

7 March 1997

Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Road
Frederick, MD 21702

Dear Harold:

Just finished typing your manuscript, *Faking Kennedy*. It took me longer than I had estimated (in mail by 1 March). The manuscript was about 50% longer than I expected once it was completely typed and formatted (345 pages long).

I took your rebuke to heart and confined my re-typing to what is on the pages that you submitted for typing and restrained myself from acting as an editor when I strained line was encountered. The manner in which I type (advanced hunt and peck) may have introduced some minor variations with the text submitted can easily be edited. I have not reviewed the text for complete fidelity with what you have sent because I felt the shipping deadline had been missed and it was more important to get the product (the re-typed manuscript) to you than it was to ensure 100% fidelity.

I notice (and cited in bold) where one passage was redundant to a page before and deleted it. The manuscript is a little redundant in some areas which you will see on a second read. This manuscript has a very good potential for publication in a major publishing house if you should desire for its to be published with modifications in its tone. As you are quite aware, your tone has been subject to much "discussion" amongst your critics and may, in fact, be a barrier to publishing your manuscripts. While I know it is difficult for a leopard to change their spots, toning down

you tone in this manuscript may make it more attractive to a publisher. I believe that the timing is right for this book to be published.

Regarding format of the book, you might consider confining your attacks on Hersh to the Foreword and outlining your case for Hersh's "Hersh-it" technique and then capturing major "Hersh-it" subject areas in individual chapters (sometimes you had thesis bleed from chapter to chapter). In your conclusion you may consider restating the evidence briefly that Hersh is a jerk and a bad (dare I say it) chronicler of history. If you should decide to annotate all your chapter notes in the back in a Fact versus fiction section, the case for "Hersh-it" and horse shit will be conclusive.

As an aside with no particular basis to make this judgment, I got the impression that Hersh was extorting *Little, Brown* for his writing. He got the money and spent it and had no product to offer at the end of several years. His name is what sold the book's potential. As time went on and the pressure to produce grew, he made feeble attempts to write and finally produced the "Camelot" novel. I believe that the staff at *Little, Brown* may actually have taken all of Hersh's materials and had written the book and then put Hersh's name on it to recover their investment. A clause in the "settlement" agreement between Hersh and *Little, Brown* would have required Hersh to parade around saying that he wrote the book (the main draw after the subject matter) and keep his mouth shut. Just look at his interviews and acknowledgments for hints of this.

I look forward to the next re-typing job. Which should arrive any day now. Did you get two packages bound as one in the last manuscript posting? One box taped to another? The first box had the manuscript and a second had some Internet stuff and a letter.

I also look forward to retyping the ZR/RIFLE manuscript. Are you in a position to list the titles of your unpublished manuscripts? My biggest fear for you and your estate is the loss of a manuscript that pops up under someone else's name after your departure from this earth. Your work should be preserved, published and evaluated for future generation's edification.

Clay Ogilvie

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Clayton Ogilvie". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the P.S. text.

P.S. Enclosed is a Union Newsletter for which I edit and write. You will note I have a distinctive style: calling a spade a shovel.



NOT YOUR FATHER'S UNION

Renaissance Covenant: Looking For a Partner

Clay Ogilvie

In the November 1997 issue of this newsletter, a call went out for participation in a restructured Partnership and the law of unintended consequences kicked into gear. The Management side of the Partnership appeared to have encouraged wider participation amongst its representatives in this effort and as a result new Partners have come forth to represent a Management perspective and not all Partners have been informed of the results of earlier dialogues. As a result of getting the new Partners "refreshed," progress has been slow.

Nonetheless, progress was inexorable, the January 20, 1998 meeting saw some interesting dialogue on the issue of communicating performance expectations to employees. It was Labor's position that no employee should be "ambushed" when it came time for performance evaluation. As a result, Labor offered a suggestion that supervisors inform their subordinates a minimum of sixty days before the end of any performance rating period of any potential adverse performance ratings to be given. This simple suggestion provoked an extended dialogue regarding the role of a supervisor in the performance evaluation process. At one point the dialogue devolved to reviewing the legal requirements to perform performance evaluations.

It should probably come as no surprise that Partners representing Management's perspective were not strongly in support of informing their subordinates of poor performance before a rating period was terminated. One Management Partner indicated that their subordinates preferred to have minimal contact with them. Hints were given that some Partners felt it would be tying the hands of Management in their conduct of management were expressed. These expressions of concern generated the impression that subordinates might not work as assiduously if they knew that the supervisor was constrained from intervening in a poor performance situation within sixty days of a performance rating period's end. While the Labor Partners were asking consideration of a "no-surprises" understanding — between both groups, Management Partners were not comfortable in relinquishing this tool.

