

JOSEPH LEVY DIES—WROTE FOR TIMES—WAR CORRESPONDENT, 64, WAS LEGION OF HONOR OFFICER

Joseph M. Levy, former New York Times war correspondent in the Middle East, died yesterday of a cerebral hemorrhage in the New York Hospital. He was 64 years old and lived at 451 West End Avenue.

Mr. Levy, after retiring from the Times in 1947, served as public relations counsel to the French Embassy in Washington. More recently he had been a press liaison representative of the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. Levy was fluent in eight languages, including Hebrew and Arabic. Born in New Brunswick, N.J., he was taken to Jerusalem as an infant. He attended the University of Beirut.

As a young man he served as private and political secretary to Sir Ronald Storrs, Governor of Jerusalem under the British mandate. In his twenties, he spent 7 months with a Bedouin tribe in the Transjordan desert, studying its customs.

JOINED THE TIMES IN 1928

He was engaged by the Times as a foreign correspondent in 1928 and made his headquarters in Jerusalem. The following year his articles about Arab outbreaks against the Jews and British in Palestine began to appear.

From 1935 on, he was more frequently based in Cairo. He made excursions to Damascus, Baghdad, and Amman as the news required. Many of his stories were about archeological discoveries, economics, and peaceful pursuits.

Increasingly his work dealt with riots, combat, and war. In 1940 he reported the Royal Air Force strikes at Italian Africa, and, with the British forces in the Western Desert, covered Anglo-Italian hostilities. In 1941-42 he reported the back-and-forth movement of the North African battle.

In 1943 he left Cairo, because of ill health, and was assigned to Ankara, Turkey. From there he sent many stories of the effect of the war in the Balkans.

After he retired from the Times, Mr. Levy worked privately and through organizations to help the Jews living in Arab countries outside Palestine.

SERVED THREE AMBASSADORS

As public relations counsel to the French Embassy he served Ambassadors Henri Bonnet, Maurice Couve de Murville, and Hervé Alphand, explaining the French point of view on international problems to Government leaders.

For his services he was made an officer of the French Legion of Honor.

He had been active in the American Jewish Committee and was a member of the Overseas Press Club and the Society for the Advancement of Judaism.

Surviving are his widow, the former Esther Levine; two sons, Fred and Robert, and three grandchildren.

A funeral service will be held at 11:30 a.m. today in the Chapel of the Riverside Funeral Home, Amsterdam Avenue and 76th Street.

ANOTHER TRIBUTE TO SENATOR KUCHEL'S GREAT COURAGE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there was published in the Bridgeport, Conn., Catholic Transcript, on March 4, 1965, an editorial entitled "Extremes, Extremists Meet."

It deals with a nasty situation which developed in connection with our distinguished friend and colleague, the minority whip, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

To my dying day, I shall applaud his great courage in moving into this matter with the resolution that he did.

The editorial is further testimony to the fact that he will have been instrumental in clarifying a situation which, pray God, we shall never have to encounter again.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXTREMES, EXTREMISTS MEET

Shocking was the disclosure this week of the cruel ordeal to which Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, of California, has been subjected for the last several months. The Senator, a moderate Republican, has been the target of low accusations supposedly proved in an affidavit. Copies of the alleged affidavit were circulated by the thousands in various parts of the country. Several rightwing publications spread the charges through their columns. An investigation has established that the accusations are utterly baseless, and a grand jury has indicted four men on a charge of conspiracy to commit criminal libel. One of the four was, until last week, a public relations man for the Eversharp-Schick Co.

The attempt "maliciously [to] defame the honesty, integrity, virtue, and reputation" of the Senator and to bring "public hatred, contempt, and ridicule" upon him is vile. But quite as significant is the political bent of the people who gave the charges currency. They are extremists who profess to be passionately concerned for the American freedoms and the rights of Americans. They declare themselves the only genuine opponents of communism, and label as Communists or the dupes of Communists anyone who disagrees with their ideas and is critical of their methods.

Just how American are their tactics as disclosed in this instance? Is it the American way to try to ruin an upstanding and outstanding public servant by circulating loathsome lies about him? Is this American freedom, or the proper means of defending American freedom? Does it indicate due concern for the rights of an American, or a sensible and honorable approach to protection of those rights? And what does it say of the perpetrators' real attitude to the moral concepts and practices of the Communists? These people credit themselves with a profound horror of Communist immorality, and tax anyone differing from them with indifference to, or even tacit approval of, Communist immorality. Yet they themselves employ the very abuses which the Communist code canonizes—deceit, misrepresentation, calumny, obloquy, reckless disregard of the rights and the good name of a person whose views do not perfectly coincide with theirs, and a ruthless determination to destroy him.

Extremes meet, and so do extremists. The extreme rightist is the twin of the extreme leftist in his abandonment of rational argument and his resort to violence against truth and decency. Both are far removed from the American ideal, and both are equally inimical to the preservation of the American way.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is time for some blunt words on Vietnam. There is a great deal of talk in Moscow, in Peiping and, in all honesty, in Washington on what the President meant or did not mean by his speech at

Johns Hopkins a short time ago. While the talk goes on, the bloodshed also goes on. The bleeding is not being done in the capitals of the world. It is being done in the rice fields and jungles of Vietnam—in North and South Vietnam alike. It is being done by Vietnamese and Americans. It is being done by Communist and anti-Communist Vietnamese and, mostly, in all probability, by simple peasants who cannot distinguish the one from the other, and whose greatest wish is to be spared the ravages of war. In all probability, these people want peace and a minimum of contact with distant Saigon and distant Hanoi, not to speak of the places which they have scarcely heard about—that is to say, Peiping, Moscow, or Washington.

That, it seems to me, is the fundamental reality of the situation in Vietnam. It is grasped, in part, but only in part, when it is declared that all would be well if North Vietnam would only leave its neighbors alone. It is grasped, in part, but only in part, when it is contended that all foreign troops must be withdrawn forthwith from Vietnam. It is grasped, in part, but only in part, when it is argued that the bombings of North Vietnam must continue indefinitely until a solution is reached. It is grasped, in part, but only in part, when it is argued that the bombings must cease before even an effort to reach a solution can begin.

It is grasped fully; it was grasped fully when President Johnson called for unconditional discussions, with the object of restoring a decent and honorable peace. Those words do not need interpretation. They say what they mean. They mean what they say.

The situation has gone so far that superficial truisms which seize upon only one or another aspect of the problem do not offer any key to its resolution. It does not much matter whether these truisms originate in Hanoi or Saigon, Peiping, or Washington. All would not be well if the bombing of North Vietnam ceases today, and it will not be well if it continues for months or years. All would not be well if the United States were to withdraw tomorrow, lock, stock, and barrel. All would not be well if North Vietnam on today, tomorrow, or the day after, ceased to send weapons, men, and even words across the 17th parallel.

The United States is in Vietnam, and whatever the circumstances which led to its projection into that situation, that commitment is now in great depth. Anyone who assumes that this projection is reversible before an ordered and acceptable peace can be obtained assumes in error. Indeed, it is far more likely to be increased.

The Saigon government and South Vietnamese military and bureaucratic structure which surround it and the tens of thousands who have actively supported it are not going to dissolve at the behest of Hanoi, Peiping, Moscow, or even Washington, tomorrow or the day after. They will not throw away their weapons and place their heads on the block of those who have hunted them for so long.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Montana has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional period of time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, North Vietnam, too, is deeply involved in South Vietnam, and when all the rational air and naval targets have been exhausted, it is likely still to be involved. The fact is that there are both historic and modern ties between these two areas which can be ignored or obscured in the flames of the present military and ideological conflict but which are not likely to be severed in any permanent sense. Even if it were possible to perform this radical cultural surgery, the fact still remains that tens of thousands of Vietnamese in the south, who have been in active or sympathetic revolt against Saigon for years under the general command of the so-called National Liberation Front, are not going to put aside their weapons and fears and placidly accept the domination of those who have hunted them for so long.

It is significant and ironic that on all sides in this dispute there is reference to the need to return to the Geneva agreements as a basis for peace. Those agreements, at least, did recognize the basic factors in the Vietnamese situation and were in harmony with the realities of it. The agreements would have been extremely difficult of achievement had all sides sought to carry them out faithfully for the past decade. The fact is that all sides did not work to carry them out. Hanoi did not work to carry them out, except as parts could be interpreted to advantage. Saigon did not work to carry them out except as one aspect or another of the agreements might have coincided with what one political faction or another in Saigon interpreted as to its advantage. It is the people of Vietnam, North and South, who now pay the price in blood for this past maneuvering of expediency.

The situation in Vietnam is now immensely more complex than in 1954. It now involves the United States directly and increasingly with major military forces and may soon involve other outside powers clearly and directly with major military forces. It now involves North Vietnam and tens of thousands in South Vietnam in active military effort to overthrow the Saigon government. It involves a 10-year crescendo of fear, hostility, and terror.

Yet, the Geneva agreement achieved in 1954, after much discussion, still remains the touchstone of the policies—at least of the pronounced policies—of all the nations significantly involved in Vietnam. It offers the last slim hope of peace before events move beyond the reach of hope.

It is, therefore, of the utmost importance that the question of how to apply the principles of the Geneva Agreement of 1954 be faced as soon as possible. That question, moreover, must be faced, in all realism, in the circumstances which exist today which, as I have noted above, are

sharply changed from those of a decade ago.

It does not much help to pay lip service from afar to this agreement, as Peiping and Hanoi have done, and then reject any consideration through discussion of its practical application in today's circumstances. And the longer this confrontation is put off, the more the people of North and South Vietnam pay for the delay, the more the likelihood that the present limited conflict will spread into a general war in Asia.

That is why it seems to me that those who seek peace in Vietnam will be well-advised to note the President's willingness to enter into "unconditional discussions," and respond to them. Those are his words and they do not require interpretation from Peiping, Moscow, or, in all honesty, from anonymous bureaucrats in this city. I repeat: "They say what they mean. They mean what they say."

That is why, too, the Soviet suggestion of a few days ago that the Geneva Conference be reconvened on the question of guaranteeing Cambodian neutrality is, as I have noted previously, worthy of the most serious consideration. Cambodian neutrality is a matter of the utmost importance, in itself, if the present conflict is not to spread. And the need for a confrontation on a situation in which none is involved so directly may indeed be a preliminary to a second and separate confrontation on Vietnam in which the involvement of all is direct. Such a conference may, indeed, be the beginning of the road not only to an assured Cambodian neutrality but to peace in Vietnam and the stability and development of all of southeast Asia.

If the desire for a bona fide peace takes precedence over face on all sides, then the convening of a conference might be accompanied by a cease-fire and stand-fast throughout Vietnam—north and south. That is a goal which, it is to be hoped, the 17 nations, the Secretary General of the United Nations, and the cochairmen of the Geneva Conference and the diplomats of every nation might well bend every effort to achieve.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I hope the world will read and take note of what the majority leader has said this morning. I particularly hope that the leadership of our Armed Forces and the leadership of the U.S. Government will read and take note of what he has said.

It is plainly evident now that unless reason returns to the world, we will be headed into the most devastating conflict the world has ever known, and we will not come out of it covered with glory, no matter who wins, because no one can win that kind of war.

It is difficult for me to understand what our Armed Forces, our Defense Department, and our executive branch are thinking of when they send 200 planes to blow up a bridge. Is it simply braggadocio, our way of saying that this is what we are doing as an example, and it is nothing at all to what we will do if those people of North Vietnam do not yield.

