

Hal Verb
P.O.Box 421815
San Francisco, CA 94142-1815

2/23/93

Dear Hal,

Along with your welcome large package of 12/21, which made fine time getting here, side from other mail I am fortunate enough to have two generous but smaller packages. I've skimmed yours and the others and read what I'll get to, very little of the total volume.

I can wait for your Dallas report. You confirm what I'd expected.

I've ~~not~~ followed the acoustics controversy and doubt I can offer a dependable opinion. I believe I had a record I can no longer find saying that the dubs were air tapes and that made cross-talk possible. If the work was done from the original dictabelt, that becomes irrelevant.

From someone else I got a transcript of a Larry King show with a guy I've highlighted, Hal Korff of Total Research of Palo Alto. What interests me most of all, and you'll see much wrong with his contrivance, is whether he used my books, which advance no theories, and if he used any official documents, to what degree and from what source. If you'd care to write him, that might be better than me. But if not, please send me his address that I presume you can get easily. If he'll give you a list of the books and pictures, that would be fine. Do not mention Itek but I've very interested to know if he used it or the Willis slides or the Moorman that ^{B.J.}ack is working with. ~~all~~ show a man on the knoll, at two different places, too.

I rush to try to get all the mail answered in the short time I have before my working day winds down, the rest in the morning, to get them in the pre-Xmas mail.

Many thanks and we wish you the best holiday,

Other side a page of NEVER AGAIN! ^{MA}.

This transcript has not yet been checked against videotape and cannot, for that reason, be guaranteed as to accuracy of speakers and spelling. (LW)

LARRY KING LIVE Transcript #972
Air Date: November 22, 1993

The Kennedy Assassination: Thirty Years Later

ANNOUNCER: Welcome to Larry King Live. Tonight: A computer says Oswald acted alone — Thirty years after the shots in Dealey Plaza, a new high-tech analysis points away from a conspiracy. Hear the latest chapter in the debate that will not end. Then, memories of the slain president from his personal photographer; and biographer Richard Reeves offers a new take on the Kennedy years. Now, here's Larry King.

LARRY KING: Good evening from Washington.

Thirty years ago, America mourned the death of a president — a criminal act that many say is still an unsolved mystery. Polls show a vast majority of Americans — maybe 90 percent — believe that John F. Kennedy was killed by unknown conspirators. But a new high-tech computer study backs up the Warren Commission — unpopular though that may be.

We welcome Kal Korff, president of Total Research of Palo Alto, California. His computers have analyzed 16 years' worth of assassination books and have ruled that Oswald acted alone. Joining us tonight from Dallas is an assassination investigator of long standing with a very different point of view — Gaeton Fonzi. In his new book, *The Last Investigation* — there you see its cover — from Thunders Mouth Press [sp?], Mr. Fonzi claims to reveal the only verifiable link between Oswald and the CIA.

Kal, what started you doing a 16-year computer analysis of this?

KAL KORFF, JFK Researcher: Well, it actually started in high school, Larry. I had asked my teacher, "Who shot President Kennedy?" I was trying to do an extra-credit report. And no one could give me an answer. So, we looked into the issue, came up with a report that was some 218 pages, and then we ended up doing a computer analysis at NASA of a photograph taken during the assassination.

KING: "We" being—?

Mr. KORFF: A friend of mine and I at the time. We were freshmen in high school — coincidentally, going to John F. Kennedy High School, just a coincidence. So, we did this analysis, and the computer comes back and tells us there is a person standing on the grassy knoll, most likely holding a rifle. A person wasn't supposed to be there. So, the *San Jose Mercury* ran the article in 1978, and then I was hauled out of school the following Monday. I got a phone call from what was then the House Assassinations Committee, demanding that I send in the photo. I did that, and didn't hear anything back from them.

Then, about three or four months went by— made a

bunch of phone calls. They sent the photo back; said, "It's not a gunman. It's a scratch on the photo." I then countered with the argument that, "That's not possible. And then, later on, the committee concludes there was a conspiracy and that there was a guy on the knoll.

KING: And you feel that— You agree with them?

Mr. KORFF: No, I don't, because what bothered me is the committee said that there was no gunman in the photo, but yet they concluded there was a gunman on the knoll. And since the photo was taken within one-fifth of a second of the fatal head shot, if a gunman had been there he had to be in the photo.

KING: So, can you briefly tell us what you did over these years?

Mr. KORFF: Yes, what we did is, that started me looking into the case. I took every book ever published that sold any significant quantity in this country — there were 60 books that have been bestsellers to this day — put them in the computer; scanned the Warren Commission report, the House committee documents; expanded the search into data on J. Edgar Hoover, anti-Castro groups such as Alpha 66; put it all in the computer; did the photographs, the films, the forensic material. We analyzed it all and, 16 years later, coincidentally, we are done with our study. And our conclusion is that there's no conspiracy.

KING: Who financed this?

Mr. KORFF: I did.

KING: Just—?

Mr. KORFF: Just myself.

KING: Your company does—?