When the idea that a supervisor's own rating should be calculated using a formula which evaluated the productivity of their subordinates and their own direct performance to their customer in a 75% to 25% ratio it appeared to be met with an outbreak of faltering heartbeats and simulated asphyxia. The thought that supervisors should be held

accountable for the productivity of their subordinates, as interpreted by some observers of their Management Partners, was deemed to be something of a heresy or a joke. Surely no proposal of such an action could be offered in all seriousness!!

Shouldn't management's supervisors be held accountable for at least: 1) creating a clear sense of organizational purpose? 2) promoting a well-defined set of values which are in harmony with the organization's objectives? 3) constructing simple and effective systems of management controls? 4) developing a clear understanding of areas of responsibilities, including objectives and boundaries? 5) establishing concrete performance objectives as a basis for measuring success? and 6) providing frequent performance reviews and feedback sessions that don't interfere with day-to-day task?

Clearly, these elements of managing are strong predictors of management success for which supervisors at all levels are responsible. If the subordinate is not meeting expectations, can it not be immediately diagnosed as a potential anomaly of one of these management activities? If there is any misadministration of any of these elements by a supervisor would it not show up as poor productivity in the subordinate? If the job of the supervisor is to "manage" what are the indicators of management effectiveness if not the productivity of its subordinates?

If DOE-ID's Partnership is to succeed, (as measured by a reduction in the number of grievances filed as result of poor communication between Labor and Management), then it must have a common basis of understanding of each other's role in making DOE-ID a viable organization. Labor's role is well defined: to perform work at the direction of its Management. The role of Management is not so well defined. As a

result, this has lead to the formation of a Union to represent Labor's constituency when attempting to understand often strangely curious behaviors of management. They are strangely curious because they bear little resemblance to six principles outlined in an earlier paragraph. Some in the labor pool explain it away as management's prerogative to act in any manner it sees fit. Others might consider it capricious in nature. Hardly professional at least.

Therefore, its appropriate that Labor's leaders offer managers an opportunity to be held accountable themselves and not just all levels of this organization at the GS-13 and below.

Imagine Management being responsible for:

- ☛ a clear sense of organizational purpose;
- ☛ a well-defined set of values which are in harmony with the organization's objectives;
- ☛ a simple and effective system for predictable management control;
- ☛ a clear understanding of areas of responsibilities, including objectives and boundaries;
- ☛ concrete performance objectives as a basis for measuring success;
- ☛ frequent performance reviews and feedback sessions that don't interfere with day-to-day tasks.

Once these are in place then we will have a partnership based on equality. Until then we will hang a sign outside of the Union office:
**PARTNERS WANTED FOR
 A SUCCESSFUL VENTURE**

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Bill Lattin

As you may have noticed, I have picked up a new crusade - the issue of equal pay for equal work at DOE-ID. Several interest announcements for positions throughout the office have been challenged because no differentiation of duties has been provided for different grades. GS-6s, 12s, and 13s are being asked to do the same duties as GS-7s, 13s, and 14s! And, GS-14s and 15s are very often doing work one grade lower! Employees sit next to each other throughout the office, doing the same jobs, but at different grades! When it suits management, employees at the GS-14 or 15 level selected for a position advertised at GS-13 may be asked to voluntarily downgrade to a GS-13. But, nothing is asked of the higher graded incumbents.

Senior leadership addressed this issue at a recent retreat, and I have been told that we will begin "position management" at DOE-ID. Yet, recent management actions have not supported this philosophy. For example, OPE believes the grade level of the person is based on "what you bring to the party," versus the nature of the position being filled. The interest announcement for Facility

Engineer at ICPP was clarified after being questioned: it was really for a *journeyman* facility engineer, not *senior* facility engineer, like those GS-14s currently at the Chem Plant! How many of you have ever seen those modifiers attached to position descriptions here at ID? I certainly haven't! It seems if you want to justify someone keeping an inflated grade, you can do it with sleight of hand, smoke, and mirrors! Another example: Procurement Services Division recently filled a position with a GS-7 for the same work which is being done by a GS-6! Yet, we can not promote the GS-6 employee because of a self-imposed moratorium on promotions which has no basis in logic!

At the risk of offending some bargaining unit members, I feel that the grade of the employee ought to be tied to the position being filled, and that grade should be justified by a desk audit of the position. If an employee has to accept a voluntary downgrade, what is really lost? The employee retains reinstatement rights for two years, and retains pay forever! Some future earning may be lost, but the employee doesn't suffer a cut in pay.

