

Jerry, re Reeves' "A Question of Character," 6/10/91

First the impression it made on the Post's reviewer, then the photo of all the many photos of JFK selected for the dust jacket and then the title, and that subtitle, "A Life of John F. Kennedy", led me to believe that this would not be a scholarly book and that it would be an ax job. "A" life? How many did he have? Anyway, I took it with me to the lab this morning and read it while resting between walking. First I checked and found no sources listed. That's because I knew her well and knew what she could have said about JFK and their relationship, I checked the index under Joan Hitchcock. It has a single mention that is carefully selected to say what advances Reeves' entirely dishonest representation of the man and his "character." Then I checked the photos. Of all the women in JFK's sex life he uses only Exner?

In the preface and 10 pages I became convinced that what I said to Gardner recently about Garrison and Stone is applicable to Reeves, he makes those who sell sex seem respectable. Reeves is, in fact, a historian trading on his credentials to whore around not only with history but with a very critical time in our history.

He is dishonest all the time. He treats sources that are at least dubious, like Jim Bishop and Victor Lasky, as impartial and dependable. He too often gives no sources and from recollection lies, as in saying, the exact words in the notes I'll give you with this, that RFK and JFK were involved in the CIA's attempts to assassinate Castro. The CIA's own records make this a deliberate lie because they have been disclosed. On this, he even says that JFK used Exner to keep tabs on the mafia plot. Not reasonable, not possible, not reasonable because he would never have let her know if he had had knowledge and would not have needed anyone like her to learn and not possible because he and Bobby had no knowledge of it, according to the CIA itself.

I was at the bottom of p. 9 when I had to use my free hand to keep pressure on the point where the needle was inserted so I made no notes beginning there, but there begins some of the rottenest, most dishonest trashiness that made me decide to read no farther in this book. I do not want to have to stop and think at every point whether he is fair or honest, whether he uses or misuses a source, whether I am in a position to evaluate what he cites, so much less than he should have cited, as with the CIA above and so much in these few pages.

His misrepresentation of the deep love the people have for JFK is indecent. Not like he was a King or anything like that.

If not before Reeves begins to equate "character" with sex life on 10, to say that sex life is the only measure of character, particularly of a President. And then not of Eisenhower or FDR or others, only of JFK, in whose Presidency he presents it as unique.

<sup>N</sup>/referring to Schlesinger as "sneering" he quotes him as though it is not true about

2

what is without question true (p. 9, graf 2, "It did not interfere with Kennedy's conduct of the Presidency." *It did not!*)

I got as far as the bottom of 10, where he says "The issue of character and political leadership is intertwined with the history of moral philodophy." By his standard Nixon had the finest character and JFK the lowest.

Because you got the impression that he said that Sorensen wrote "Profiles in Courage" I read that part carefully. He does intend to give the impression you took but it is not what he actually says. What he actually does is cite Farnet, who has either lied or is misquoted to make him lie and can't be entirely impartial <sup>him</sup> for the uses Reeves makes, his "account of Theodore Sorensen's dominant role in the creation of" that book.

What does this really mean? More than that Sorensen had the idea? Did the research? (Wasn't JFK flat on his back when he wrote it?) Edited? Made suggestions or corrections?

"Dominant role"? Why use these words and not be specific in giving them meaning?

I certainly had a "dominant role" in Chip Selby's excellent and prize-winning documentary, but the plain and simple truth is that it is nonetheless his and entirely his.

Is a thesis less that or the author because his professors have a "dominant role" in it?

Was it even hidden that JFK had speech writers? Is it not a fact that he was also in his own right a successful writer? Was he not, extemporaneously and under stress and pressure, a very articulate and often eloquent man?

Who would dare write that George Washington had no character, but cannot some of the same be said of him? And so many others who were good leaders, good politicians?

This wretch doesn't know what "character" is in a political leader because by his standard joining Nixon as a paragon would be Reagan and Bush, among so many others of the most questionable character, in the usual sense of the word.

Reeves is all the more dishonest because so careful a reading is required not to be deceived, misled, lied to.

If you can read them, you'll find illustrations in my notes. Such gross distortions, too, as his pretense that the Bay of Pigs was JFK's. No mention that it was a project of the Ike administration, with Nixon its point man for the White House, no mention to the position in which JFK was in this in those very earliest days of his administration, or of the fact that Allen Dulles was less than forthright in informing him about it during the interregnum.

I regard this rotten book as more than an effort to make a villain of a man who had become a great President before he was killed. It has to be part of a campaign to deprecate the many constructive accomplishments of his Presidency and of the many changes in policy that he initiated. It is an ax job disguised by the credentials of a professional historian.