Mr. KORFF: My company is a research company which is dedicated to humanitarian causes. We have identified a bunch of issues which we feel are problems in this society one of which is this belief in the wrong thing — that there was a conspiracy.

KING: Your conclusion, then, backs up the Posner [sp.] book?

Mr. KORFF: I would say it's probably the other way around, because our study's a lot more comprehensive than Posner's.

KING: You've come to the same conclusion?

Mr. KORFF: Yes, but so did the Warren report.

KING: OK. Now, Gaeton Fonzi — former investigator for the House Select Committee, author of *The Last Investigation* — what's wrong with Kal's concepts based on computer analysis?

GAETON FONZI, Author, "The Last Investigation": Well, if investigations could be done while sitting in an office, I think we'd find them a lot easier to do and get them over with a lot quicker. I believe, unfortunately, that you have to go out and hit the streets and talk to people and get your results that way. I think—

KING: Yes, but, I mean, you use ballistics, you use fingerprints. That's all technical. That's in the office. That's not going out.

Mr. FONZI: That's true, but—

KING: Computers are a big part — DNA research now.

Mr. FONZI: What happened with the House Select Committee on Assassinations was its heavy reliance on scientific

ic evidence. And what happened, also, as a result of that is, you had a lot of conflict between so-called experts, and you never really got to a final answer. Again, you're talking about areas of the investigation that weren't in my bailiwick.

You know, one of the points I make is that so many theories over the years, so many speculations, have developed, really, from the basis of the government not telling us the truth about its investigations. And the truth about the investigations — both the Warren Commission and the House Select Committee on Assassinations — was that neither one conducted a full and complete investigation.

KING: Do you agree with that, Kal?

Mr. KORFF: Yes and no. Mr. Fonzi's book was—

KING: One of the books?

Mr. KORFF: One of the books we studied. And basically, I think the difference between our conclusion and others is that ours is the only conclusion that any one can independently verify. From what I can tell in our analysis of his book and the committee documents, you cannot verify conclusively that Lee Harvey Oswald was a member of the intelligence community. And a lot of the sources which claim he was have done so many years after the fact.

KING: Can you prove it, Gaeton?

Mr. FONZI: We developed evidence that Lee Harvey Oswald was seen with a man who later became a high-ranking intelligence officer in the agency, in late August, early September of 1963.

KING: Seen with him in what circumstances?

Mr. FONZI: In Dallas, in the lobby of an office building. This man, who went by the name of Maurice Bishop [sp?], worked with the leader of Alpha 66, the largest and most militant of the anti-Castro Cuban groups.

KING: Well, how do you know he didn't just run into him in the hall?

Mr. FONZI: They met regularly—

KING: I don't know who I bumped into today.

Mr. FONZI: The leader of the group — His name was Antonio Visciana [sp?] — worked with this Maurice Bishop from 1960 to 1972, and he was the strategic director of Alpha 66. And they would meet on a regular basis over the course of a year, wherever Bishop called.

KING: So, this leads you to think — in the interests of time — and of course, I'm looking forward to reading your book — that Oswald was doing this on behalf of the CIA, working with the CIA? Are you saying he was one of the people shooting? What's your conclusion?

Mr. FONZI: Well, I don't draw any conclusions, because I think there's so much speculation out there. But the point is that the CIA had denied any association with Oswald from day-one.

KING: And you say that denial makes them now suspect?

Mr. FONZI: No, what I say is this is an area of the investigation that the committee failed to pursue.

KING: All right, now, I'd like to ask Kal to show us, if he would, what your computers did to show that Oswald fired all three shots.

Right?

Mr. KORFF: Yes. Well, first of all—

KING: Put that up to the camera.

Mr. KORFF: Yes. [*Holds up enlarged photographs*] First of all, what we have in the computer analysis here is, this view here shows us—

KING: On the left?

Mr. KORFF: On the left here. It shows us the view that the assassin had when he fired the first shot. Now, the computer enhancement, on what would be the right, shows all of the leaves that are in the way. And because Oswald's rifle was sited four inches up to the right, the odds of him hitting the President at the time he pulled the trigger were very small. And if you look at the witnesses and take their testimony at the time, you see that the first shot did miss.

KING: OK, now the second thing.

Mr. KORFF: [*Holds up enlarged photograph of limousine carrying President Kennedy*] OK, the next issue here is, this is a frame of the Zapruder film from one of our enhancements. This has gotten a lot of publicity later in Gerald Posner's book because he's quoting some computer-enhancement work. This is frame 223 of the Zapruder film, and if you'll look very carefully here, you'll see Governor Connally with his suit right here. And then, in the next enhancement, you will see, of course, that the lapel, which has been talked about now, pops up. And more importantly, you see back here that President Kennedy is already reacting to the shot. And when we look at it this way here, you can see how, when you zoom in close on it— You see that the President is reacting and the lapel has flipped up.

KING: So, you're saying the one-bullet theory works?

Mr. KORFF: Yes. In other words, it's important to know that if it was three shots total, Larry— that President Kennedy and Governor Connally should show reactions of being hit at the same time.