Upcoming Meetings

If you like what I just said, let me know! If not, also let me know! Opportunity exists at meetings scheduled during the month of February. On Thursday, Feb 5, the Executive Committee will meet to discuss changes to the by-laws. On Feb 12, the stewards will meet to discuss the proper format for grievances. If you have feedback on any subject, tell any officer or steward and it will be

presented at one of these meetings. Or attend in person! On Feb 19, there will be a general membership meeting at 7 p.m. in Room 163, ID-North. The by-law changes discussed above will be presented and voted on at that meeting, as well as discussing the upcoming elections and nominations for office.

Martin Luther King Jr.: Union Supporter and Visionary Leader

In memory of Martin Luther King, Jr. and the dignity of men who dare to stand up and fight for what is right and just, Local 94 recalls the struggles of a moment in labor history and a man who came to help a group of workers who sought justice and equality through collective action.

On Wednesday, January 31, 1968, Memphis was experiencing rain as temperatures hovered about the middle thirties. The supervisor of the Sanitation Department called all garbage trucks back to their depots because of hazardous conditions which was expected to continue to exist

for the remainder of the day and into the night. The sanitation men, mostly black men, stood around the yard until they were directed to go home for the day. Early the next day, two sanitation men were crushed to death when the automatic compressor of their truck accidentally triggered and crushed them to death.

Grief for their killed coworkers turned to anger when these black garbage collection men and sewer workers learned that the white workers doing the same job received full pay whereas they were paid for only two hours or work that same Wednesday that they were all sent home. The anger grew until there was a strike vote by Memphis Local 1733 of the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), an AFL-CIO affiliate, on February 12th.

Memphis Mayor, Henry Loeb saved his city a total of \$14,00 or roughly \$10.20/black employee with his penuriousness. He made a calculated decision that the strike would not last since he figured that Memphis' \$1.70 an hour was above the national average. The black sanitation workers couldn't expect a better deal anywhere else. Besides he did not want his sanitation department unionized. While willing to concede to strikers demands for the institution of a fair promotion policy, an adequate hospital and life insurance program, uniform grievance procedures and a pension fund, he would not budge on recognizing Local 1733, a ten cent raise over two years, or payroll deductions of union dues.

The Wednesday, Mayor Loeb issued an ultimatum: employees that failed to return to work by Thursday morning would be fired. Loeb's decision to reject recognition of the virtually all-black local transformed the local labor dispute into a conflict of the race and power. Through the use

of nonunion workers escorted by police, the Mayor was able to reestablish garbage collection in white neighborhoods. Meanwhile Jerry Wurth, national president of AFSCME, joined the picketers in a marches and Walter Reuther of the United Auto Workers pledged material support.

Eleven days later, James Lawson, a local black minister and an adherent to Ghandi's non-violence movement, organized a protest march down Memphis' Main Street. By the time this peaceful demonstration was over, many marchers were maced and clubbed including the regional director of the Civil Rights Commission, Jacques Whitmore.

Thinking of the events in Memphis, Martin Luther King, Jr. spoke to a crowd of nearly fifteen thousand in Gross Pointe, Michigan. He said: "Along with wages and other securities, you're struggling for the right to organize. This is the way to gain power. Don't go back to work until all your demands are met." Martin Luther King Jr. visited Memphis on March 28th to lead an aborted march down Main Street. At the first hint of trouble many members departed the demonstration and left militants teenagers behind to continue the march which turned into a melee which left a sixteen year old boy shot by police, fifty people injured and approximately 120 were arrested. King pleaded for a distinction to be made between the peaceful marchers and the militants, the press would give him no quarter.

On April 4th in a return visit to support the Memphis sanitation workers, Martin Luther King Jr. stepped out onto his balcony at the Lorraine Motel and was assassinated. His death left us many memorable quotes about the power of organizing to gain power and the value of men who are willing to stand up for ideals.

Listed below are just a few quotes from Martin Luther Kings Jr.'s oratory:

"... confined to the lowest paying jobs, they must get together to organize a union in order to have the kind of power that could enter into collective bargaining with the employers."

"Many people fear nothing more terrible than to take a position which stands out sharply and clearly from the prevailing opinion. The tendency of most is to adopt a view that is ambiguous. That it will include everything and so popular that it will include everybody. Not a few men who cherish lofty and noble ideals hide them under a bushel for fear of being called different."

"An individual has not started living until he can rise above the narrow confines of his individualistic concerns to the broader concerns of all humanity."

"We are prone to judge success by the index of our salaries or the size of our automobiles, rather than by the quality of our service and our relationship to humanity."