Those people over there, I suppose, are not in a mood to negotiate when they see everything they have worked for being blown to pieces by a huge air fleet. Instead of capitulating they seem to be consumed by greater hatred for the United States.

For the life of me, I cannot understand what we are doing by sending those tremendous air armadas to do the work which normally, I understand, can be done equally well by a small force even if were desirable to invade North Vietnam at all.

I realize there is wrong on both sides. Who started this trend toward human catastrophe will probably always be debatable. Whether the North Vietnamese or the South Vietnamese or no Vietnamese started it is not a question that I can answer. However, I believe it is plainly evident now that unless this conflict is stopped, whatever history there will be left to record will show a very black page.

I say again that I hope the world—and that includes Russia and the United States and everybody else—will read and heed what the Senator from Montana has said. [Applause.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The occupants of the galleries are advised that demonstrations are not permitted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I ask that additional time be granted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Vermont for his remarks. I reiterate that I believe what the President said at Johns Hopkins on the question of unconditional discussions held out the possibility that reason might return to the conference table, especially in view of the invitation issued by the Soviet Union for a reconvening of the Geneva Conference of 1954, a conference which, incidentally, has never gone out of existence.

I recall that some weeks ago the British suggested that the Geneva Conference be reconvened. At that time the Soviet Union showed no interest whatever. In the meantime Norodom Sihanouk, the Chief of State of the Kingdom of Cambodia, has renewed his plea that the conference be held for the purpose of guaranteeing the neutrality and territorial integrity of Cambodia.

On this occasion the Soviet Union came forward with the suggestion that the Geneva Conference be reconvened. This time it is the United Kingdom that does not come forward to accept the invitation.

I mention these two nations because both the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union are cochairmen of the Geneva Conference, and at any time that they desire, the conference can be reconvened.

I believe that the reconvening of the Geneva Conference, to consider the question of the neutrality of Cambodia, would be in the best interest of all concerned.

I feel that if it were spread out to other areas of southeast Asia, it would be meritorious in itself.

April 21, 1965

I emphasize again that what the President said at Johns Hopkins about unconditional discussion is still the order of the day, and that the President in that speech laid down a dictum which I hope will reach into Peiping and Hanoi and Moscow and into the capitals of the 17 uncommitted nations and into the capitals of the 114 nations represented in the United Nations.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise, filled with admiration for the leadership of my majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], whose head reasons through the Vietnam crisis that confronts this Republic. His mind is never brainwashed by his adrenalin glands. Senator MANSFIELD has made here today one of the most powerful speeches on the Vietnam crisis that has ever been given in the historic debate on the Asiatic crisis during the past several months.

I rise also to pay my respects and to express my admiration for the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken]. He and I, as members of the Foreign Relations Committee, have listened to all the briefings that we have received from the State Department and the Pentagon in regard to our program in Asia.

I can best express myself on this crisis at this time by asking unanimous consent to have published at this point in my remarks an article by Walter Lippmann published in the Washington Post of the 19th of April, and an article by Walter Lippmann published in Newsweek for this week, in which Mr. Lippmann makes the major points that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening] and the senior Senator from Oregon have made for more than a year in speech after speech on the floor of the Senate. We have pleaded for a change in America's involvement in South Vietnam by returning to our treaty obligations which our warmaking acts in Asia have violated time and time again.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain other editorials and newspaper columns and correspondence that I have received on the South Vietnam and Asiatic crisis be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Apr. 19, 1965]

UNBUTTERED DIPLOMACY
(By Walter Lippmann)

In the wake of President Johnson's Baltimore speech of April 7 and of the appeal of the 17 unaligned countries, which preceded it by about a week, discussions looking toward an eventually negotiated settlement have actually been underway. Some of the discussion has been public and has consisted of exchanges of statements by Washington and Hanoi; some of the discussion is private through the various intermediaries who are concerned to prevent the spread of the war.

A curious, yet important, fact about the public discussion is that Washington and Hanoi start from the same legal basis. The President on March 25 declared that "we seek no more than a return to the essentials of the Geneva Agreements of 1954." On April 13 Premier Pham Van Dong of North Vietnam made a policy declaration which said that Hanoi's fundamental war aim is

the carrying out of the Geneva Agreements of 1954.

If both sides were in fact prepared to abide by and to enforce the Geneva Agreements, a strong legal basis for a settlement would exist. But the fact is that neither we nor they are willing to settle for the Geneva Agreements.

These agreements stipulate that North and South Vietnam are not two separate nations but two temporary zones of the same nation, and that 2 years after the armistice which demarcated the two zones, "the settlement of political problems, effected on the basis of respect for the principles of independence, unity and territorial integrity, shall permit the Vietnamese people to enjoy the fundamental freedoms guaranteed by democratic institutions established as a result of free general elections by secret ballot." As Hanoi has never held anything resembling a free election in North Vietnam, there is little reason to believe that it is prepared to have free elections in both zones of Vietnam. As for the United States, while our Government endorsed the Geneva Agreements, and especially the provision for free elections, it opposed free elections when it realized that Ho Chi Minh would win them. General Eisenhower states this frankly in his memoirs. Since that time we have insisted that South Vietnam is an independent nation.

And so, in spite of the apparent agreement on the "essentials of the Agreements of 1954," neither side has as yet adopted a credible and genuine negotiating position. This country, at least, should do so. Our policy since February has been to attack, to make war upon, North Vietnam in order to compel it to negotiate a settlement that we approve. Therefore, it matters a great deal that we adopt a negotiating position which we are able to defend clearly and openly.

A cardinal weakness of our diplomatic position today is the President's statement at Baltimore that "the first reality is that North Vietnam has attacked the independent nation of South Vietnam." This was not our original position. It has been called the first reality only in the most recent phase of the war, the phase which began in February. Our present position is contrary to the indubitable essentials of the Geneva agreements of 1954, that North and South Vietnam are not two nations but two zones of one nation.

It is argued by some, though not yet by the State Department explicitly, that the 1954 agreements have been overtaken by history and that de facto, as things have actually been for 10 years, there are now two separate and independent nations. But if this is our official position, how then does the State Department explain why we ignore the charter of the United Nations, especially articles 39 and 51, and declared on our own say-so that North Vietnam was the aggressor against an independent state? Had we gone to the Security Council for such a determination, we would, of course, have collided with a Soviet veto. But we would at least have proved that we believed what we were saying and perhaps we might have gotten a few votes to support us.

As a matter of fact, the argument that we are now using, that the two Vietnams are independent because they have been separated for 10 years, is a very embarrassing principle for the State Department to rely on. It would mean, for example, that there are two independent German states because Germany has been partitioned for 10 years.

I am well aware that to be concerned about our legal and moral position is regarded by the new school of superrealists as unworthy of a proud and tough nation. But I think we have something to be very much concerned about when we look about us and see how we are drifting into an icy isolation.

On the continent of Asia there are besides Red China four major Asian powers, the

Soviet Union and Japan in the north, Pakistan and India in the south. With the possible, though only apparent, exception of Japan, we are embroiled with all the powers of Asia. The bitter truth of the matter is that we can search the globe and look in vain for true and active supporters of our policy.

That is how successfully the State Department has planned our diplomatic policy and has argued the American case.

[From Newsweek magazine, Apr. 26, 1965]

THE TEST IN VIETNAM

(By Walter Lippmann)

The President's Baltimore address on Vietnam marked a certain change in our official policy. For the first time he offered to engage in discussions with Hanoi without reserving the right to refuse discussions unless certain conditions (which were not specifically stated) were met first.

Although this opened the door a little for discussions, there is no reason to expect a diplomatic settlement of the Vietnamese war in the near future. For the time being the outcome in Vietnam is being determined by the course of the war itself, and there is no disposition as yet on either side to avoid a military showdown.

The scene of the showdown has been and, it seems certain, will continue to be in South Vietnam. It will be a showdown between the government in Saigon which we are supporting and the Vietcong which Hanoi is supporting. The issue hangs on whether there can be a government in Saigon which is able to subdue the Vietcong rebellion, pacify the countryside, and get itself accepted by the preponderant mass of the people in the greater part of South Vietnam. There is now no such government in Saigon. As a matter of fact, the Saigon Government is in a critical position, having lost control of a large part of the countryside by day, of an even larger part at night.

The United States has been committed, and never more strongly than by the President at Baltimore, to reversing the military trend in South Vietnam. The President has undertaken to make the Saigon Government, which is near to defeat and collapse, into the victor in the civil war. This will take a lot of doing, but the administration has decided that it will be possible to defeat the Vietcong in South Vietnam if it is deprived, as the President put it, "of the trained men and supplies, orders and arms," which "flow in a constant stream from north to south. This support is the heartbeat of the war."

THE OFFICIAL THEORY

This is the basis of the policy adopted in early February, of putting increasing pressure on North Vietnam by bombings which creep nearer and nearer to the highly populated and industrialized centers around Hanoi and Haiphong. The official theory is that by these bombings we can deter Hanoi from supporting the civil war in the south and even force Hanoi to force the Vietcong to ask for peace, especially since we are offering an attractive economic future if they do this. We hope also that the bombings in the north will inspire and enable the Saigon Government to rally the people and to win the war.

We are now embarked on a crucial test of this theory. Can the Saigon Government win the civil war while we attack the Hanoi Government? The outcome of this test depends in the first place on whether the government in Saigon can acquire the military morale and muster the national support to put down the rebellion. It depends in the second place on whether our bombing can hurt or frighten the North Vietnamese sufficiently to cause them to stop supporting the Vietcong rebellion and indeed, to tell the Vietcong to desist. The official policy assumes that they will do that when they are hurt more than

they can endure. Looking at it in a cold-blooded way, this is a test of a military theory. For my part, I am inclined to think that Hanoi will endure all the punishment that we dare to inflict.

BOMBING CAN'T WIN

I am assuming that we dare not and will not devastate the cities of North Vietnam and kill great masses of their people. I am assuming that we shall not do this because we are too civilized, and also because the reaction to such cruelty, would be incalculable in every continent.

The relatively moderate punishment we are inflicting we shall probably continue to inflict. I believe it will not force the North Vietnamese to their knees. They are, we must remember, a country of peasants. Their industries are comparatively primitive, and their capacity to do without the products of their industries is quite different from that, let us say, of a well-to-do, middle-class American community in an affluent suburb. Provided they get some food, which they can from China, they are not likely to quit and to do what we might want because their powerplants and bridges and factories are demolished. What they are likely to do if we make the north increasingly uninhabitable is to go south into South Vietnam.

So, experience may show that our official theory of the war is unworkable. If it does, we shall have to do what we have already done several times in the course of our entanglement in southeast Asia. We shall have to change our minds. This is always a painful process, especially in a big, proud country. But it may have to be done, and it will be done best if we keep the problem open to free and resolute public debate.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Apr. 1, 1965]

SOUTH VIETNAM CONSIDERS WEAKENING LAND REFORM BY BOOSTING LIMIT ON ACREAGE OWNERS CAN HOLD—STIPULATION WOULD BE THAT THEY HIKE OUTPUT WITH MODERN METHODS—REACTION BY UNITED STATES IS MIXED

(By Richard Dudman)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM, April 1.—The Government of South Vietnam is considering weakening a key provision of its land reform program. United States officials here are thought to be giving the controversial proposal some encouragement. They consider it premature but believe it has some merit.

