

NEVER AGAIN! Add to Kenny O'Donnell oral history insert

Fairness also requires, Johnson being Johnson, that the opposite evidence ~~is~~ not be ignored.

in his extraordinarily fine, definitive and fair book, JFK and Vietnam (Warner Books, New York, 1992) John M. Newman presents the evidence to the contrary, that Johnson did want us in a ground war in southeast Asia. Newman retired as ~~a~~ ^{an Army} major after 18 years in intelligence. He served in southeast Asia, in Thailand, the Philippines, Japan and China. On the University of Maryland, College Park faculty, he has taught courses in Soviet, Chinese Communist, East Asia and Vietnam war history.

In November, 1993 testimony before the House of Representatives Government Operations Oversight Committee, presided over by Michigan Democrat John Conyers, Newman expressed what is the thrust of my work in testifying that, "A great deal more is at stake than who killed President Kennedy. What is at stake is nothing less than the faith of the people in our institutions."

As the Washington Post headlined ^a more than ~~a~~ full-page article by Jefferson Morley ~~is~~ on Newman and his testimony - in its Style rather than main news section of November 18, 1993 "DID DEMOCRACY DIE IN DALLAS?" The subhead is "John Newman says the government's lies about JFK's assassination are tearing America apart."

In the "Webs of Deception" chapter of his book, those webs of deception spun by the military, Newman makes clear in the subchapter "Back Channel to the Vice President" that Johnson ^{new} knew that the military was lying. Newman cites the "incontrovertible proof" of this. (Pages 225ff.)

Of the Johnson desire not to get involved in a ground war in Vietnam, reported by O'Donnell, Newman begins to make the very persuasive opposite ~~case~~ case in his "The Drums after Dallas Chapter." (Pages 438ff)

~~The first proof he cites is the exchange made in the for Kennedy draft of National Security Council Memorandum (NSAM) 273~~

The first proof he cites ^{is} in his sub-chapter ^{Section} "NSAM-273 - the Dam Breaks" (pages 445-50) ^{h/} This NSA ^{M/} had been drafted in accord with Kennedy's instructions, for his approval when he returned from his Texas trip. As soon as Kennedy was killed it was

revised immediately and, as Newman says, his emphasis, "significantly," in accord with "directives that Johnson gave on Sunday, November 24. ...These revisions were uniformly escalatory." His source in the version of The Pentagon Papers ~~EDITED BY THEM~~ Senator Mike, Gravel, volume 3, Document 156, pages 494-6. Newman continues, "The truly important change in NSAM-273... was the authorization for plans to widen the war against Vietnam." Kennedy had permitted only "advisers in Southeast Asia but the military soon expanded their function, ~~to~~ but within South Vietnam. (Page 447) As these military operations against North Vietnam were expanded, the Navy was authorized to use "destroyers in the Gulf of Tonkin to 'acquire visual, electronic and photographic intelligence on infiltration activities and coastal navigation." Referring to the second of these operations, Newman refers to a destroyed in saying, "The Maddox was authorized to go within eight nautical miles of the coast [within what North Vietnam regarded as its territorial waters], leading to the incident with North Vietnam on August 2 - the match that lit the tinder box."

Later it became ~~clear~~ ^{clear} that there had not been any attack on the Maddox or ^{on} a second provocation ~~with~~ ^{by} the destroyer the C. Turner Joy. But this pretended attack was used by Johnson to get Congress to enact a simple resolution rather than the Declaration of War required by the Constitution for the United States to engage ^{in that} ~~in~~ war.

On Johnson's intentions, Newman quotes former Washington Post reporter Stanley Karnow's 1983 book, Vietnam (Viking, New York, page 326):

"...at a White House reception on Christmas Eve, a month after he succeeded to the presidency, Lyndon Johnson told the Joint Chiefs (of staff), 'Just get me elected, and then you can have your war!'"

It never ceases to amaze me how the most competent reporters miss significant ~~information~~ statements, despite their expertise, knowledge and questioning instincts. The military intent to get us involved in a war on the Asian ~~mainland~~ ^{mainland} was brought to light in ~~Arthur~~ Pulitzer Prize Historian Arthur Schlesinger, who was also on JFK's White House staff, in his 1965 book, A Thousand Days. (Houghton Mifflin, Boston), page 338.)

Even as sharp a reporter as my friend the late Stephen Barber, then the Washington correspondent of the ^{conservative} London Standard, missed ^{conservative} this. Steve covered the war in Vietnam. He knew and told me that the military was lying its head off, particularly about its claimed successes and enemy body-counts. Yet he read Schlesinger's definitive book without understanding, referring to the Kennedy ~~in~~ Presidency, *that*.

the Pentagon was developing what would become its standard line in Southeast Asia — unrelenting opposition to limited intervention except on the impossible condition that the President agree in advance to every further step they deemed sequential, including, on occasion, nuclear bombing of Hanoi and even Peking. At one National Security Council meeting General Lemnitzer outlined the processes by which each American action would provoke a Chinese counteraction, provoking in turn an even more drastic American response. He concluded: "If we are given the right to use nuclear weapons, we can guarantee victory." The President sat glumly rubbing his upper molar, saying nothing. After a moment someone said, "Mr. President, perhaps you would have the General explain to us what he means by victory." Kennedy grunted and dismissed the meeting. Later he said, "Since he couldn't think of any further escalation, he would have to promise us victory."

In this country, policy is set by the President under the constitution, not by the military. ~~JFK's~~ JFK's clear policy was not to get involved in such a war, but the military was nonetheless set upon a course of its own, the opposite of the President's, as Newman in particular documents with painstaking and overwhelming ~~detail~~ detail.

Was that a military conspiracy?

The danger was foreseen by our Founding Fathers and they drafted the Constitution with the intent of precluding it, by vesting policy in the presidency. In their essays in support of the pending Constitution, Alexander Hamilton, James Madison and John Jay, ^{a book,} engaged in lengthy explanations. These essays were later collected and published as The Federalist Papers.

In the 25th ⁽¹⁾ speaking of the military, Hamilton wrote,

"For it is a truth, which the experience of all ages has attested, that the people are more commonly in danger when the means of injuring their rights are in the possession ^{those of} of whom they entertain the least suspicion." (quoted from the New American Library/Mentor Ment or edition of 1961)

Whether O'Donnell's opinion, that LBJ wanted not to get involved in a war in Vietnam and was manipulated into it by the military, ^{is correct or not,} it is a fact that Johnson did order the change in policy that did involve us in that war and he did that before ~~the~~ Kennedy's body was in its grave.

While such things are never adjudicated, ^{ditto} Neuman makes an irrefutable case of a military conspiracy to get us involved in that war and that their conspiracy did succeed.

This is ~~why~~ why there have been those who from the time those shots were fired in Dallas suspected that Kennedy was killed as the end product of a military conspiracy, the narrower view of some, or in a broader ~~expression~~ expressions, the conspiracy was by those who wanted to change policy.

That policy was changed -immediately- and with the most disastrous consequences.