KING: What do you think, Gaeton?

Mr. FONZI: Well, I'll tell you about my own experience in terms of coming to the conclusion that it was a conspiracy, right from the beginning, when I studied the Warren Commission report and its volumes of evidence and I went to talk to Arlen Specter. This was back in early '65, shortly after the Warren report came out. And what bothered me most was the fact that the Warren Commission concluded that a bullet hole went into the lower part of Kennedy's neck, the back of the neck, and came out his throat; and yet, the holes in the jacket and his shirt were almost 6 inches down from the collar.

Well, I had known Arlen Specter, and I thought, "Well, Arlen will clear this up for me." When I went to talk with Arlen Specter, he couldn't resolve that issue. He admitted, in fact, that was a troublesome point, as he put it.

Unless you can explain why the bullet holes are in the shirt and the jacket 6 inches down from the collar— And the explanation of it being bunched-up or doubled-over — the jacket — would have resulted in two bullet holes, if that were the case, but the photos show that the President's jacket wasn't doubled-over.

KING: All right, I've got to get a break. But Kal—

Mr. KORFF: Yes.

KING: —how do you respond to that?

Mr. KORFF: Well, I disagree. I think it is not possible, Larry, to pinpoint the exact trajectory of a bullet hole based on the clothing. Clothing does move around, and the assumption that the clothing would be folded over is just an assumption.

KING: OK, let me get a break and come back with more. We'll be including your phone calls. And later — a major discussion of John F. Kennedy, politically and otherwise.

This is Larry King Live. Tomorrow night, Anjelica Huston will be one of our guests. Don't go away.

[Commercial break]

KING: We're back on Larry King Live with Kal Korff, president, Total Research of Palo Alto, California — they did that 16-year computer analysis of the assassination; and in Dallas, Gaeton Fonzi, the former federal investigator for the House Select Committee on Assassinations — His new book is *The Last Investigation*.

We'll be going to calls in a couple of moments. Kal wanted to add something.

Your thoughts on the commission?

Mr. KORFF: Yes, I'd like to mention to Mr. Fonzi, Larry, that when we did our analysis—

We do agree with you, sir, that the committee was flawed. However, we don't agree that because the CIA decided to withhold evidence from you, because you didn't have a need to know, that that means Oswald was on their payroll and that they paid him to kill President Kennedy.

Also, some of your main sources, like Sylvia Odio [sp?] and Vanciana [sp?]- Other than their word that these events actually happened, we have no proof that Maurice Bishop even existed. It's just, in a way, kind of like a UFO report, where you have someone's story that they saw something.

KING: Yes, how do you know that Bishop met with Oswald?

Mr. FONZI: Well, let me, first of all, go back to that Sylvia Odio incident that was just mentioned, because I believe this is one of the crucial areas in terms of conspiracy. Sylvia Odio said that Oswald— two Cubans came to her door in Dallas in late September of 1963, and linked Oswald to the assassination. One of the men called later and said, "Oswald thinks we Cubans should have killed the President after the Bay of Pigs."

She told that story— The Warren Commission tried to discredit her, and they did in their report. But the House Select Committee proved that she had told that story prior to the assassination. And this is one of the—

KING: Told it to whom?

Mr. FONZI: —most important events, I believe, in the conspiracy.

KING: Obviously. Now, she used the name "Lee Harvey Oswald"? She told who — city officials, FBI, who?

Mr. FONZI: She never came forward, herself. As a result of telling her sister and her sister telling a friend, they found her. But she told a priest and she told a doctor prior to that—

KING: And both confirmed that she did?

Mr. FONZI: —and her sister was present at the visit— Pardon me?

KING: Both said that before November 22nd they knew the name "Lee Harvey Oswald"?

Mr. FONZI: He was introduced to her as "Leon Oswald," and they immediately recognized— Both her and her sister immediately recognized him as Lee Harvey Oswald when they saw him on television.

Mr. KORFF: OK, yes, a lot of people when they saw Lee Harvey Oswald, Larry, on TV, after the assassination, did come forward and say, "Oh, I saw this guy with Jack Ruby or with Meyer Lansky." We have all kinds of reports like that. The truth is, if you look at the committee's own records and the FBI reports, you will find out that her doctor has testified that he heard it the day after the assassination, because the day of the assassination, Larry, Odio had a nervous breakdown. She'd come to this country she'd been here a couple of years earlier than that; she had had her kids taken away from her because she was deemed an unfit mother. She was psychologically unstable, and that is what her doctor has testified to.

Her sister could not recall the phrase "Leon Oswald." Also, finally, when she claims that she saw Lee Harvey Oswald, that entire last week of September, he was in Mexico at the time.

KING: Does that change your mind, Gaeton?

Mr. FONZI: No, not at all. The information that he's drawing from is from the original FBI reports, which were discredited by the House Select Committee. She did tell the priest and she did tell the doctor prior to the assassination.

Mr. KORFF: How were they discredited?

Mr. FONZI: Because the Warren Commission didn't have their testimony at the time. They used only FBI reports that went to other doctors to claim that she was unstable.