The provision in question is the current limit of 100 hectares (247 acres) on what a single landowner may hold. Holdings beyond that amount are supposed to be sold to the government and then sold to landless peasants on a time payment plan in plots of three to five hectares.

The Minister of Rural Affairs, Nguyen Ngoc To, told the Post-Dispatch he thinks it may be advisable to increase this limit to 200 or even to 1,000 hectares. He said that the higher limit would apply only to the owners who agreed to use modern machines and fertilizers to increase their crop production.

Some Americans and Vietnamese familiar with the land problem here are outraged over the proposed increase. They contend that it is given in to pressure by the big landowners, who have been powerful in every regime since Vietnam won its independence 11 years ago. Critics argue that the Vietcong always poses as the protector of the peasant and would capitalize on the change in propaganda.

Asked about the origin of the proposal, To said that many farmers had asked that the limit be increased because they wanted more land for cultivation. He said it would be politically useful to satisfy these landowners. He observed that the big landown-

ers are better educated than the peasants and thus can adopt modern methods and produce better crops more readily.

American officials have learned of the proposal only informally. Their reaction has been mixed.

"That's about the last thing we need—to satisfy a few big landlords in a country of 16 million people who are mostly peasants."

Another contended, however, that land hunger was not the imposing political problem here that it is in some other countries. He said that the Vietcong had been trying to raise a false issue without great success. As concerns land reform, he said, they are "rebels without a cause."

Aside from self-serving pressure by landlords, the controversy is between economics and politics. Large areas can be farmed more economically, as French rice planters demonstrated, but most observers agree that the Vietcong have had considerable success in stirring peasant resentment over high rents charged to sharecroppers and unfair practices under the 1956 land reform law.

Land distribution under that law is less than half accomplished although in January 1962 President Ngo Dinh Diem announced that it already was completed.

The regime of Gen. Nguyen Khanh eased the burden on the peasants by doubling the 6-year repayment period and halting the expulsion of squatters from government land.

But Khanh rejected a proposal by his Deputy Prime Minister for Pacification, Nguyen Ton Hoan, that the top limit on land holding be reduced to 10 hectares. Nguyen Cong Hau, then Minister for Rural Affairs and a big landowner himself, opposed the plan.

Leroy S. Wehrle, assistant director of the American aid mission, reported last November that the present retention quota of 100 hectares still left the majority of farmers in tenant status.

He quoted a study in a typical delta village that showed the people "were bitterly disappointed by the land reform, which left nearly all of them tenants."

Recommendation by Wehrle and others that a land reform expert be sent to Vietnam has not been adopted. Officials give the land problem little concentrated attention. They are stronger in their opposition to proposals for tightened land reform than in heading off the plan taking shape in the Quat government loosen the program.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Apr. 4, 1965]

A NEW VIETNAM STRATEGY—RESULTS OF INCREASED BOMBING MAY NOT BE KNOWN FOR MONTHS—PRETENSE OF OBEYING 1954 GENEVA AGREEMENTS IS ABANDONED

(By Richard Dudman)

SAIGON, April 3.—President Johnson's new bomb-until-they-give-up strategy in Vietnam is a gamble against odds that can only be guessed. These unknown odds will have much to do with whether the United States is heading toward something that can be called a victory or toward obvious and humiliating disaster.

Resort to the new strategy came as this undeclared war was taking an abrupt turn for the worse. It had been a gradual loser from the start, despite official statements expressing standard "cautious optimism."

Then in recent months a big increase in men and arms from Communist North Vietnam helped the Vietcong guerrillas attack in larger units and come close to cutting the country in half.

Everyone here is actually aware that Mr. Johnson's new strategy has made this a new war—a bigger war and to a greater extent, an American war. That was an obvious result of the air raids against the North (in which Americans pilot their own planes as well as some of the Vietnamese air force planes),

the use of American jet bombers against targets in South Vietnam and the sending in of the first big units of American ground combat forces.

The justification is that infiltration from the North to help the Vietcong has made the conflict more of a North Vietnamese war and less of a civil war.

Little is said here, however, about legal or moral aspects of the new strategy. The United States has expanded its own violation of the Geneva agreements of 1954, which prohibited "the introduction into Vietnam of foreign troops and military personnel as well as of all kinds of arms and ammunition," any foreign military bases in either zone, and the participation of either zone in any military alliance.

The United States now has abandoned all pretense of abiding by the 1954 agreements. It refused at the time to sign the accords, stating merely that the United States would "refrain from the threat or the use of force to disturb them."

Officials whose advice Mr. Johnson now at last is taking are largely those who favored American armed intervention in 1954 to help the French. They disapproved of the Geneva Conference from the start and considered the accords a major diplomatic defeat for the West.

For them, stepped up infiltration and Vietcong raids against American installations was a powerful argument, but did not change the essentials of the situation. They denied this was a civil war when that was more nearly true than today.

North Vietnam continues to maintain the fiction that it is abiding by the agreements, just as did the United States until the last few months.

There are other perhaps more significant signs of moral change in the war.

The American Embassy in effect gave its blessing to the recent forced exile to North Vietnam of three signers of a petition calling for peace negotiations. The Embassy is understood to have advised against an original plan to dump the three civilians out of a plane and let them parachute into North Vietnam. As long as they were merely shoved across the international bridge at the 17th parallel, the United States had no objection.

The predominant view among American officials seemed to be that this was a relatively humane solution, even though there was no trial and it was not clear what Vietnamese law the three men had broken. A Vietnamese Government spokesman, asked why there was no trial, said "we didn't have enough proof."

Nor was there any sign of U.S. objection when Vietnamese bombers attacked a schoolhouse taken over by the Vietcong. A South Vietnamese report estimated that 20 to 30 children were killed. The pilot was said to have seen either gunfire from the school or a Vietcong flag on the flagpole. The village was described as Vietcong infiltrated but not Vietcong dominated. More and more, the United States is declaring "free strike zones" and warning the innocent to get out before unrestricted bombing begins. The United States tried an attack by forest fire this week in an effort to clear Vietcong from a 48-mile square forest stronghold.

The U.S. Military Assistance Command reports meticulously each day how many of the Vietcong are said to have been killed in the day's air attacks in South Vietnam. But there is no such reporting system for the men, women, and children being killed, burned, and maimed by rockets, napalm, and white phosphorus from American and Vietnamese planes. Hundreds jam civilian hospitals in Hue, Danang, Qui Nhon, and other cities throughout South Vietnam. Medical teams from the United States and allied nations help treat the patients with makeshift

April 21, 1965

7841

equipment, two or three to the bed. Success of the new strategy will be determined on a strategic rather than a moral level, however. It will be determined by the composite answer to some questions that are not now answerable.

How painful to the regime in Hanoi are the raids north of the 17th parallel?

There is no expectation here that the attacks in themselves can come anywhere near stopping the infiltration. There is hope—but only a hope—that they will persuade Hanoi to abandon the war.

The belief here is that it may be weeks or months before any effect of the raids can be observed, either in reduced infiltration or in a change in North Vietnamese policy. The further belief here is that the United States would not consider it sufficient if Hanoi merely halted the infiltration, but would insist also on clear orders being issued to the Vietcong to end the war. Weather sometimes makes targets hard to find and damage hard to photograph. Current estimates of damage may turn out to be too rosy. The Navy has been making return raids on some radar stations hit earlier. Despite all the attacks on radar stations in recent weeks the North Vietnamese are always out of their buildings and into trenches and bunkers and manning antiaircraft guns by the time the high level American jets appear over the target.

How much are the stepped up raids in South Vietnam hurting the Vietcong?

Vietnamese who fought with the Viet Minh against the French in the war of independence sometimes say that the French bombs and napalm were effective at first, but became much less so when the Viet Minh learned how to disperse its men and supplies and use jungle cover and camouflage. American officers who have studied the French war here recall that French planes destroyed many bridges each day in an effort to block the flow of arms and supplies from China to the siege of Dienbienphu. The Chinese kept a gang of coolies and a supply of timbers beside each bridge. In 24 hours a bombed bridge generally was back in service.

There are offsets to whatever positive effect comes from the increased use of airpower. It is making the Vietnamese army overly dependent on air support, which will be less useful when clouds obscure targets for days at a time in the approaching rainy season.

The raids also can make recruits for the enemy as well as inflicting damage on him. Some officials fear that many may be driven into the Vietcong when American bombs destroy their villages or kill or maim their relatives. Propaganda efforts to blame the Vietcong for attracting the bombs have only limited success, it is felt.

Even when leaflets and loudspeakers warn that a village has been declared a "free strike zone," to run from American bombs may be to invite a Vietcong bullet.

How strongly does North Vietnam want to continue the war that it is sponsoring?

"Those people in Hanoi are tough and won't give up easily," says a diplomat who spent 2 years there. Wishful thinking sometimes causes Western officials to exaggerate the effectiveness of bombs or economic pressure to force nations to abandon their cherished plans. The bombing of London and Berlin during World War II and the present economic squeeze on Cuba are examples. As the bombing raids against the North continue, as the targets creep farther northward and perhaps shift from military to industrial installations, there must come a time of appraisal of the Communist response.

The response can range from a big increase in terror along the lines of the bombing of the American Embassy, through invasion by the North Vietnamese Army, the strongest in southeast Asia, to intervention by China or the Soviet Union or both through supplying

of ground-to-air missiles, air assistance, volunteers or regular troops.

What if the response is the hoped for announcement that Hanoi is closing down the war?

The question then is how to tell whether the guerrilla war is really being ended or whether the Vietcong is merely going underground, hiding its weapons and melting into the population to wait for an opportunity to start over again. That is what the Viet Minh did in 1954.

In either case—whether the Communists step up the pace or whether they make motions to close it down—the likelihood is that American troops must remain here on the ground indefinitely. Their mission would be in one case to defend against new Communist moves, in the other to police whatever agreement is reached. The United States has shown little enthusiasm thus far for the alternative of a United Nations peacekeeping force.

The present course is quite different from a State Department plan reported to have been agreed upon last December here and in Washington. That plan called for small unannounced raids, all south of the 19th parallel and thus well south of Hanoi combined with certain incentives. These would include offers of economic aid to North Vietnam through the American food for peace program and through international development assistance. Broadened diplomatic recognition and expanded foreign trade.

Underlying that plan was the thesis that North Vietnam could serve its vital interests—avoid domination by Communist China, resume its normal trade with South Vietnam and continue its industrialization—all by discontinuing an increasingly costly war in the south.

It was intended to follow the classic principle that an adversary should be given a way out. The proposal resembled a suggestion made last summer by Dr. Bernard B. Fall, an authority on North and South Vietnam. Officials here doubt that the plan ever won administration approval. In any event, it now has gone out the window. The raids have been big, highly publicized, and north as well as south of the 19th parallel that was supposed to be their northern limit.

Indications here are that the United States is thinking entirely in terms of increasing punishment, not at all in terms of positive incentives.

In the embattled northern region of South Vietnam, two middle-grade American advisers had just finished briefing a reporter on their difficulties in trying to break the tightening Vietcong noose around their provincial capital.

The reporter asked: "If you were Ho Chi Minh, would the air raids make you decide to quit the war?" The major replied: "Would I quit when I was winning? Don't be silly."

[From the New York Times, Apr. 15, 1965]

THE HANOI COUNTERPROPOSALS

The most important thing about Hanoi's counterproposal for a Vietnam settlement is not what it says but that it was said at all—after Peiping's violent rejection of President Johnson's peace plan.

