise of movement leaders and workers including Stokely Carmichael, Dave Dennis and Bob Moses. For those familiar with the background of this episode, Mr. Cummings' corruption of it here is pathetic.

16. Though Mr. Cummings cites and quotes periodically my co-edited book about Mr. Lowenstein, he repeatedly gets wrong simple facts clearly on record in it. For example, he misdescribes basic physical evidence of the Robert F. Kennedy assassination, though citing as his source Mr. Lowenstein's (accurate) description of this evidence from my co-edited book (Lowenstein: Acts of Courage and Belief, pp. 243-256). He turns on its head the fundamental "Zionism-Racism" contention of Mr. Lowenstein's published article, "Why I Quit" (LACB, pp. 279-282), thus misrepresenting a key diplomatic issue. He misses by two months the date of the Senate vote to lift U.S. sanctions against Rhodesia (LACB, p. 304); he fails correctly to reproduce the reported Rooney victory margin in the contested Brooklyn primary election (LACB, p. 201); and he gets wrong the number of bullets which struck Mr. Lowenstein on the day when Mr. Lowenstein was assassinated (LACB, p. 322).

Mistakes of this kind would be surprising in a serious eighth-grade term paper.


17. I dissent from Mr. Cummings' suggestion in his book that Mr. Lowenstein was in the process of becoming a "neo-conservative," a label Mr. Cummings uses imprecisely, but not one applicable to the man I knew and worked for. I wish, however, to record specifically that on the two issues Mr. Cummings highlights to buttress this claim, capital punishment and educational tax credits, I know of no change in Mr. Lowenstein's position during the years in which I worked for him. Mr. Cummings' discussion of these issues is significantly misleading.

18. As mentioned above, Mr. Cummings indicated at our interview that he planned to remain in touch with me on informational matters. When I ran into him by chance a few times later, he seemed to be ill at ease, and would ask for my phone number, which he already had. Gradually, I became concerned about his purposes and sincerity. Had these concerns been satisfied, and had further interviews taken place, I would have attempted to provide relevant facts and to clarify Mr. Lowenstein's positions and record in areas of importance.

19. My primary hesitation in citing the examples above the implication is to avoid that they are more than limited illustrations from a much broader pattern of misportrayal. More needs to be said than I can attempt to touch on here. Some of Mr. Cummings' facts, of course, are correct, and some of his characterizations

are valid. This does not cheer me, however, because instances of limited accuracy often give spurious color to more basic and serious falsehoods. Persons without detailed knowledge of Mr. Lowenstein's life may easily be taken in by Mr. Cummings and led to a version of events - and of his subject - which is deeply misleading.

20. In summary, the portions of Mr. Cummings' draft book which I have read distort or ignore statements I made to Mr. Cummings and transcend the intended nature of our discussion. These sections are marked by error, distortion, and unsupported innuendo. The breakdown of journalistic standards to which they attest is both professionally shameful and, in a work of this kind, genuinely tragic.



Gregory Stone

Sworn to before me
this 26th day of
February, 1985



Notary Public

My Commission Expires July 14, 1987