

Dear Harry,

6/23/91

Whenever I could find a few moments I read your first chapter, "The Kennedy Presidency." The ^{concept} ~~concept~~ is fine, some of it is excellent, some is unclear, there are some mistakes or various kinds, ranging upward from a few misspellings but it is well worth the work it requires.

It may interest you to know that I had pretty much the same ~~idea~~ idea and researched it in a different way 26 years ago. I have no idea where that research now is. I've made mention of the book I was working on then, "Liger to Ride."

It is not possible for me to take the additional time to explain all the small things I caught in this one interrupted reading so please don't ask it. What - have done is use a highlighter as I read and what I marked to call to your attention ranges from a single letter to whole sentences, sometimes ~~indicating~~ indicating the underlying thought, sometimes ^{to} ~~indications~~ indications needed clarification, etc.

Give these markings the thought you can and try to determine what I am calling to your attention.

As I now recall, on occasion it is factual error. Sometimes over-simplification, sometimes ambiguity - a range of reasons.

Sometimes you are getting at the right thing in what I regard as the wrong way. I can't recall all the many things now.

But what you have is an excellent beginning for something that needs to be said and understood and is, as I say above, well worth the time to perfect it and what also can be important, protect it from criticism that could undermine acceptability of what it says.

On page 18 you make two references to what Mansfield said, one to LIFE 8/7/70, the other to the Wash. Post of 8/3/70. If you can send me copies I'd appreciate it. I am currently having an argument with someone over this precise point.

I can't find ~~my~~ research now but if you feel you have to, you can find additional confirmation for this point. I do not think you need it.

I see one highlighting on this page. The last sentence in the penult graf needs rewriting for clarification. I think that what you intend saying is that "they constituted a relatively large paramilitary organized, trained and ~~equipped~~ equipped by the CIA, which also selected its leaders and the plans for their unsuccessful invasion.

Good luck with it! Ditto for Introduction, also enclosed.

Some of the writing is quite good.

Sincerely,

Harry

HIGH TREASON 2

By Harrison Edward Livingstone

c 1991

3025 Abell Avenue
Baltimore, MD 21218

(301) 243-4272

Chapter 1 High Treason 2

with us before we could find out if we could work together, as we seem to be so good at doing with many bloody dictators in the world.

Senator Mike Mansfield also reasoned with Kennedy and told him to withdraw, after returning from a trip to Vietnam in 1962. Kennedy told O'Donnell after the meeting, "I got angry with Mike for disagreeing with our policy so completely, and I got angry with myself because I found myself agreeing with him."

There was also a political equation. Kennedy had to wait until the next election. He told Senator Mike Mansfield in the Oval Office in Kenneth O'Donnell's presence that he agreed with Mansfield that we had to withdraw all of the military from Vietnam but he said "I can't do it until 1965--after I'm reelected." When Mansfield left the office, Kennedy said to O'Donnell: "In 1965, I'll be damned everywhere as a Communist appeaser. But I don't care. If I tried to pull out completely now, we would have another Joe McCarthy Red scare on our hands, but I can do it after I'm reelected. So we had better make damn sure that I am reelected." (Life, August 7, 1970, excerpts from Kenneth O'Donnell, Johnny, Johnny, We Hardly Knew Ye,)

Kennedy was not chicken. That is not why he began to sidestep out of Vietnam. He had proved his manhood in World War Two and in the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis. The fact is, he had learned from the Bay of Pigs that military solutions are not always the best.

But as Senator Mike Mansfield, a close friend of Kennedy had said, "It was not unusual for him to shift position. There is no doubt that he had shifted definitely and unequivocally on Vietnam, but he never had the chance to put the plan into effect." (speaking of the intent to withdraw from Vietnam) (Washington Post, August 3, 1970) Mansfield also said in that interview with the Post, that Kennedy "had definitely and unequivocally made that decision." This was at a Congressional breakfast with Kennedy. "President Kennedy didn't waste words. He was pretty sparse with his language."

The issue here is one of statecraft. There is the Machiavellian view, of doing whatever you have to do, ruthlessly if necessary, to achieve your goal, letting the chips fall where they may. That means lying, murder, whatever. The Prince was Machiavelli's crucial work on the subject, and his philosophy was adhered to for centuries by rulers. <

The expectations of the Cubans in that Brigade may have been unrealistic, and of course colored with the false promises or implied promises of American military backing for their invasion. They certainly had a large paramilitary force with them supplied by the CIA.

Since some of these same cubans may have later helped kill Kennedy, we need to think long and hard about what we say as well as what we do. If the government is going to support