The exegestists undoubtedly can find innumerable traps in North Vietnam's statement. But the fact that Hanoi felt compelled within a week to make a serious reply to the Baltimore speech demonstrates dramatically that a political offensive can be no more ignored than a military one.

Nothing about the Hanoi declaration is more interesting than its tone. Invective is absent, apart from a single passing reference to American aggression. President Johnson's proposals are called nothing stronger than inappropriate. The need to appeal to world opinion has forced both Washington and Hanoi to spell out their objectives in a form

that would appear reasonable. And this process alone has inevitably narrowed the gap between the two sides.

Whether Hanoi is insisting that there be prior agreement in principle on the nature of the settlement is not yet clear. But it is intriguing that American withdrawal from South Vietnam and even cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam now seem to be listed as objectives rather than preconditions for a negotiation. It must be hoped that such important points as these will be clarified when Hanoi replies formally to the proposal for unconditional negotiations made by 17 nonaligned chiefs of state, a proposal President Johnson has already accepted.

Both Hanoi and Washington seem to agree on restoring the 1954 Geneva agreements—in itself enough of a basis for at least exploratory talks. Both agree that reunification of Vietnam is for a later day and that the first task is to end the war and assure a neutral South Vietnam. Surprisingly, Hanoi seems prepared even to accept the principle that North as well as South Vietnam must be neutral, free from any military alliance or foreign military bases, troops, or military personnel.

The goal Hanoi sets for a Vietnam solution is hardly one, of course, that would recommend itself to Saigon or to Washington. It provides that the internal affairs of South Vietnam be settled in accordance with the program of the Vietcong's National Liberation Front.

But no one has ever claimed that negotiations, once engaged, would be easy or that they would lead quickly to agreement. It took President de Gaulle 18 months to get the Algerian guerrillas to the conference table.

The problem in Vietnam now is to find a forum for exploratory talks and to get negotiations started. It is as irrelevant at this stage to argue about the delicate needle-point of a settlement as it would be to dispute how many angels can dance on the point of a needle.

[From the Champaign-Urbana Courier, Apr. 11, 1965]

AN OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT JOHNSON ON VIETNAM FROM MORE THAN 200 MEMBERS OF THE CHAMPAIGN-URBANA UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

(Paid advertisement, prepared and paid for by ad hoc faculty committee)

We, as members of the academic community, feel impelled to raise publicly with you, Mr. President, the question of our Government's present policy in Vietnam.

Neither the latest American decisions to escalate the war in Vietnam nor the future course of American action has been openly and freely discussed in this country. We are deeply disturbed by the managed silence concerning both the extent and the direction of our involvement in Vietnam. In our belief, the choice is now between a return to the free flow of information as a basis for open discussion of public issues, or the infliction of permanent damage to democratic institutions at home. Therefore we urge you, Mr. President, to encourage domestic examination of our current policy in Vietnam.

We ask you to consider our present course of action in view of the following facts:

We are militarily intervening in support of a succession of undemocratic regimes which have not won the support of the South Vietnamese people.

We are employing increasingly inhumane means of attaining our professed goals in Vietnam, which have aroused concern and moral indignation even among America's closest allies.

Our expanding air attacks on North Vietnam and our introduction of American combat troops in large numbers intensify the danger that a local conflict will develop into

a major war. The possibility of a nuclear war cannot be ignored.

Our present policy, instead of preventing the spread of communism, has had the effect of alienating the people of South Vietnam and of other southeast Asian countries.

Mr. President, we urge you to halt the war in Vietnam by initiating the following courses of action:

The United States should cease its attacks on North Vietnam.

A conference of all parties to the conflict in Vietnam should be convened to negotiate a political settlement in Vietnam.

To prevent a repetition of the tragedy of Vietnam, an international conference should develop guidelines for the peaceful settlement of disputes throughout southeast Asia.

Oliver Aberth, Mathematics; Gary Adelman, English; Egbal Ahmad, Political Science; Joseph A. Albert, Psychology; Thomas J. Anton, Institute of Government and Public Affairs; Mark Appelbaum, Psychology; Suzanne Appelbaum, University Press; David E. Aspnes, Physics; Joyce Aspnes, Physics; K. C. Atwood, Microbiology; Terrance Auger, Education; James S. Ayars, Bonita S. Baker, English; Sheila Baker, Psychology; V. Lewis Bassie, Bureau of Economics and Business Research; Edwin G. Belzer, Jr.; Health and Safety Education; Howard J. Birky, Psychology; Lindsay M. Black, Botany; Richard J. Bloesch, Choral Music; Victor Bloomfield, Chemistry; Van Bluemel, Physics; Robert Blum, Music; Thomas L. Bohan, Physics; Kenneth A. Bowen, Mathematics; Niels W. Brarce, anthropology; Herbert Brun, Music; Edward M. Bruner, Anthropology; Geoffrey Bruun, History; Mary M. Burdette, Music; Robert Carroll, Mathematics; W. Ellison Chalmers, Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations; Lee Chesney, Art; Milt Cloud, Computer Science; Carl Cohen, Philosophy; Anthony J. Conger, Psychology; Daniel Curley, English; Philip W. Curry, Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations; Lawrence J. Daley, Music; E. E. Davis, Psychology; James D. Davis, Mathematics; Natalie H. Davis, Botany; D. G. Bourgin, Mathematics; Sylvia Dugre, Microbiology; Phillips L. Garman; Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations; J. Goodisman, Chemistry.

Mahon M. Day, Mathematics; John J. DeBoer, Education; Milton Derber, Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations; Robert Dippner, Psychology; James A. Donaldson, Mathematics; Ben E. Drake, English; Don E. Dulany, Jr., Psychology; Elizabeth G. Dulany, University Press; Murray Edelman, Political Science; Jonathan Elsen, Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations; Mary Nell Eldridge, Student Counseling; David R. Ewbank, English; Peter S. Farrell, Music; Marianne A. Ferber, Economics; Marian I. Fertik, Speech and Theater; Ross Figgins, Division of General Studies; Morris W. Firebaugh, Physics; Jacqueline W. Flenner, Computer Science; Roderick G. Forsman, Psychology; Robert M. Fossum, Mathematics; Merlin J. Foster, Computer Science; Dale Franzwa, Communications; Helen Franzwa, Speech; Ken Garrison, Mathematics; John G. Gazley, History; Gene Gilmore, Journalism; Eleanor Gilpatrick, Bureau of Economics and Business Research; Betty Glad, Political Science; Edwin L. Goldwasser, Physics; Fred M. Gotthell, Economics; Norman Graebner, History; John W. Gray, Mathematics; R. Jeffery Green, Bureau of Economics and Business Research; Allan C. Greenberg, History; Gordon Green-

berg, Psychology; Corrinne Guntzel, Economics; Ronald O. Haak, Anthropology; Santosh Haider, Psychology; Charles Hamm, Music; David Harvey, Sociology; Allan J. Harrison, Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations; Edward W. Haurek, Sociology; Jaquelin McGrath, Sociology. James R. Hawkes, History; Joseph M. Heikoff, Bureau of Community Planning; Maurice Heins, Mathematics; Martin O. Heisler, Political Science; Alex Heller, Mathematics; Ernest O. Herreid, Food Science; Louise Herzberg, Institute for Research on Exceptional Children; Paul Herzberg, Psychology; Bernard Hewitt, Speech and Theater; George L. Hicks, Jr., Anthropology; L. A. Hiller, Jr., Music; Hugh K. Himan, Economics; Jack Hudson, Chemical Engineering; Janette Hudson, German; Lyod G. Humphreys, Psychology; Rodger Jacobsen, Fine Art; Joe W. Jenkins, Mathematics; William C. Jenne, Institute for Research on Exceptional Children; B. Connor Johnson, Animal Science; Keith H. Johnson, Bureau of Economic and Business Research; Ben B. Johnston, Jr., Music; R. Stewart Jones, Educational Psychology; Bernard Karsh, Sociology; U. Milo Kaufmann, English; Scott Keyes, Bureau of Community Planning; Kurt A. Klein, Slavic Languages and Literatures; John W. Krolik, Spanish, Italian, and Portuguese; Norris G. Lang, Anthropology; Byron G. Larson, Sociology; Bernard Lazerwitz, Sociology; Robert B. Lees, Linguistics; F. K. Lehman, Anthropology and Linguistics; John Levee, Art; Solomon B. Levine, Center for Asian Studies; Harry Levy, Mathematics; Lucretia Levy, Mathematics; Michael Lewis, Sociology; Oscar Lewis, Anthropology; M. Lieberthal, Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations; D. H. Lindley, Physics.

Richard J. Loftus, English; Royal B. MacDonald, Music; Richard Malter, School Psychology; David R. May, Psychology; J. P. McCollum, Horticulture; Warren L. Meinhardt, Spanish, Italian, and Portuguese; Steven P. Meshon, Linguistics; Milton O. Meix, Bureau of Educational Research; Charles W. Mignon, English; David Mills, Psychology; Nancy M. Minahan, Psychology; Marjorie Moretz, Mathematics; David E. Muller, Mathematics; Bruno Netti, Music; Leonard N. Neufeldt, English; Kennalee Ogden, Educational Psychology; George H. Orland, Mathematics; C. E. Osgood, Institute of Communications Research; M. H. Pajoja, Agricultural Engineering; E. T. Parker, Mathematics; Sherman Paul, English; Claude Penchina, Physics; Donald R. Peterson, Psychology; Joseph D. Phillips, Bureau of Economic and Business Research; Norman Potter, English; Robert J. Pranger, Political Science; Mary B. Price, University Press; Richard H. Price, Psychology; Alexander L. Ringer, Musicology; T. Thacher Robinson, Mathematics; Philip Rogers, English; Walter Roosa, Music; Joseph W. Rudmin, Physics; Betty Lynn Rueckert, English; William H. Rueckert, English; Yohko Sano, Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations; C. B. Satterthwaite, Physics; Herbert I. Schiller, Bureau of Economic and Business Research; Robert L. Schneider, English; E. J. Scott, Mathematics.

Joan E. Serber, Psychology; W. H. Shoemaker, Spanish, Italian, and Portuguese; Art Sinsabaugh, Art; Harry J. Skornia, Radio and Television; Thomas O. Sloan, Speech; David Q. Smith, English; Sherre Owens Smith, Fine Arts;

Miriam Sperber, Student Counseling; Albert Steiner, Mathematics; Donald C. Stewart, English; Ruth Stillwell, Rhetoric; Leon Swartzendruber, Psychology; Donald R. Taft, Sociology; Gaisi Takeut, Mathematics; Daniel P. Testa, Spanish, Italian, and Portuguese; Erich K. Thomanek, Psychology; Charles S. Thomas, University Press; Howard I. Thorsheim, Psychology; Harry M. Tiebout, Philosophy; H. Y. Tien, Sociology; Stewart L. Tuckey, Helen W. Tuttle, Library; Preston H. Tuttle, English and Speech; Paul Ulanowsky, Music; McCay Vernon, Institute for Research on Exceptional Children; William J. Wainwright, Philosophy; Douglas C. Wartzok, Biophysics; Richard H. Wasson, English; Gregorio Weber, Chemistry; Ronald C. Weger, Mathematics; Allen S. Weller, Art; Paul Wells, Economics; Robert F. Welsh, English; Paula Westerlund, Physical Education for Women; Conrad Wetzel, Psychology; R. A. Wijsman, Mathematics; Nathan Wiser, Physics; Carl R. Woese, Microbiology; Sharon Wolfe, Institute of Communications Research; Bing K. Wong, Mathematics; Robert W. Woody, Chemistry; Raymond Yeh, Mathematics.