"The ultimate measure of a man is not where he stands in moments of comfort and convenience, but where he stands at times of challenge and controversy. The true neighbor will risk his position, his prestige, and his life for the welfare of another. In dangerous valleys and hazardous pathways, he will lift some bruised and beaten brother to a higher and more noble life."

Campaign Financing Reform: A Credible Working Proposal?

Day after day in newspapers and television news programs, the public is bombarded with the latest revelation that asserts that elected officials are being inordinately influenced by individuals and corporations that have made substantial campaign contributions. Tired of exposes regarding the realities and the suspicions of influence peddling and unethical/illegal campaign fundraising? How about suggesting an alternative? Submit the following campaign financing reform proposal to your elected official for public debate.

Dear Elected Official:

I am tired of the scandals, allegations of scandal and general dirtiness involved in politics, especially in the area of campaign fund raising. Therefore I propose for you to bring before the public the following proposal for campaign financing reform for open discussion and action. Restore the faith in government that has been so sullied by those who would put their own interests before those who elected them.

I propose:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>1. All money and non-monetary contributions (exempting uncompensated labor) received in a campaign should not come from outside the campaigner's home district. (Congressional districts for Senators and Representatives. The United States, District of Columbia and its territories for the Presidency)</p> <p>Note: This would promote the interests of the candidate's constituency over external interests.</p> | <p>promote innovative campaign strategies for operating within the limits of a restricted campaign budget.</p> |
| <p>2. The ceiling for contributions from individuals should be limited to a negotiated amount times the number of registered voters in the candidate's district.</p> <p>Note: This would promote voter registration by all candidates and promote an increased desire by candidates to keep in touch with their constituencies. In addition, this would</p> | <p>3. The ceiling for contributions from all others sources (excluding individuals) would be limited by a negotiated amount times the number of registered voters employed by organization which resides in the candidate's district.</p> <p>Note: This would potentially increase employment in companies which wish to influence public policy especially if the employment threshold was raised to full-time workers with at least a six-month employment history with the company.</p> |
| <p>Note: This would promote voter registration by all candidates and promote an increased desire by candidates to keep in touch with their constituencies. In addition, this would</p> | <p>4. Campaign funds or any other form of contribution raised, collected or received will be restricted to defined campaign periods and/or when the elected official is not</p> |

conducting business, i.e., (Congress is not in session for Senators, Representatives and Presidential candidates).

Note: This would virtually eliminate the perception that special interests that are alleged to flood the halls and workplaces of decision makers are buying influence.

5. Campaign funds raised by political parties, political action committees, etc. should not exceed negotiated amount times the number of party affiliated registered voters in the candidate's district and will not be spent outside the district in which they are raised.

Note: See note number two. This would severely restrict the influence of outsiders in campaigns. This could potentially increase political part affiliation among the registered voting population.

6. Violations of any of the above would result in the candidate being penalized, the equivalent to 150% of the value of the violation, and forfeiture of the one month's salary in the position if elected to be accumulated sequentially for each violation.

Note: If our elected officials are to be held accountable for their actions and that of their staff, let it be done significantly.

All six tenets of campaign financing reform would strengthen representative democracy and severely curtail the influence of "big money" in our electoral process. Its administration would be straight forward. For example, how many registered voters in the district made individual contributions to the campaign; how many registered voters in the district made contributions through their corporation/nonprofit to the campaign; did the contributed money get spent within the district?

Your History: Scope of Bargaining and Management Rights

Labor relations policy addresses the scope of bargaining or what can be bargained. The policy may make bargaining on issues either mandatory or permissive. Mandatory issues are those that must be bargained, and the permissive issues are those that may be bargained if both parties wish to do so. There are also prohibited issues, that is those that cannot be bargained according to the policy. In the federal government, for example, wages and salaries cannot be bargained. Discriminatory provisions cannot be included in any federal agreements.

A conflict often arises over the scope of bargaining because management wishes to

maintain as much management prerogative as possible in decisions, and labor wishes to share in that responsibility. That conflict usually leads to a delineation of what issues can and cannot be bargained. Generally, it is assumed that management rights exist independently of the collective bargaining relationship.

Federal labor relations policy defines the basic rules under which labor relations take place. In the future, this column will address many of these issues. So watch this column for descriptions of such topical issues as Position Management and Work Force Planning, rights and duties of public employees and many contentious issues.

It's Your Right and Your Responsibility: The Freedom to Choose

Sue Lantz

Elections for Union officers will be conducted in May. The mechanics of nomination, voting and tallying will be discussed at the next general meeting which is on February 19. Many of

you know the part that the Union played in supporting YOU!, the bargaining unit employees. For those who have no idea, it is time to find out what is going on in YOUR Union.

A Reminder: This is your union. Your President can only do what you want if he get your input/feedback!