*He even says that JFK intended divorcing Jackie because somebody said that Senator said it. Hitchcock told me the opposite - that he loved her (even if he had run around) although he suspected that she was running around too.*

HCC

any  
Table, it's free selected  
for almost - product cover,  
not consistent with what  
he says in further, using  
Evolution just use end of the  
call Jeff's worth, sample  
ref to health work + its  
Practice plus emphasis  
to be made on Prots  
Reviewed, please use me  
to begin with, that he  
not dilute information  
with. Then asked me  
how could that be is  
select me in what he was  
of J.F.'s personal life.  
Also on that, indicate  
relationship from what  
which info told me.  
P.2 He does not state  
J.F.'s "support" of me  
has not been "assistive"  
also not identify J.F.'s

2) 6/63 speech for media  
can go to (FBI),  
in 1980 + do not in 1980  
in 1980, FBI investigation, but using  
for history, I think just  
that any what follows  
assessors he is not seeing  
the others were of former  
his failure to honestly  
characterize with looking  
+ his book if not also of  
connect them with taking  
money for political services  
to GOP/ROEP/Min  
P.3) less than honest  
in representation of the  
Governor + Ambassador  
photo is dishonest in that  
he does select a pic-  
ture to show his  
preference while not giving  
the reader even a hint  
that they are something  
detailed accounts of the  
J.F.'s administration +  
no policies problem, etc

3) What is there about  
abnormal in the family  
according to your comment,  
how does this in any way  
help from the past? Who  
to seek out + pushed writing  
especially in the past with  
with only part of the  
history & history of the  
He also not give the reader any  
meaningful account of the  
nature of the investigation  
or of the views of the  
believer + investor, and  
who are not only in the  
Datie to do also have a  
This is an important on  
Austria, through P.55)  
on P.6 he is implying we  
are impeding election  
has failure to identify D. or  
the belief, but no evidence of  
an over normally normally  
beliefs or not as a  
wrote in the past in his  
dangle by that it is  
that J.F. is not a  
under the influence of his  
father. So the way that in  
and take I have questions  
about Drew, honesty as  
well as his relationship  
in what, as seems odd in  
a well known liberal -  
Native to when character  
expectation is not as  
where he has a political  
power. I would have  
he was first in a  
last fall, he had his  
then call me while yet  
which he might want  
me in  
not he beyond me not  
do in this man what

of "Friedrich" in "The City" <sup>is not a name</sup>  
 But "Friedrich" means "man" or "son"  
 depending on which part of the  
 when you do the opposite.  
 Compare it with the other part  
 till the reader knows what  
 they are talking about with the  
 way the words "Friedrich" sound  
 and the way they are used.  
 is opposite. Now, why in the  
 book "The City" does it follow  
 + not in the other part?  
 "Friedrich" is not any German  
 (it is in the "The City" part)  
 only under "The City" section  
 and other section, just after  
 to "Friedrich" has a section from  
 "Friedrich" is not in any way  
 (opposite) why does "Friedrich"  
 not appear in the other part?  
 I don't know, but I think it's  
 because of the way the words  
 are used in the other part.  
 I think it's because of the way  
 the words are used in the other  
 part of the book. I think it's  
 because of the way the words  
 are used in the other part of  
 the book. I think it's because  
 of the way the words are used  
 in the other part of the book.

of "Friedrich" in "The City" <sup>is not a name</sup>  
 But "Friedrich" means "man" or "son"  
 depending on which part of the  
 when you do the opposite.  
 Compare it with the other part  
 till the reader knows what  
 they are talking about with the  
 way the words "Friedrich" sound  
 and the way they are used.  
 is opposite. Now, why in the  
 book "The City" does it follow  
 + not in the other part?  
 "Friedrich" is not any German  
 (it is in the "The City" part)  
 only under "The City" section  
 and other section, just after  
 to "Friedrich" has a section from  
 "Friedrich" is not in any way  
 (opposite) why does "Friedrich"  
 not appear in the other part?  
 I don't know, but I think it's  
 because of the way the words  
 are used in the other part.  
 I think it's because of the way  
 the words are used in the other  
 part of the book. I think it's  
 because of the way the words  
 are used in the other part of  
 the book. I think it's because  
 of the way the words are used  
 in the other part of the book.

of "Friedrich" in "The City" <sup>is not a name</sup>  
 But "Friedrich" means "man" or "son"  
 depending on which part of the  
 when you do the opposite.  
 Compare it with the other part  
 till the reader knows what  
 they are talking about with the  
 way the words "Friedrich" sound  
 and the way they are used.  
 is opposite. Now, why in the  
 book "The City" does it follow  
 + not in the other part?  
 "Friedrich" is not any German  
 (it is in the "The City" part)  
 only under "The City" section  
 and other section, just after  
 to "Friedrich" has a section from  
 "Friedrich" is not in any way  
 (opposite) why does "Friedrich"  
 not appear in the other part?  
 I don't know, but I think it's  
 because of the way the words  
 are used in the other part.  
 I think it's because of the way  
 the words are used in the other  
 part of the book. I think it's  
 because of the way the words  
 are used in the other part of  
 the book. I think it's because  
 of the way the words are used  
 in the other part of the book.