(This advertisement has been paid for by individual contributions of the signers. Departmental affiliations are listed for identification purposes only.)

To ad hoc Faculty Committee on Vietnam.

JACQUELINE FLENNER,
Secretary-Treasurer,
902 West California, Urbana, Ill.

W. ELLISON CHALMERS,
Chairman.

E. E. DAVIS,
Executive Secretary.

JACQUELINE FLENNER,
SHARON WOLFE,
Secretary-Treasurer.

You may call on me for further support of this appeal.

I enclose a contribution of \$_____ toward further publication of this advertisement.

Name _____
Address _____

SOUTHAMPTON MONTHLY
MEETING OF FRIENDS,
Southampton, Pa.

The Southampton Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends authorizes Norman E. Polster to present his deep concern that the destruction of life and property in Vietnam cease and the tasks of rebuilding and healing envisioned by the President be taken up without delay.

Minute from the meeting of the Southampton Monthly Meeting held in Southampton, Friday, April 9, 1965.

ANNA S. MORRIS,
Clerk.

CONCERN ON VIETNAM OF MEMBERS OF SOUTHAMPTON MONTHLY MEETING OF FRIENDS

In his speech of April 7 our President has pointed out certain goals of our presence in Vietnam with which we are in cordial agreement. He has stated that, in that country, we seek nothing for ourselves—only that the people of South Vietnam be allowed to guide their own country in their own way. He has, furthermore, mapped out a great program of development in southeast Asia which might permit us, in close cooperation with the other nations of the world, to heal the scars of war, to improve the conditions of life, and to replace enmity with cooperation for the common good. He has, finally, announced our readiness for "unconditional discussions" as a way toward terminating the bloodshed and destruction which are now engulfing not only South Vietnam but, through our bombing forays, North Vietnam as well.

April 21, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

7843

We are in full agreement with these objectives and this approach and urge our representatives in Congress and the departments of our Government to give them their unstinting support. However, we submit that not only our declarations, but also our actions, must change if the desired goals are to be realized. Specifically,

1. We must halt our bombing raids on North Vietnam, which have been extended increasingly to civilian objectives—roads, railroads, powerplants, bridges—with a human toll which is unknown to us. The wanton destruction of the fruits of hard labor in a country which is not rich will not convince its inhabitants of American interest in their welfare, but only spread the notion that "the American invader is the enemy of the people."

2. We must include the National Liberation Front or the Vietcong in our openness for unconditional discussions. Whether it is a creature of North Vietnam, as our State Department has contended, or a broadly based nationalist movement comparable to the French resistance in the Second World War, as Shunichi Matsumoto, investigator for the Japanese Government, a firm supporter of our policies, has found, the immediate conflict in South Vietnam is between the National Liberation Front and Vietcong on the one hand and the South Vietnamese Government and American forces on the other. If the killing in South Vietnam is to stop, a cease-fire must be arranged by consultation between these two groups. A final settlement will without doubt have to be reached by negotiations which would include North Vietnam and the broad range of nations with interests in southeast Asia.

Our goals in these negotiations have been spelled out by the President. Presumably they would include the withdrawal of outside military forces from South Vietnam, and the holding of elections under the supervision of International Control Commission or United Nations teams to ascertain the manner in which the people of South Vietnam desired to be governed. We must contemplate the possibility that, if these elections are truly free, they may express the desire of the people of South Vietnam to be reunited with their brothers in North Vietnam under a government with primarily Communist orientation. The force of nationalism would seem to render such an outcome probable unless Vietcong terror has alienated the people even more than American bombings, burnings, and gas. Yet, if we are true to our word, we must abide by the outcome, whatever it is. Doing so, we will support the cause of law in the world, enhance confidence in American motives, and strengthen our sense of national purpose and leadership. We shall have demonstrated that respect for the dignity of the human person which we seek to have acknowledged everywhere.

Shirley Garth, Marlies Harper, Robin Harper, Robert Horton, Anna S. Morris, Elliston P. Morris, Elizabeth Polster, Norman Polster, Edward Ramberg, Sarah Ramberg.

SOUTHAMPTON, PA., April 15, 1965.

FRESNO, CALIF.,
April 16, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: I deeply appreciate your opinion on the war in Vietnam. And I feel that the Nation owes you a debt of gratitude for daring to state it in the face of almost unanimous opposition.

I am a registered Republican because I think we need an opposition party. But alas, on at least three major issues that are destroying our Nation, and our civilization (war, liquor, and finance) there is no longer any difference between the two parties. This means that we are fast becoming a one-party government. And one-party government inevitably becomes a dictatorship.

What to do about it? If reactionary Republicans continue to rule the party, the die is already cast. An effective coalition of conservatives and liberals is impossible. This seems to leave a new party, with new leadership, as the only hope. The last election showed that the voters no longer merely rubber stamp the party label. So I am convinced the time for an independent party is now. But the fiction is out which says "third parties cannot win." In 1860 the Republicans won as a third party. With intelligent leadership it might happen again in 1968. The need is fully as great as in 1860. I believe all we need is leadership. But time is running out. So hurry.

Sincerely yours,

Rev. W. R. WILLIAMS.

FIRST METHODIST CHURCH,
DES PLAINES, ILL., April 17, 1965.
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am counting on you to step up your pressure against our stupid policy in Vietnam. I do not in any way wish to be classed as being the same group as the so-called leftist student demonstration, but someone must try to bring some sanity to our foreign policy. Let us stop bombing North Vietnam. Let us defend South Vietnam so long as necessary, but by all means let us avoid the possible confrontation with Russia in North Vietnam. We should rather be weaning Russia away still farther from China, not throwing them in each other's arms.

Also may request your concern over the possible strike. One more problem would be too much. May I urge Federal intervention if necessary.

Sincerely,

R. A. W. BRUEHL.

WOODLAND HILLS, CALIF.,
April 14, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I support fully your position on the war in Vietnam. Continuation of the war is not only destroying life and property in Vietnam, and turning peoples in the underdeveloped nations against the United States, but is also eroding democracy here. It is becoming commonplace for the Government to manage and distort news, and lie to the people. Your efforts to penetrate the blanket of mass media distortion are a great service to the preservation of peace and democracy around the world.

Sincerely,

LYNN HALMI.

ST. LOUIS, MO.,
April 15, 1965.

DEAR MR. MORSE: You are putting your finger on the meaningful point when you say that the war in Vietnam is not the American people's war. We were given a choice only between Johnson and Goldwater by the professional political organizations financed by big business which choose the candidates. This is little choice, and I frequently heard the opinion expressed during the campaigns that it was choice between the lesser of two evils.

It turned out that the candidates were perfectly agreed on foreign policy, or more likely, that both were committed to the same foreign policy laid down for them by the big business men who financed both campaigns. Goldwater said frankly that he intended to escalate the Asian war, while Johnson kept his mouth shut except to chew barbecue, and the result was that Goldwater was buried for his frankness. He said Johnson was the biggest phony in Washington, and now we know in our hearts that the general was right about that, anyway.

The hot and cold wars through which the taxpayers have been bilked of huge sums annually for years are for the financial benefit of big business thriving on Government

contracts. It is the representatives of big business who really run this country because they support both political parties. Their greed for profits has increased our national debt to topheaviness dangerous to our economy, and has destroyed our freedom under the pretense of protecting it from communism. The American voters no longer have much say about how their country is run, as witness the war.

Johnson ought to be impeached for the Bobby Baker affair.

G. B. CORWIN.

COLUMBIA, MO.,
April 13, 1965.

HON. SENATORS CHURCH, GRUENING, MCGOVERN, and MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATORS: Although I am not one of your constituents I wish to commend the strong stand you have taken against the official policy on Vietnam.

It seems that the prelection talk of being a "peace President" has been replaced by acquiescence in the plots of our military establishment. Instead of a sane, realistic, compassionate policy toward the people of southeast Asia, we have regressed into a savage play for power, which will make us the most hated nation on earth, if indeed, the whole earth is not destroyed as the result of our cruel stupidity.

The \$3 billion spent for war in that area should have been used for the Mekong River development and other such projects. It's not too late to admit our mistakes, and call on all concerned to meet under U.N. supervision to work out a humanitarian settlement.

Maybe China needs help with a hydroelectric project, too.

I feel that what we do in the next few days will ruin or strengthen the U.N. depending on whether we act outside or inside its "good offices." The press of many countries reflects a loss of faith in our integrity, and fitness for leadership.

May you continue your good work.

Sincerely and respectfully yours,
LENA GREENLAW (Mrs. J. P.).

LONG ISLAND CITY, N.Y.,
April 17, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I please ask you to consider the letter to President Johnson which appears below. If you feel that you can support the suggestion contained therein, a formula for ending the fighting in Vietnam, won't you please detach the letter, sign it, and mail it to the President? I should also be most grateful to get your considered reaction to the proposal.

Yours most sincerely,

IRVING AMBUR.

P.S.: A number of foreign policy specialists have been of help to me in formulating this proposal. Won't you please take a hard look at it and do something with it if it makes sense to you?

Date: _____

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Although your recent offer to negotiate unconditionally with North Vietnam was one of the most morally impressive utterances ever made by an American statesman, it is now apparent that we must go further if we want to end the destruction of human lives and the possibility that the conflict might escalate beyond control.

The proposal outlined below could further strengthen our moral case, prevent further damage to the Soviet-American rapprochement, reinforce the U.N., shift the struggle

7844

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

April 21, 1965

in Vietnam from the battlefield to the ballot box, and yet safeguard our aims, interests, and friends in Asia and elsewhere.

I propose that we induce the Saigon government and the Vietcong to agree on the following terms:

1. An immediate cease-fire;
2. Temporary occupation of South Vietnam by a neutral force, assembled either by the U.N. or by an ad hoc grouping of neutral powers and consisting of troops and general officers from countries acceptable to both the government and the insurgents;
3. Surrender of all arms by the government and the insurgents to the occupying command;
4. Withdrawal of all American, Soviet, Chinese, and North Vietnamese personnel to points outside the borders of South Vietnam;
5. Assignment by the Saigon government and by the Vietcong of their fighting men in equal numbers to the occupying command which would proceed to form mixed military units consisting half of government and half of Vietcong personnel;
6. The gradual phasing out of troops from the neutral countries and the replacement of them by the mixed units which would operate under either a Neutral or a U.N. Command and retain an absolute monopoly on military equipment;
7. Division of Vietnam into electoral districts equal in population for the election of delegates to a constitutional convention which would frame a constitution stipulating that there shall be: (a) elections every 2 years, (b) guarantees that all parties are to have complete freedom to participate in election campaigns, (c) a provision similar to article 9 of the Japanese Constitution, an article which would renounce war as an instrument of the foreign policy of South Vietnam and would prohibit government authorities from ever raising an armed force exceeding that required for legitimate internal police functions (which would continue to be subject to supervision by the U.N. or the ad hoc grouping of neutral powers);
8. Massive economic and technical aid to South Vietnam, and possibly also to North Vietnam, through the joint efforts of the United States, the Soviet Union, and perhaps the United Nations.

I beg you prayerfully to consider this proposal which might conceivably end the danger of the eruption of World War III.

