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 belseve 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. They 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 Lardner 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 cordentials to whore around not only with history but with a very critical time in out 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 NEK and JFK were involved in the CIA's attemptes to assassinate Castro. The CIA's wwn records make this a deliverate 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 n ever 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 farthur 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 gevaluate 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 durything 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 of FDR or others, only of JFK, in whose Presidency he presents it as unique.

I/referring to Schlesinger as "sneering" he quotes him as though it is not true about

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

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 Parmet, who has either lied or is misquoted to make him lie and can't be entirely impartial 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 rile"? 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 doesnot know what "character" is pr in a political leader because by his standward 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 ^Julles 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 polocy that he initiated. It is an ax job disguised by the credentials of a professional historian. He even says but JFK intended directing factor decause some true take said that Spher Sawit Hitch cock to be me in regente - that he tout her liven of he full sum around although he supported that she was running uround the Here

acht ALWENDE. MA. FYME Unewer MA alls not Julia # 40 110 MAJANC たいは 4AD 2 Sar WHILE TT 2 THE Kenh-Chills anaistant with Whit LAND IN lust - Juniat works 1-11 Swowin mudean え Ther and. UNALA LATE we in what the Uses JTK that wat the elsonal MENTYNIJ FUS yes not date Wen Artud MALD WANTY CAN many . Inst the 10 blattation MANTER IM hon In ad equate are silleted . Mu Pust he Cht Plato 2446 1 MAR WWW lile NOW H.L. Res 440 MAT 100 montation NUM he appear week ann to gop + hip both, 4 Charlen Lind this inter is distingut in In this selectil a few 444 HUNNER & JUNIONALY connect twee with taking OWTH MAN Uning to flow buchnes while that young 2 2 is representation of the CIGAGA ma an under hera will dere to MURA (Millin 2, the 110TON Muy lip Then house Amin all Lin CUPED! m 10 10 6 political served 4u WHAT not also UWA unerthy ON alling dui tuh. mur Winch luid VINNER NO-177 the work anna KKM Undaw Wer Ard 1 Tud 1hat march ç meaning ful ac have the inguest point in the . Sy have early point in about the I new honesty as about there honesty as abnonna who an early submy fains P22 WWA hart protect to beyon chosener 0 9 his in man restar. 9 This is an when you on Cas the dites not and the visiter any unite Whatter on mot an int " newrity highly he was lind w Cellier + imager Nen wha 144T nitie of a des atria m will there with - loader -THE an b 7125 25 wh mut t of which VIAL they we have Wholen, as Reeves omit is does This in litre 4mp nu stewa it authors the 232 und to identify D. un p entrel 4nd in edge pio feo rule on the the and in the free the chill 5 In a constitution por flokine, and the with the m. Pert undurre of " Bos who what account of the a comment IL Alman Inere at all CUMALLA TIN W WIN COMPACTION OF then it was latin un up D. fr shirt fall yet ha TUSCH L Water & -H NI BUC in Usuche 4

when the is The offering augun duple a tell pet ready about Whatan is appendict new and in the Breakier, is onis weaking wing byhere a truth of the total the urra 1 icuus mia ENAND . muture 1 nadal Crean とちゃく croon or 1 telestic filet and man heliger to poster. That with wind of the wind lindrout my " JEK "The -Epin In his selection from My resign fullet whet NT-VA CLA in supporter a free in and ally INO itry examples and I then at 4, 6 how any atominate W BUNNU ON 12 on infidelity is use as topper of up in the induces 8 Lune " Cur HAN HE WE MA 10 alpen lint in a women into this him us the so why partials Mucherry, In dies, not milia and Minit ut This Hon-L while a 5 Funderpottime i not Blier u 50 delihike 09. YE wen not throught by most thing ! NA DI NEK was not " The working 30 20 and allight of the law. In Jung Blun "Word Reends Ann had a a domining to my: Com to what to wet it welling to have " to any way with WWW List divid the in lowly with the - 1 leaver was, in 19th men in property in any has active as not mean restricts of Prinkelin in YH. Hutsh when the by march inada win es alter and los were Revola winting here dilli-+ moneholus in / hid Contractor volut ę utrying illections when is wheath was me Why hay they all the These is constituting them men was i ALLAS - Lin Athat lithad to when any up with MARD MARE hu hanna & unite it we we Reeves durhanestry ran 1 100 40 62 1 100 william Thist y E. Wen y N / CLEW 4 mo ALL ENA いちまいも Adl 5 This wild B 50 LU-HANK 6 l annonan Centro w anno -Bany 17 Mig VIFI with plan ming with the The republic atton that 1 Mm Matte in any weg FUER Walt - WHAN Monith hour is Kup white rian MC.W tion N. HULP I depunditity, municity, ANNA A innormatication and in WAY THE owno ti Neeves weer 14. NHMAD AMA GAMA pell in return the red it in nute due x + cd of un on JERTREA Coller, Howweld which , by Last age TEKO IMA ptalin . 11 hat men matur the NW Hot is MAT credute unerther " allow Helven sausant internal 4 Minute I IS a puestion Mat Why SAMO / 14199 HOM NG. CUA Minhad Julgenter " 8 and 4 West while Mune SAMUT ALON > which hural more un. 5. White WILLIAM WAR. TANA B 9.41 AMMA トレノオ 2.0FM futh 0 And had An