KING: So, a Catholic priest said that he knew the name "Oswald" before November 22nd?

Mr. FONZI: That's right.

KING: We'll be right back with Kal Korff and Gaeton Fonzi. We'll include your phone calls. And then — Richard Reeves and others. Don't go away.

[Commercial break]

KING: We're back, and we'll go to some calls.

Houston, Texas, for Kal Korff and Gaeton Fonzi — Hello.

1st CALLER: *[Houston, Texas]* Yes, Larry. I'd like to ask Kal—

About 30 years ago, I was standing on the curb in Dallas when the shots hit the President. And in all of your research that you've done, I'd like to know what you found that allowed you to either discredit or not go along with a lot of the information in David Lifton's [sp?] book?

Mr. KORFF: Well, David Lifton started his study by looking at an FBI report which incorrectly stated that surgery had been performed on the head of the President.

KING: During the flight, right? And the body switched, or something?

Mr. KORFF: Yes, that was later his scenario that he came up with. What we came up with was, basically, this. When you look at the Zapruder film, we were the first ones, in 1988, to identify the moment of the first shot. We

then found the second shot, where you can see the bullet go through both President Kennedy and Governor Connally. That's the lapel flipping up that everyone is talking about now. And then, the third shot, of course, is the fatal head shot.

KING: Are you going to publish these findings?

Mr. KORFF: Yes, we're going to— We don't have a publisher yet. We're looking for a publisher that's going to treat the data respectfully. But next year, our goal is to get out software and a book so that—

KING: Software? In other words, I can go home and play assassination buff?

Mr. FONZI: Yes. If you own an IBM computer or a Macintosh computer, you can, with our software, replicate the assassination, yourself. You can actually participate in it and verify the results on our own.

KING: Vincennes, Indiana, hello.

2nd CALLER: [*Vincennes, Indiana*] Hello, Larry.

KING: Hi.

2nd CALLER: My question is, in the Magruder [sic] film—

Mr. KORFF: Zapruder film, sir.

KING: Zapruder.

2nd CALLER: Yes, sorry. The presidential car goes behind that big sign and then comes out.

Mr. KORFF: Yes.

2nd CALLER: Do researchers think that those missing frames are very important?

Mr. KORFF: Well, there aren't any missing frames. The three frames you're talking about were accounted for, once the technician was found who accidentally tweaked [sic] the three frames when they were making a copy print. I have the three frames at home on our computer archives. They have been published.

KING: Gaeton, let me understand. Are you saying that— Can you both be right? Can Kal be right, and can you be right by saying Oswald was shooting for the CIA?

Mr. FONZI: Well, you know what still bothers me, as I said before, are those holes in the jacket and the shirt. And this is not an assumption I'm making. There are photographs of the jacket and shirt indicating where it is.

KING: Yes, doesn't clothing move when a bullet hits someone?

Mr. FONZI: Well, a jacket may move, but Kennedy was probably the best-dressed president we had, and he was wearing a back brace and he had a form-fitting shirt. And in addition to which, every Secret Service man behind the motorcade described the shot as hitting him in the back, below the shoulder. Two FBI agents who were present at the autopsy said that they observed Dr. Humes [sp?] probing this bullet wound in his back, and it was only a finger-length long.

Mr. KORFF: Well, if you look at the reports that are going on at the time, you have all kinds of things. You have people who claim they heard everything from two shots to six shots. Again, clothing— The one thing missing, I think, in what you're saying is that you don't account for the fact that Kennedy wore an Ace bandage, as well. And, yes, that did affect the way his shirt was bunched up.

And because of the way he's waving— Again, look at the film. You see it yourself. I'm simply saying that holes, bullet holes— One bullet hole in a shirt is not proof that there was a conspiracy or that the person who pulled the trigger was from the CIA.

KING: Columbia, Maryland, hello.

3rd CALLER: [*Columbia, Maryland*] Hello. I'd like these gentlemen to please quote on what I heard last night for the first time — it may have been reported before — that one of the Secret Service men shooting towards where he heard a shot coming from— his gun may have bolted or the car may have jolted, and the Secret Service man, himself, may have shot the President. This was reported last night—

KING: Where?

3rd CALLER: —by a ballistics— on the news— a ballistics expert from Maryland. I believe it was "Mr. Howard" was the one who has done the study.

KING: Kal?

Mr. KORFF: Yes, there's a book out called *Mortal Error*. The author of that book, whom you're talking about last night, is the guy who claims that Mr. Hickey [sp?], one of the Secret Service agents, accidentally discharged his AR-17 rifle, wounding Kennedy in the back of the head. That is not true. Look at any photo taken during the assassination. You see that Hickey did not bring his rifle up until after the third shot was over. Hickey doesn't— will not even respond to such an accusation, because it is ridiculous.

KING: Groningen, The Netherlands, hello.

4th CALLER: [*Groningen, The Netherlands*] Hello. I have a question for Mr. Kal [sic].

KING: Yes.