Yours most sincerely,

For additional copies of this appeal write to: Dr. Irving Amdur, 2115 34th Avenue, Long Island City, N.Y., 11106.

FLUSHING, N.Y.,
April 13, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am a resident of the State of New York and so I did not have the opportunity of casting a vote for you. However, I feel that you are representing me.

I have written to my New York Senators urging them to speak out in opposition to the present policy on Vietnam. I shall continue to express my belief that our present policy is a wrong and dangerous one.

However, I felt that I did want to express my gratitude to you for your forthright position. You are really acting in the best interests of all the American people, as well as for the Vietnamese and all the peoples of the world. All of us have cause to be glad that you are in the Senate of the United States.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. MARLANE KULICK.

SEATTLE, WASH.,
April 13, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As our son goes to Washington, D.C. to visit you with a number of like-minded young people, I thought of asking you again to discontinue the U.S. self-subscribed role in Vietnam, that of fighting. The 1954 Geneva Conference held the answers for today's conflict there. Initiate an official cease-fire there now, to reduce the present tension there, here, and abroad. Promote a plebescite in Vietnam under U.N. auspices.

Give the way for worldwide disarmament achievement, and withdraw all foreign troops everywhere.

I am glad to see the growing number of Congressmen in favor of withdrawing men and materials from Vietnam and looking toward a peaceful solution.

Thank you,
Sincerely,

CECILIA CARR.

APRIL 14, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In my ninth grade social studies class, we have been discussing the crisis America faces in South Vietnam. I favor military withdrawal from this nation with continued economic aid. From our discussion, it has become apparent that Americans must think it a sacrilege to question their Nation's actions in a conflict that theoretically could become global. It is a frightening thought to think that the United States may be precipitating a far greater war by carrying the conflict across South Vietnam's border.

Another thing that makes this war an enigma is its nondefinition. Although President Johnson delivered an address to define the war in Vietnam, I feel certain that his nebulous terms and assorted tangents did not placate the parents of those who have been lost or killed, nor did his speech enlighten the public greatly. The talk only reiterated the American obligation and ideal.

I commend your efforts and ideas concerning America's policy in southeast Asia. I hope you, your associates, and interested Americans can make a case for withdrawal and perhaps for a conference of nations to conclude fighting and launch a program to rebuild war-torn South Vietnam.

Sincerely,

ANDREA CALL.

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF.,
April 13, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to express my approval of your stand on the U.S. position in Vietnam, and urge you to continue speaking out on important issues.

It was a statement of yours that sent me to the library to read all I could find on southeast Asia and to inquire as to how this country became involved there. All the information that I could find leads to a confirmation that our country's position is morally wrong. President Eisenhower's position was wrong. President Kennedy's position was wrong. President Johnson's position is unconscionable. We who love our country would, as Dr. Pauling said, like to see her near the top in the listing of moral nations instead of near the bottom of the list.

Judging from the letters to the editors in our local newspaper, there must be many more people than myself who feel that our policy in Vietnam is shameful and should

be altered. An editorial in support of Government policy on Vietnam brings a spate of letters lucidly spelling out our errors in that area.

It seems to me that a foreign policy that isolates our Nation from contact with upward of a billion people (i.e., China and Russia) and seems to depend more and more on warlike actions and intimidation by threats of nuclear war to maintain its position, needs to be reviewed.

Please do continue to speak out on vital issues. Your speaking out not only challenges one to search out the truth or error of your premise, but also gives aid and comfort to citizens who sometimes view Government actions with uneasiness of conscience and even alarm, but feel that they are unable to truly justify their views in opposition of the learned columnists and editorial writers.

Yours truly,

Mrs. J. M. WILLIAMS.

SAN CLEMENTE, CALIF.,
April 8, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It is heartening to hear your voice raised against the policy of our Government in escalating the war in southeast Asia. The increased bombings were supposed to bring the hostilities to an end in perhaps less than 2 months. Instead, they are threatening to bring China and perhaps Russia into a war. When can we learn that retaliation only brings on more countermeasures and solves nothing?

Keep up your good work in protesting and publicizing our continued use of violence and threats. Let us try to reach a civilized settlement before it is too late.

Sincerely,

R. W. WOLFE.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
April 16, 1965.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are appalled at the contradictions between your statements and your actions. How can you say you are for independence and freedom in southeast Asia and yet deny the Vietnamese the right to determine their own affairs by free elections, under international supervision, as promised in the Geneva Convention?

How can you say you want peace, yet order the dropping of bombs on North Vietnam? How can you offer "unconditional negotiations" to North Vietnam and Red China—knowing full well that by omitting mention of the ones who are actually waging this war, the South Vietnamese NLF, you are thus creating not only a "condition" but an impossible obstacle.

We agree with the 2,700 ministers, priests, and rabbis who, in a full page ad in the New York Times of April 4, pleaded with you to stop it in the name of God. The longer your present policy of brutal military assault on the Asians continues, the more will you drive them into the arms of the Communists—thus creating the very situation you so dread. Your daily escalation of the war will win you the hatred not only of the Asians, but all the peoples of the world—including the American people, as our youth is slaughtered so needlessly.

We urge you to stop doing the bidding of those war hawks who are advising you, or you and your family will wind up in an early grave, together with all the American people. Listen, instead, to the counsel of Senators GRUENING, MORSE, McGOVERN, and CHURCH. Stop this murder before it is too

April 21, 1965

7845

late. Leave Asia to the Asians and tend our own problems here at home. Lork knows we have enough of them; overcoming poverty and unemployment; reconversion of industry from war to peace (so that our economy won't depend on maintaining wars to keep from crumbling); guaranteeing equal rights to our Negroes and other minorities; spreading our affluence around among our own people, as well as the world, and showing, by example, not bombs and death, that democracy can be better than communism.

Please, Mr. President, do not bring the judgment of God upon our Nation. Put an end to war, or it will put an end to us.

Very sincerely concerned,

Mr. and Mrs. S. EHRlich.

P.S.—Please do not send me any more explanations from the State Department. We are sick of these rationalizations for meting out death. Nothing short of stopping the war will satisfy us.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE
CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN THE U.S.A.
New York, N.Y., March 31, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Impressed with the growing gravity of the Vietnam situation, leaders in the National Council of Churches have taken two actions and we share them with you in view of your responsibilities along with the President for U.S. foreign policy.

Among our constituency across the country, increasingly strong and insistent concern is being expressed about Vietnam developments. Many questions are being pressed as to the direction and decisions of our Government, and whether they mean a drift toward war. Now, special importance and encouragement are being attached to the statement of President Johnson on March 26, emphasizing again the principle of restraint and the willingness for honorable negotiation, and indicating the possibility of a peace offensive in terms of new initiative for economic, political, and social development which can help to make viable, stable, independent nations in that whole area. We hope that such initiatives will find a real response among peoples in other parts of the world and among all in our own Nation having responsibilities in developing and carrying through such an imaginative program for peace and human betterment.

The deep concern of our constituents across the Nation is clear. On the basis of the meaning of religious faith and ethics for events in Vietnam, insofar as facts could be known to us, our president, Bishop Reuben H. Mueller, telegraphed President Johnson, February 15 copy enclosed. This was also sent to the U.N. Secretary General and the Secretary of State. Further concern was expressed by church leaders gathering from all parts of the country and meeting of the west coast in our policymaking body, the general board. After deliberation, they adopted the February 26 resolution, enclosed.

For your information reviews about Vietnam among church leaders in other parts of the world are enclosed: the World Council of Churches' statement from its commission of the Churches on International Affairs. We cooperate, they being worldwide and we a national organization, but we are not organically related.

We have appreciated the debate of issues re Vietnam in the Senate and we trust that there will be continuing fulfillment of this important function, the expressing of various views on this critical issue in the highest deliberative body in our Government. Be assured of our prayers and appreciation for your services in your critical role in our national life as decisions are made toward possible war, or peace with justice and free-

dom, affecting the lives of our people and others around the world.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH L. MAXWELL,
Director.

FEBRUARY 15, 1965.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In pursuit of policies long advocated by the National Council of Churches, we welcome your repeated statements that the purpose of the U.S. Government in actions in Vietnam is not to escalate war but to open the way for negotiations and peaceful settlement.

We realize something of the tremendous complexity and the awesome significance of the situation. We are concerned that continuing efforts be made to create conditions for honorable and effective negotiations. We feel it is imperative that all parties involved live up to international agreements already entered into conducive to peace with justice, and that they exercise the utmost restraint by ceasing infiltrations and subversion and deeds which threaten to escalate the military action into a wider war which would benefit none and do vast harm to all.

We would urge, too, that all nations seek peaceful means for settlement of conflict and the development of that area, as in the Mekong River project, making use of the United Nations and other channels as will be most effective, for the sake of the people of Vietnam, the best national interests of all, and the peace of the world—hopes which we, as Christians, share with people of other faiths and men of good will everywhere.

Be assured of our appreciation for your seeking to exercise restraint and your earnest efforts to find peaceful ways to deal with this extremely complex and critical set of issues. You and other leaders in our land and in other countries involved are in our prayers that you and they may be enabled to lead us all into the paths of peace with justice and freedom.

Sincerely yours,

REUBEN H. MUELLER,
President, National Council of the
Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.

RESOLUTION ON VIETNAM ADOPTED BY THE
GENERAL BOARD FEBRUARY 25, 1965

Recognizing the concern of the United States for the freedom and independence of all peoples;

Acknowledging our responsibility to the people of South Vietnam who have been depending upon our aid;

Expressing our distress at the continued violence, war, and loss of life of all the peoples involved;

Believing that mankind must learn to settle its disputes around the conference table rather than on the battlefield;

Welcoming the initiative taken by the Secretary General of the United Nations in the present crisis and sharing his conviction that, "only political and diplomatic methods of negotiation and discussion may find a peaceful solution" to the problem;

Conscious that there are many difficulties and dilemmas facing our country in negotiations for political settlement, but mindful also of the seriousness of prolonged military conflict, the danger of escalation of hostilities, and the possibility of a third world war.

The General Board of the National Council of Churches urges the U.S. Government:

To engage in persistent efforts to negotiate a cease fire and a settlement of the war which will attempt to achieve the independence, freedom, and self-determination of the people of South Vietnam;

To utilize United Nations assistance in achieving a solution and in seeking to reduce the area of conflict by effective border control and internal policing; and

To give bold and creative leadership to a broad international development program for the Mekong region and to continue full-scale U.S. economic and technical assistance where necessary.

The general board pledges support and cooperation in the urgent tasks of reconciliation and reconstruction in Vietnam.

SOUTH VIETNAM

(A statement on certain lines of action by the chairman and director of the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs, Sir Kenneth Grubb and O. Frederick Nolde)

In the complex and explosive situation of Vietnam today, where precise information is not at hand, caution must characterize both appraisal and public utterance. As officers of the CCIA, we have been in touch with a number of our regional and national commissions of the churches on international affairs, particularly those of the East Asian Christian Conference and of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States, and thereafter have issued an interim report on South Vietnam. In speaking now more specifically, we do not seek to pronounce judgment but rather to voice the deep concern of millions of Christians in the World Council of Churches; to identify ourselves with the tragic lot of the people of Vietnam; and to suggest certain lines of action which we believe merit consideration.

The effort to solve the problem of South Vietnam by military measures to offset acts of calculated infiltration or subversion is bound to prove futile. While conceivably results of a temporizing nature may thus be achieved and the stage set for negotiations, the risk of escalation is an ever-present danger, and critical world public opinion especially among the peoples of Asia will inevitably increase in depth and volume.

