

Dear Sol,

11/28/92

Again the Times clippings are very interesting. Thanks for them. I am particularly glad to be able to read Roger Morris' anti-JFK propaganda in the guise of a review of Nigel Hamilton's JFK: Reckless Youth. For the Times to select one who could serve and satisfy both LBJ and Nixon in the White House was to assure that the review would be propaganda and more of the effort to destroy popular faith in ^{and} a love of the last national leader who earned and deserved both.

The very first sentence in the review is a lie and a misrepresentation and a deception. It is quite wrong to say that JFK's popularity was "brief" or that it was limited to his own generation. My mail abounds with letters, more in recent years, from those not yet born or quite young and they will never forget him nor will vicious propaganda like the Times/Morris one end that.

The intent to tar the son with the father's brush is obvious in the review.

First I explain my own view. I believe JFK was not a good Congressman or Senator, that he was reactionary on many issues, and we voted for him for President because Nixon was the choice. So I do not begin his partisan.

Were I to believe all that Morris says is true, and I do not by any means, then it is still the most deliberate dishonesty to portray a grown man as what he was as a boy and as young adult, at the latest not much past 20.

How unusual was it, again assuming Morris is fair and truthful, a big assumption, to evaluate the man, the President, by his boyish beliefs when his father was the pro-Hitler ambassador to England and they all associated with the English of that view? The real question is did he stay that way and the obvious answer is that he rapidly outgrew it as he learned and matured.

assuming that the accounts of JFK's sexual life are not exaggerated - and basically I know that in general he slept around, knew and was the house guest of one of his rich woman friends - even that is out of context and has nothing at all to do with what kind of President he was. One of the basic causes of all this JFK hatred is that he became an entirely different President beginning with the October, 1962 Cuba Missile crisis, when he opted for peace and the many ^{and} risky steps he took are largely unknown. He began detente and he and Khrushchev were groping toward ^{peace} it when he was assassinated. *Both had real problems.*

Hamilton can be fairly evaluated by a very wrong opinion that is a gross lie. Writing about JFK's youthful writing under the influences he was under as a youth in England, before Pearl Harbor, Hamilton says "Nothing else Jack would write in his life would so speak the man." Really a bigger lie would be difficult. As a conspicuous illustration, take his 6/63 speech at the American University, the exact opposite of Hamilton's lie and a powerful beginning of turning popular opinion against the cold war and for peace.

There is no rationality in Morris's question, "What price did we pay for the deeper flaws

of
and scars which the sexual and sexist pathology was only a manifestation?" Can you think of a single one? (I doubt the sexist allegation is true)

Then the outrageous line that we "could never again allow ourselves such identification, such investment in a politician." Or, when we have a leader who has earned both love and trust he should not have it. ^{them} Transation- do not re-elect him?

He does not say that about FDR, who played around a bit, too. Or of Ike, who also played around. As so many have and will without that influencing them outside the bed.

JFK was, I think, the last good President we had. He did not begin that way but he was. He was the first since FDR who really earned the love and trust he got, aside from those who did not understand Truman and what he was doing to the world and to this country. And that those who long for their own power and influence, if not personally, through policies they prefer, that who do not want really popular government, cannot abide.

Few leaders have ever faced the challenges and disasterous and destructive potentials JFK did. He faced them with intelligence, courage, increasing understanding, and he evolved policies that were, largely, the best possible. Solutions, too. This is what galls those who hate him and would destroy the love and respect for him so many have.

That as a man he had outgrown and overcome the influences under which he was as a youth makes him as one who did think for himself and grow as he matured.

His sex life had nothing at all to do with the kind of President he became and it is the kind of President he became that those who hate him and would destroy the warm feeling for him so many ordinary people have cannot abide, so they misuse his sex life as part of the campaign to destroy these feelings ^{and} to discourage the emergence of another like him who can outgrow their pasts and can become good leaders.

The Hamiltons and the Morrises ooze from the literary and political bordellos.

They want no popular models and they do not want for their ilk to have to be compared with those who earned their popularity.

I doubt that in the coming works Hamilton will report how Joe's three sons wound up so completely opposite him, all three earning their popularity and all three not only caring for those who did not enjoy their benefits but really trying to help those who lacked them.

Harold