4th CALLER: Why do you think Lee Harvey Oswald has been shot? Clearly, there was a great interest to prevent Oswald from talking.

KING: Is that too circumstantial?

Mr. KORFF: Well, I can't tell you why Jack Ruby decided to kill Lee Harvey Oswald, other than what Jack Ruby ended up saying before he died. He said he just thought he was going to be a hero, he wouldn't get a big sentence.

KING: What do you think, Gaeton?

Mr. FONZI: Well, I think, again, it's not an area of my investigation. But I think the committee concluded that Ruby was actually stalking Oswald prior to the day he shot him, and that he had help getting into the police department.

KING: Montgomery, Alabama, hello.

5th CALLER: [*Montgomery, Alabama*] Yes, when President Kennedy was shot, John Connally was shot, too. And all these years, he carried fragments of those bullets in his body — even to his grave. I want to know, if you all got those fragments now and analyzed them, would it shed any light on the case?

Mr. KORFF: Well, it would shed light on the case if a neutron-activation analysis were to be done. The problem is, there's only one fragment in Governor Connally's body. It is buried with him. In fact, it was deemed so insignificant — left over from the bottom of the bullet that

hit him — that the doctors didn't even remove it.

KING: Gaeton, do you think we'll ever resolve this?

Mr. FONZI: You know, I don't think that's the question. I think the question is: Can we afford not to continue to pursue the truth? Unfortunately, because of the inadequate investigations conducted by the government, we still have a lot of open questions. And I think, as I say, we can't leave them open in this democratic society of ours.

Mr. KORFF: I would disagree with that, sir. I would simply say that, if you look at our conclusions, as well as some of those advocated by Posner's — but ours go a lot deeper because our study was a lot more comprehensive — I don't think there's any part of our analysis that cannot be replicated. A fact is a fact. Anybody should be able to independently check it and verify it.

The problem I have with some of the theories advocated with Lee Harvey Oswald being a CIA operative is that the evidence for this comes from individuals who have no proof to back up what they've claimed, other than just their word.

KING: All right, we're going to stop it there, but we'll, obviously have— One thing you can be sure of: Death, taxes, and you have not heard the last of this. Thank you very much, Kal Korff and Gaeton Fonzi. Gaeton's book is *The Last Investigation*, and we look forward to Kal's published materials as well as the software next year.

When we come back, we'll be joined by Richard Reeves and others to look at the Kennedy legacy, right after this.

ANNOUNCER: Coming up: A fresh look at "Camelot" from author Richard Reeves, and JFK's personal photographer shows off his favorite pictures.

[Commercial break]

Images of JFK

KING: Grieving for JFK went on all over the country today. Thirty years after we first absorbed the terrible news, polls still name Kennedy our greatest president. No wonder many say his leadership and charisma remain unmatched to this day. We reflect on this somber anniversary with Jacques Lowe. He was JFK's personal photographer through the 1960 campaign and in the first months of his presidency. His collection of intimate photos is *JFK Remembered*, published by Random House — and it is spectacular. Also here is the veteran political reporter, Richard Reeves. His new biography is entitled, simply, *President Kennedy* — There you see its cover. It's from Simon and Schuster, and has been praised in every circle we've read. And we welcome documentary filmmaker Robert Drew, who was there with a camera through Kennedy's brightest and darkest hours.

First, individually — How did you get to be JFK's photographer?

JACQUES LOWE, JFK Photographer: Actually, through Bobby. I was a young magazine photographer, and Bobby was appointed the majority counsel of the McClellan committee, and I had three assignments in one week to go photograph him—

KING: And he liked you?

Mr. LOWE: The third time, it got funny. He took me home, we had dinner, I stayed overnight, he invited me—

KING: And he recommended you to his brother?

Mr. LOWE: No, what happened is that after a year of going up to Hyannisport and McLean, I made a whole set of pictures — 128 prints, in fact — of dogs and cats and goldfish and hundreds of kids and goats, and you name it. And I sent it down, and he was on the phone in a flash asking for another set. And I said, "Well, you're crazy. What are you doing with all these pictures?" And he said "I want to give it to my dad as a birthday present."

Forgot all about it. Four months later, I get a call on the telephone at midnight. The voice says, "This is Joe Kennedy, Mr. Lowe," and I said, "This is Santa Claus." And he said, "No, no, this is Joe Kennedy, and it's my birthday, and I got this wonderful set of pictures, and it's the greatest birthday present I ever got. And would you come and photograph my other son?" And that's how it started.

KING: Did you know Kennedy, Rich?

RICHARD REEVES, Author, "President Kennedy": I didn't—I was in college when—I knew Bobby.

KING: You did?

Mr. REEVES: I traveled with Bobby, yes, for *The New York Times*. But John Kennedy—I was in college when he was elected.

KING: What led to a biography now?

Mr. REEVES: I wanted to do a book about what it was like to be president. I thought that there was enough information, enough new information, coming from all over the world that I could literally sit with John Kennedy at the center of power and write what he saw, what he said what he did each day.

KING: And this is the political Kennedy, this book, right?