Our commission has over the years held that justice will be more fully served and world order under law better advanced by processes of peaceful change and peaceful settlement. We believe we reflect a widely held conviction in calling upon all parties foreign to South Vietnam to exercise the utmost restraint by ceasing on the one hand acts of infiltration and subversion and on the other consequent military measures which may result in enlarged conflict. This is a first requirement, and if it is not met negotiation for a solution will become increasingly difficult if not impossible.

The United Nations Secretary-General has said that means must be found urgently, within or outside the United Nations, of shifting the quest for a solution away from the field of battle to the conference table. We are convinced that this can be done and that it can be done honorably, but only if false pride in facesaving is abandoned and there appears a readiness to take necessary risks without guarantees of success in advance. The shift from the battlefield to the conference table will not be facilitated if the United States awaits a clear signal from North Vietnam, or if North Vietnam awaits the withdrawal of U.S. forces from active participation. A new attitude of cautious venturesomeness is needed if catastrophe is to be averted.

Various suggestions have been made as to how the parties concerned could be brought to the conference table and all should be looked into carefully. They include recourse to the United Nations, recognizing the disadvantage that the Peoples Republic of China has not been seated; response to initiatives of the United Nations Secretary Gen-

eral; utilization in some form of the 14-Power Conference, realizing that the commitments made in 1954 have not been sufficiently honored and that the machinery there set up has proved ineffective; the use of ad hoc representation by great powers—notably the U.S.S.R., the United Kingdom, and France—in whom the interested powers may have sufficient confidence. We see in addition to these yet another possibility which should be adequately explored. While the whole world is concerned with the problem of South Vietnam, governments in the area who are not involved in the conflict are nevertheless most immediately and vitally involved in the total situation. Their good offices might serve to bring into negotiation the parties in conflict or responsible for the conflict.

The objective which we believe should be sought by all is a situation where the people of South Vietnam are permitted to seek what seem to them to be the best solution for their problem, and one which satisfies the demands of peace and security in southeast Asia. The expressed will of the people of South Vietnam or the decision of a government freely chosen by them—taking into due account the common concern of all peoples—is the essential justification for the presence of foreign forces on their territory. We know how difficult it will be to insure that all foreign intervention based on force or the threat of force shall be removed and that the people be given an opportunity to express their desires. It may be that here again governments in the area who have much at stake could provide the manpower for observation and direction on the scene whereas other governments proceeding through impartial channels could contribute to the financial costs.

We cannot overlook two factors of long-standing concern which play adversely into the present situation in Vietnam. In the first place the inability of the United Nations to deal with the problem as it should is in no small measure attributable to the absence of the Peoples Republic of China from its deliberations and decisions. The continued artificial isolation of some 700 million people is a dangerous situation and may well aggravate the intransigence of the government in effective power—an intransigence which has thus far made peaceful solutions in the area difficult or impossible. In the second place, peace will be endangered or only precariously maintained so long as one side supports wars of liberation and the other side provides military support for the defense of freedom. A frontal approach to these two problems may well at this time result in failure. However, ingenuity motivated by good will should be able to create a situation in which there emerges a coincidence of interests and it becomes possible to override hostile attitudes and conflicting ideologies.

In this troubled world, Christians as well as all men of good will can find their obligation and opportunity in the struggle to convert evil into good and to make what is potentially destructive redound to the benefit of mankind. We pray Almighty God who rules and overrules our tangled history that such may be the course of events in South Vietnam.

APRIL 15, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: Am writing you in regard to the disgraceful way we are bombing in Vietnam. I guess the United Nations don't apply to us, it makes one ashamed to be born in America.

Where we bomb women and kids and schools, maybe someday we will get it back, then what?

Are we always going to bully the rest of the world to our way of thinking? Which I don't think is so hot. We are taxed to death and still in debt up to our eyes, free

world—Christ—what a joke, freedom, another joke. This economy is dead, dead, dead. People borrowing money to pay their income taxes. We have a tax curtain.

It makes sense—that if we had a sound monetary system, the Communist system won't get nowhere in this country—but why are we so afraid? It is because our political system 'is rotten. How did Ike get his farm? I have always admired your work.

No use writing to these nincompoops in California—one thinks he can dance and sing. I don't know why, he never proved it, now he wants to live on tax money.

Thanks,

C. MACOMBER.

LITTLE SILVER, N.J.

Senator MORSE,
The Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You are no doubt in my mind the greatest Senator in our times. From your brave stand in the early 1950's opposing Senator McCarthy (and you almost stood alone then and as now) to the present stand in Vietnam you deserve my heartfelt thanks.

The cry over the entire country must be "We should not have gotten in, we should not have stayed, we should get out."

Cordially yours,

DAVID POLLOCK.

LOS ANGELES,

April 15, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I enclose a Drummond column from the Los Angeles Times of the 13th and a Chamberlain column from the Herald-Examiner of the 12th, aimed at you particularly—a nasty slur or two.

Have answered sharply both gentlemen—and they will not be happy with my letter. When even Senator JAVRS says his mail is running 50 to 1 against our role in Vietnam am afraid its the columnists who are misled as to popular feeling. Regarding the Chamberlain statement on the use of private letters in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I assured him I am certain most writers would be happy to have their Vietnam views publicized particularly because the press has failed to carry the bulk of the criticism but is conducting a virtual campaign to escalate a real war.

The "polls" are very unreliable as we know—especially since they are not truly representative and they are belied by the evidence on every hand—I have yet to talk to anyone who approves Vietnam—not all write letters.

ERMA DUTTON.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, Apr. 13, 1965]

NO FURTHER DOUBTS ON VIETNAM
(By Roscoe Drummond)

President Johnson's strong and lucid report on Vietnam to the Nation—and to the world—leaves nothing in doubt.

Three consequences flow from it:

It will, I am certain, decisively unite the American people behind what is being done and whatever still must be done to successfully defend South Vietnam from aggression.

It puts the onus totally on Hanoi for refusing to seek a peaceful settlement by opening talks with the United States.

It will enlist for the United States mounting support from world opinion—particularly the 17 unaligned nations which have appealed for negotiation. It will do so because the President says that he will talk with the aggressors or other nations any time under any circumstances without any conditions.

I am convinced that only weakness and vacillation on the part of the President in his commitment to defend South Vietnam could divide the Nation.

There is no weakness, no vacillation in the

actions which Mr. Johnson has taken in the last 2 months to show Hanoi that aggression will not pay.

There is no weakness, no vacillation anywhere in the address in which he expounded those actions.

His message is clear. To our beleaguered ally, South Vietnam, to our adversaries in Hanoi and elsewhere in the Communist world to the American people who bear much of the pain and cost, he made this total commitment: "We will not be defeated. We will not grow tired. We will not withdraw"—until the aggression ceases.

I believe that the Nation will be overwhelmingly relieved that he said it.

But the President made it equally clear that the United States does not put one single condition, one single barrier, not even one diplomatic breath in the way of our willingness to discuss an end to the war.

In his Johns Hopkins speech he told everybody that the United States stands unconditionally ready to begin "unconditional discussions." To the 17 neutral nations he said, in effect: Yes, we will talk; see if Hanoi will, too.

This is a crucial clarification of Johnson policy.

The President is saying that we will talk with the aggressor even while the aggression persists, that we will talk with Hanoi even if the infiltration of men and arms from North Vietnam continues, that we will negotiate and defend—simultaneously.

Does this mean that the United States is going to negotiate away the independence of South Vietnam? Does willingness to undertake "unconditional discussions" mean that there would be no conditions on the results of such discussions?

I can say with knowledge that it means no such thing. It means that nothing will keep the United States from the conference table except the absence of Hanoi. It also means that we will have only one objective to take to the conference table: the independence of South Vietnam and its freedom from future attack.

Mr. Johnson makes this vital point: If Hanoi wants to talk and continue the aggression, we will talk and continue the pressure until the aggression is ended either by negotiation or by any other means.

He assures Hanoi—and the world—that we seek no overthrow of the North Vietnamese regime, no military base in South Vietnam, and that we stand ready to give enlarged assistance to any cooperative effort in which the nations of southeast Asia would collectively join.

The President is saying that defending South Vietnam successfully is not a road to war; it is the road to peace.

[From the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner, Apr. 12, 1965]

U.S. LETTERS HELP SOVIETS
(By John Chamberlain)

Do you want to know how Moscow's Pravda, the official news organ of the Soviet Communist party, is dealing these days with American attitudes toward the Vietnam crisis?

The issue for April 2 is an astounding eye-opener, and it makes one wonder about the naivete of Oregon's off-beat Democratic Senator, WAYNE MORSE, in presenting the Soviets with opportunities for scoring a major propaganda triumph.

What has happened is that a number of letters to Senator MORSE from his admirers and supporters have turned up in Pravda as grist for the Communist peace propaganda mill. The letters are from all over the United States.

A man from San Francisco writes Morse that today the "supreme manifestation of patriotism is to be in opposition to the Government." Someone from Detroit accuses Lyn-

don Johnson of following the policy of that maniac, Goldwater, in southeast Asia.

PREFERS IMPRISONMENT

An abject fellow from a town in Indiana writes that "if my country demands my service in this war, I would prefer imprisonment. I never thought that the day would come when I would have to say that I am ashamed of being an American. But that day has arrived."

Pravda has printed the names of Senator Morse's correspondents. I refrain from passing them along because I assume that most of the letter writers would, on due reflection, be ashamed of the anti-American use to which their words have been put. (He assumes too much.)

The Russian reporter who has used the letters to Senator Morse is S. Vishnevsky. That Mr. Vishnevsky is a partisan distorter of the worst order is proved by the use he has made, in the same Pravda issue of April 2, of a column written by my colleague, William S. White.

In the particular column in question Mr. White poured scorn on the handful of professionally anti-American Americans who continually run down their country, calling it "ugly America," "guilty America," and so on. But Mr. Vishnevsky, ignoring the whole thrust and meaning of the White column, quoted selected bits from it to prove that America is indeed a guilty nation.

True enough, Senator Morse did not hand the correspondence directly to the Russian reporter. The letters may be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It is one thing to carry on a campaign against White House policy as part of a great debate over the issue of American interest in southeast Asia, but isn't it something else again to make presumably private letters available for use by anybody?

U.S. POPULAR FEELING

Can you imagine the embarrassment that would have been caused back in 1940 to patriotic members of the America First Committee if their letters to Congressmen had found their first news exploitation in Dr. Goebbels' press in Berlin?

We may be sure that Senator Morse wanted his mail to make an impression on the White House, but S. Vishnevsky stresses the point that none of these letters have been published in local papers.

I am sure that many Americans, including Oregonians who voted for him, are ashamed of Senator Morse's naivete in permitting Russians to be misled about popular feeling in the United States.

The polls indicate that a majority of Americans have backed Lyndon Johnson's policy of standing by our promises to the South Vietnamese.

In helping to pass along to the Russian people the palpable lie that America as a whole is ashamed about honoring its commitments Senator Morse may be doing his own cause of peace a great disservice.

For wars are most likely to come when great powers misread each other's minds.

GREELEY, COLO.,
April 17, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have the honor to receive your regular newsletters. I wish to commend you for your stand on the Vietnam situation. I am dismayed at what is going on there, and feel that our Government's position and actions are reprehensible. The idea of our bombing raids with numbers of planes against a nation, which by news accounts has almost no fighting air force. Our punishment of North Vietnam it seems to me is out of proportion to what they have done and will be useless.