Mr. REEVES: This is the President Kennedy. Well, some of the personal things happened in the Oval Office, too, but this is President Kennedy. This is the man at the center of power when the world was holding its breath.

KING: It takes us from what — his election, or his inaugural?

Mr. REEVES: It takes us from his first meeting— his last meeting with President Eisenhower, to Dallas. And it is, to the extent I could, a kind of minute-by-minute construction of how he used power and what kind of man we had there.

KING: And Bob, how did you get to doing documentary films? You did three close-range documentaries — *Primary*, *Crisis*, and *Faces of November*. How did that come about?

ROBERT DREW, JFK Documentary Filmmaker: Well, I was a *Life* magazine correspondent, and I worked with people like Alfred Eisenstadt [sp?]. And the candid still-picture essay was what interested me. And I wondered why we couldn't do that in motion pictures, why television couldn't shoot candid pictures of real people in real situations and bring back some of the emotional power that's in character and in story.

It took me five years to develop the equipment and the organization to make the first really candid film, and then

I had to look around for a subject. And there was this young fellow running for president, and I was afraid for him. He was beautiful and thin and very young, and I wondered, "How can a man think that he can control this country and deal with this world—" By the way, I'd been set off by a book called *The Education of Henry Adams*, in which Henry Adams said, "On the day I die — maybe 1910 — a child will be born who will grow up to think he can see it all." When I first saw Kennedy walk out on a stage, I thought, "That's the child. He thinks he can see it all."

KING: Obviously, enormous attraction and, obviously, a lot of charisma.

Does the photographer have to like the subject?

Mr. LOWE: Oh, yes. Oh, yes.

KING: If you don't, the picture won't be as good?

Mr. LOWE: It will be a different picture. I mean, the photographer brings something to the subject. You bring your own emotion to your photograph.

KING: Photographically, he was— How would you describe him?

Mr. LOWE: He was— People say he was photogenic, but I don't believe in that word. I think that's a bad word. I think his eyes, his body movement, his intelligence — All that came through in this remarkable man. And you know, when you photographed him, all that becomes part of it.

KING: Scale of 10 — What kind of president?

Mr. REEVES: I would think between eight and nine.

KING: Really?

Mr. REEVES: I would definitely— This is the president who put the government on the side of the minority in civil rights— was a great decision. This is the president who— the first American president to come to power since 1812 with the possibility that the U.S. could be invaded — in this case by guided missiles — and that danger was much less when he left the office. And in the end, you have to judge a democratic leader — with a small "D" — by whether he brings out the best or the worst in his people, and he brought out the best.

KING: Do you think he began the civil rights movement?

Mr. REEVES: No, I think he resisted it like crazy. When he found out about the freedom riders by reading about it in the newspapers and calling in his civil-rights aide — who was Harris Wofford, who was a young man then — and told him, "This is making us look bad all over the world, pictures of burning buses and Negroes being beaten. We're looking bad all over the world. Get your god-damned friends off those buses—"

KING: His death, though, really brought about the Civil Rights Act, didn't it?

Mr. REEVES: Well, I think he would have gotten the Civil Rights Act. I mean, he had the guts, when he finally realized he couldn't be on both sides. He thought the country was not ready for it, as Lincoln thought they were not ready— we were not ready for the Emancipation Proclamation. But two years in, he decided he couldn't sweep this away any more. He had to deal with it, and he had to take sides, and he took the right side.

And also, when he left office, there was less chance of

war than when he entered. That's not bad stuff—

KING: Did he enjoy being filmed, Robert?

Mr. DREW: The great thing about Kennedy is that, when I told him that the camera was going to be with him from morning till night for five days — that was the primary — and that we were going to have a new kind of record out of this, a new kind of history, he didn't object, and he was not— And I told him he would not be conscious of the camera, and he wasn't. I traveled with him with one photographer. We were in and out of cars, in and out of hotel rooms; went everywhere with him. And after the first 15 minutes, he forgot us.

KING: Let me get a break and come back with Richard Reeves and Jacques Lowe and Robert Drew, and your phone calls, as well. All have intertwined in Kennedy's life through this brilliant biography by Richard Reeves, this brilliant collection of photographs, *JFK Remembered*, by Jacques Lowe, and three terrific documentaries from Robert Drew. We'll be right back.

[Clip from "Primary," by Robert Drew:]

JOHN F. KENNEDY: [campaigning] I have strong ideas about the United States playing a great role in a historic moment — when the cause of freedom is endangered all over the world, when the United States stands as the only sentry at the gate, when we can see the campfires of the enemy burning on distant hills.

[Commercial break]

KING: We're back with Jacques Lowe, personal photographer to JFK and author of *JFK Remembered*; Richard Reeves, the nationally-syndicated columnist — he teaches political science at UCLA, and he's written a biography, *President Kennedy*, from Simon and Schuster; and Robert Drew, the award-winning documentary filmmaker whose films on JFK include *Primary*, *Crisis*, and *Faces of November*.

Saint Paul, Minnesota, hello.

6th CALLER: [Saint Paul, Minnesota] Hi, Mr. King. How are you?

KING: Hi.

6th CALLER: Two questions real quick. I'm a professional shooter, myself.

For Mr. Lowe, I just wanted to know, in your opinion, how did you— What did you think about JFK as far as did he like getting, you know, shots taken of him?

And the other was that I don't know if you all know of George Tames [sp?]. He's my teacher. And I think that if America wants to know a lot more about JFK, they should read his book, *Eye on Washington*.

KING: Do you know that book?

Mr. LOWE: No, I don't know that book.

KING: No, that might be George calling, trying to sell a book.

Mr. LOWE: I see.

KING: OK. Did he like being photographed?

Mr. LOWE: But answering that first question, I don't think it was a question of liking to be photographed. I think that — and I only realized this all these many years later — that he had found in me, for some reason, for some chemical reason, a person that he could trust and rely on

and feel good about. He didn't— I mean, he literally did not know that I was photographing, and I photographed him in all situations.

KING: The book is brilliant.

He liked the press, didn't he, Richard? I mean, he liked journalism.

Mr. REEVES: He was the first president not to call us "the boys" — "Bring in the boys" kind of thing. And the only non-government check he ever got was as a reporter for Hearst. But, as he would say, himself, that, you know, "We come together for a while, and then we go our separate ways"; even to the point he would write Khrushchev notes advising him, "Now, don't talk to the American press. There are too many. You've got to understand, they're competing and they'll use you."

KING: How, politically, do you measure what is now termed "character flaws"?

Mr. REEVES: Character— I don't know about Napoleon's character flaws or Caesar's character flaws. I don't think that character is at the root of leadership. I think that leadership is—

KING: Really? You differ from Garry Wills—

Mr. REEVES: I do. I do.

KING: —who would say it's at the root.

Mr. REEVES: Yes, I don't think so. I think that bad men can do wonderful things, and wonderful men can do terrible things. And I think that, whatever personal character flaws John Kennedy had, that as a public man he was a figure of great significance, and as a cultural figure I think. This was a man who wouldn't wait his turn, and now no one does, and part of the reason is that he was so much the model for Americans. It was self-improvement, watching Kennedy.

KING: Do you agree, Robert?

Mr. DREW: Kennedy was self-improvement— And I want to say that I agree with Richard in one basic thing. Kennedy had a view of the world, and that view was internalized, and then we felt it from him and he held a mirror up to us and we saw ourselves in the mirror and we saw the best part of ourselves. I've just recited a litany of about four points that Richard makes in other words. But I observed all those things myself. And I think that the man had this internal balance wheel, this confidence — insane confidence, maybe — that he could see it all and handle it, and that helped all of us to feel we could see our lives and handle them.

KING: Alexandria, Virginia, hello.

7th CALLER: [Alexandria, Virginia] Hi. Right before JFK was elected, he came to a small town I lived in — Sugar Notch [sp?], Pennsylvania — and I was just a baby. And he came to the street corner that we lived on, and he picked me up and he held me and I touched his face. And I've always wondered if there was a picture of that somewhere. Is there somewhere where there's groups of pictures or something that you could look through?

Mr. LOWE: I'm afraid I can't help you. I have thousands of letters from all over the country — people saying that they were at such-and-such place at such-and-such hour and they knew I was there, and didn't I have a picture. I'm

terribly sorry. I wish I could help you.

KING: We'll be back with more on Larry King Live.

Tomorrow night — Anjelica Huston, and the famed lawyer, Jerry Spence [sp?]. Don't go away.

[Clip from "Primary," by Robert Drew:]

TV ANNOUNCER: "Kennedy, of course, is Roman Catholic; Humphrey, a Congregationalist and Nixon, a Quaker. And some observers think that the election has resolved into a religious struggle..."

JOHN KENNEDY: [watching broadcast] It's not a religious thing. It's just—

See, it makes religion to be of disproportionate importance, being— put a front-page story, when under ordinary conditions it wouldn't have been even— be put in the paper—

1st STAFFER: Well, it turns up—

2nd STAFFER: I see it every week—

[Commercial break]

KING: Stockton, California — as we get back to calls — Hello.

8th CALLER: [Stockton, California] Hello. Hi, Larry.

KING: Hi.

8th CALLER: I really enjoy your show.

KING: Thank you.

8th CALLER: Mr. Lowe, did you ever take any pictures that reflected what they're saying about President Kennedy's life— health, not life, about his health?

Mr. LOWE: Yes.

KING: Were there pictures of him—

Mr. LOWE: Yes, if you look through the book you will find many photographs of him leaning on a table— even when he was standing up, leaning on a table, either with one arm or with both arms. And that always means that he is in pain and that it is a support movement. I always knew when he—

KING: You knew?

Mr. LOWE: —the pain came on— Oh, absolutely.

KING: Did you know, Robert?

Mr. DREW: In *Crisis*, when he came back from a very distressful trip and had to face this very distressful decision, and we shot closeups of him trying to decide, you could see that his eyes were puffy, that his face was puffy, that he didn't really look the way he used to look—

Mr. LOWE: Lines around his—

Mr. DREW: And I think it was— We kind of knew it was the medication.

KING: Addison's disease is a killer, isn't it?

Mr. REEVES: Well, it's a fatal disease. The adrenal glands wither away—

KING: Would he have lived a shorter life than—

Mr. REEVES: Not necessarily. I mean, he was maintained by taking cortico-steroids each day, which substituted for the adrenalin, so life was maintained, but he also was taking a range of drugs. I mean, he was much more promiscuous about medication than he ever was about women, including using amphetamines and massive shots of—

KING: All associated with health, though, right?

Mr. REEVES: Yes, he had been—

KING: Yes.

Mr. REEVES: He had taken medication his whole life and he was in pain, I think, most every day—

KING: Would you say he was a pill-popper from a lifetime of pills?

Mr. REEVES: I wouldn't use that phrase, but he took enormous amounts of medication.

KING: Was he in constant pain?

Mr. REEVES: I think he was often in pain.

KING: Marietta, Ohio, hello.

9th CALLER: [Marietta, Ohio] Hi, Mr. King and panel. What I was calling about, you know, I grew up in the— You know, I was born in 1960. I grew up during the— you know, the Kennedy years and stuff. And I was wondering, what kind of person was Mr. Kennedy? I heard that, you know, he was a person who, you know, liked to, you know, have his privacy. And, also, was he a—

KING: OK, briefly — because I've got to take a break — what kind of guy? A guy's guy?

Mr. LOWE: I think he was a man of— very *cevrapro* [sp?]. He had a wonderful sense of humor. He was very itchy—I mean, he had to move all the time. He couldn't sit still for a moment. He was very curious, terribly curious about everything that he saw. He couldn't go through a room and see a newspaper and not bend down and read it.

Mr. REEVES: Averell Harriman said you had seven seconds with John Kennedy—

KING: To get his—

Mr. REEVES: If you lost him— If you couldn't get it to him then, you lost him. He was the most impatient of men. It was also, I think, though, the little rich boy side of him which could, I found—

Mr. LOWE: No, I think he— I really do think it was his curiosity—

KING: Robert?

Mr. DREW: I would add just one thing; that Kennedy is, according to Reeves, not a great intellectual. And I don't know what a great intellectual is, but I do know this. He had a sense of history. He'd written several history books. And part of the reason I was able to make candid films on him in the White House is that he felt that this would be a new form of history. And tonight we just screened the three films at the American Film Institute here in Washington, and it is history. It became history.

KING: We'll be back with our remaining moments, on this November 22nd, after this.

[Commercial break]

KING: With Jacques Lowe, Richard Reeves, and Robert Drew — last call — Fleming, Georgia, hello.

10th CALLER: [Fleming, Georgia] Yes, hello, Larry. Good evening.

KING: Hi.

10th CALLER: I find it very difficult to understand why the American public and that generation of people who lived during that tragedy has [sic] to see photos such as I've been seeing recently of the autopsy of the President that my generation and millions of Americans love very deeply. And I find it very, very disrespectful.

KING: All right, we've got less than a minute. What do you think?

Mr. LOWE: Well, I tried to make my book not about the tragedy, but about his life.

KING: What do you think about photos of the autopsy?

Mr. LOWE: Oh, I detest it. I'm furious about it.

Mr. REEVES: Well, obviously, I was taken; spent six years with the man alive. It's what Kennedy did as a president that should live on and not—

KING: This macabre interest. Bob, what do you think?

Mr. DREW: Well, it's how Kennedy was able to put things into words, while looking great.

KING: That's what counts.

Mr. DREW: Well, that's what counted.

KING: Thank you all very much.

Jacques Lowe's book is *JFK Remembered*, an intimate portrait by his personal photographer; Robert Drew's documentary films — they showed all three tonight here in Washington — *Primary*, *Crisis*, and *Faces of November*; and Richard Reeves' terrific book, from Simon and Schuster, titled simply *President Kennedy*.

Anjelica Huston — tomorrow night. Thanks for joining us.

Linden Soles goes it alone in Atlanta with the world news.

Linden, what's up?

LINDEN SOLES, "WorldNews": Larry, we will pick up where you leave off, as the memories of that one brief shining moment leave an indelible mark on this day 30 year later.

Another one of Hollywood's true gentle men is gone — Bill Bixby has lost his battle with cancer.

And, a reprieve for Thanksgiving travelers — The American Airlines strike is over, as both sides agree to binding arbitration.

Please join us next on *WorldNews*.

Copyright © 1993 Cable News Network, Inc.

FURTHER INFORMATION:

The Last Investigation by Gaeton Fonzi (Thunders Mouth Press), available in book stores.

JFK Remembered by Jacques Lowe (Random House), available in book stores.

President Kennedy: Profile of Power by Richard Reeves (Simon and Schuster), available in book stores.

The preceding text has been professionally transcribed. However, although the text has been checked against an audio track, in order to meet rigid distribution and transmission deadlines, it has not yet been proofread against videotape.