Yours very truly,

GERTRUDE E. JACOBS.

YORBA LINDA, CALIF.,
April 16, 1965.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I do not wish to smother you with stupid and vain compliments, but I do wish to commend you.

I support you 100 percent on Vietnam. I wish to express my appreciation for the wonderful job you and Mr. GRUENING are doing in fighting the war hawks. Whether you succeed or not, I know you will know you have fought the good fight.

Yours truly,

BOB BLAIR.

CLEARWATER, FLA.,
April 16, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

I have written the President about bombing in North Vietnam.

Please keep up your opposition.

Mrs. ISABEL S. CLARK.

APRIL 17, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Again I wish to express my appreciation of your strong stand against our military policy in Vietnam and your comments on the President's speech at Johns Hopkins.

I am glad to have heard your excellent speech on the same campus several weeks earlier.

Very sincerely,

LILLIAN M. KLOPPFEL.

APRIL 14, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR: By passing the Vietnam resolution, Congress abdicated constitutional responsibilities, and gave President Johnson power greater than De Gaulle's or Khrushchev's.

When people protest Johnson's war, Congress replies it has no further control over the situation and washes its hands of it. Who then, are the people to petition?

A mounting disaster, the foolish work of President Johnson, appears irreversible unless Congress acts to take back the powers so casually handed over.

Yours,

GEORGE CHALDEN.

PORTLAND, OREG.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We make an urgent plea for your continued effort for United Nations intervention in Vietnam.

LESLEY McCORMACK.
TOM ROSSEN.

We support a cease-fire in Vietnam and immediate application of U Thant's formula for negotiations.

NINA GRABOL.
MICHAEL GRABOL.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you so much for the support that you have on the war in Vietnam.

Please continue to uphold peaceful means to avoid a nuclear war. We need more people like you that want to see worldwide peace. I appreciate your interest very much.

Sincerely,

Mrs. CHARLES MEADE.

TEANECK, N.J.,
April 17, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: May I express appreciation of your efforts to clearly reflect the Vietnamese situation to the American people.

After studying the facts leading up to today, I am really appalled and ashamed of American foolish and harmful policy. I did think President Johnson would see the light, but apparently if he does he's hiding it.

I only hope that his leadership is gaged to draw the greatest backing, to enable him to guide our policy in a more intelligent and humane way.

I know that you and other Government leaders will do everything in your power to have the United States adopt policies designed to lead us into more idealistic action than we sometimes follow, in particular strengthening the UN.

Sincerely,

RENA KAMENA.

GROVE CITY, OHIO.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: We appreciate the stand you have taken on the war in Vietnam.

We have been a savior in times past for many small nations I know, and sometimes I wonder if the war is justified in Vietnam. Communism is a terrible thing if the reports are true, but we must work for peace sometime, so why not now.

ALMA E. TAYLOR.

TANNERSVILLE, N.Y.,
April 15, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please accept my cordial good wishes for a blessed Easter. They are accompanied by the hope that you will continue to speak and act against prolongation of the war in Vietnam. My friends and I are with you wholeheartedly.

Sincerely yours,

MARIQUITA PLATOV.

FEMININE TOUCH

Editor, The Hackensack (N.J.) Record:
To all American women under 40 and over, married or single, with children or without, housewives, or jobholders, organized or unorganized, church or unchurched, plain or fancy: we have something valuable.

Social scientists are saying that we have qualities superior to the male's—intuition, adaptability, resourcefulness, ingenuity, peacekeeping and negotiating ability, patience, tact, understanding, and compassion. They are even saying that women should be represented in the councils of decisionmaking, since men have brought the solution of conflict by war to its limits.

If President Johnson happened to be Madam President, his intuition (defined by H. L. Mencken as a sharp and accurate perception of reality) would have told him that chemicals are being used to gas innocent villagers in Vietnam. It is quite clear that the President needs an overwhelming dose of feminine persuasion to counteract the effect the warhawks have had on him. He finally identified himself with those trying to put Negroes on a par with whites; he could finally identify himself with the majority of Americans who are appalled at our militant action in Vietnam. United States officials even admit that most Vietnamese people don't want us in their country. We certainly aren't making the world a better place for them. And we are defying the United Nations, our own repeated verbalizations that the best hope for peace lies in the United Nations, and the urgent pleas to negotiate coming from Secretary-General U. Thant and countless other statesmen and leaders.

President Johnson will listen if hundreds of women will take the time to write a short but urgent note expressing their concern. When casualty lists start coming in together with other evidence that we are involved in a brutal war—worse than the suffering going on down South—damage will be great. For years we shall have to compensate for our foolish and harmful ways.

Mrs. RENA KAMENA.

TEANECK, N.J.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
Easter Sunday.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Easter greetings to you—a man of peace. Please continue to

April 21, 1965

resist the insane and criminal policy of the "war howls" in our Government in the war in Vietnam. Your recent piece in the New York Times was the most intelligent and humane article by anyone in the Government.

The eyes of the whole country are on you and mothers like me look to you as a leader out of this terrible, cruel war we are sacrificing our sons to in Vietnam.

Help sanity to prevail.

Sincerely,

RUTH G. PHILIPS.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
April 18, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We have written to the President asking for the immediate cease fire negotiations on Vietnam and the adoption of U Thant formula in further talks.

It seems logical that the cessation of our air raids on North Vietnam should be the logical prerequisite to any meaningful diplomatic activity.

Sincerely yours,

ANATOL KOVARSKY.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
April 16, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have just written to President Johnson the following letter:

"DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As a loyal taxpayer and registered Democrat I wish to protest your action in Vietnam. Please stop the bombings and killings. Only you can stop the war and I pray that you will have the courage to do it immediately.

"In protest.

"P.S. To Presidential staff: Do not bother to acknowledge this letter but instead mail it on to Mr. McNamara or Dean Rusk to read."

My letter to you is to thank you for your clear stand on Vietnam and to let you know that I am a solid supporter of yours here in Berkeley. I am writing to you to urge you to continue your very fine work in the Senate and to tell you that many are beginning to take notice of your views here in Berkeley because the national syndicated columnists (for and against you) are mentioning you. More power to you.

Please let me know if there is anything I can do here in Berkeley to help you. If letters help I will gladly write to congressional members, etc. Do protest marches around the White House do any good? What can the concerned citizen do that will help stop all this Vietnam madness?

Yours truly,

BABRARA LEIGHLY,
Mrs. John B.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
April 16, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The world already knows our military strength. Now let us show our moral strength by (1) immediate cease-fire in Vietnam; (2) immediate use of U Thant formula for negotiations.

Very truly,

Mrs. H. BETTY SALPETER.

CLEVELAND, OHIO,
April 17, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I recently came across some historical material about the origins of World War II which I think are extremely topical in our own times. The enclosed article, which appeared in the Port Clinton, Ohio, Daily News, resulted from this.

I should point out that I was one of those who thought that Sir Robert Vansittart was

right, that the free world should rearm against nazism. But until now I had no idea that Sir Robert's thinking was so far off base, so impractical, so useless. In our own era, Sir Robert would be a "hawk."

But, I think, a "hawk" should do more than to lead his people to war—he should weigh the consequences of his advocacy. Sir Robert, obviously, did not.

As to the sorry role played by Ian Colvin, "the man who started the war," one cannot help but wonder if we don't have his likes whispering into the ears of our "hawks" today. If the quality of the information he gave in 1939 had not been so completely wrong, the mutual defense pact with Poland might not have been concluded. Yet, I ask myself, was this bad? It was, after all, the only morally correct step taken by the Anglo-French entente in those dismally immoral days.

Still, it is hard to say that our own political calculations in southeast Asia are based on firmer ground.

Yours sincerely,

STEPHEN G. ESRATI.

[From the Port Clinton-Oak Harbor (Ohio)
Daily News, Apr. 14, 1965]

STEVE LOOKS AT THE NEWS

(By Steve Esrati)

What might be called "The Secret History of the Origins of World War II" is still being written.

With each publication of memoirs, each new snippet of previously unknown information, the jigsaw puzzle slowly falls into a discernible whole.

But the entire story remains to be told as the governments release their official papers in drips and drabs.

One man who played a large role in attempting to rearm Britain throughout the period of Hitler's ascendancy was Sir Robert Vansittart, a man who performed as a 20th century counterpart of Rome's Cato (who repeatedly told the Roman Senate, "Delenda est Carthago," or "Carthage must be destroyed").

Vansittart was permanent undersecretary of the Foreign Office from 1930 to 1937. He clearly saw the threat of German rearmament and, as captured German records now show, repeatedly exaggerated the actual German state of preparedness.

But Vansittart was satisfied, like Cato, to make bleating sounds. He warned, he prophesied doom. But he had no plan with which the free world would defend itself against the threat of Nazi supremacy.

In fact, Vansittart was the godfather of the Hoare-Laval Treaty which helped doom the only chance the free world had to defend itself against the Nazo-Fascist threat.

The time was when the Fascists invaded Ethiopia. Forty-two nations agreed to condemn Mussolini's aggression and to apply sanctions under the League of Nations Covenant.

In a famous speech, Sir Samuel Hoare, British foreign secretary, pledged that Britain would stand by the covenant. But, instead, he had come to an agreement with French Premier Pierre Laval to do nothing of the sort. Sanctions were not applied and poison gas was allowed to pass through the Suez Canal, then still British, in unlimited quantity.

By May 1936, the Italians had captured Addis Ababa and the world had stood by as Emperor Haile Selassie had appealed in vain to the League.

What Hoare and Laval had agreed to was predicated on Vansittart's theoretical and completely impractical theory that the great democracies could stop Nazi conquests in Austria and Czechoslovakia.

In 1936, Vansittart wrote: "We should do all we can to secure better treatment of German minorities (in non-German countries). And I would certainly dispose of the demil-

tarized zone in Germany's favor. And I would restore her colonies to Germany. In return for these offers we should extract from Germany a return to Geneva disarmament and a formal renunciation of any territorial designs in Europe, including aims of at absorptions of Austria and Czechoslovakia."

Commented the British historian A. J. P. Taylor: "This was curious advice. Great Britain and presumably France were to give way to Germany over the colonies, where they were comparatively strong, and were to resist her over Austria and Czechoslovakia, which they had no means of doing."

And so the Germans remilitarized the Rhineland without objection from the British or French. Next, they forced the unification of Austria with Germany. You know the rest.

The hope of the time was in collective security under the League. But Vansittart was the man who destroyed the League by being the real brains behind the Hoare-Laval Treaty. The idea behind this treachery against Ethiopia was that it could buy the friendship of Mussolini.

And so Britain ended up fighting alone.

Playing a peculiar part in all this was a British newsmen stationed in Berlin, Ian Colvin. Sir Winston Churchill pinned everlasting fame on Colvin by calling him "The man who started the war."

The time was 1939. British ministers consulted Colvin before the conclusion of the British guarantee to defend the borders of Poland against German aggression (a moral guarantee that could not be exercised though the Rhineland could have been defended.)

The Polish Pact was made known March 31, 1939. The invasion of Poland began Sept. 1, 1939.

Here is what Colvin told the British ministers in March:

"The Germans may attack the Poles tomorrow, the next day, the day after, in a week." (He gave March 28 as the most likely date.)

Colvin is said, by Taylor, to have told the ministers that Hitler was unpopular in Germany because of his persecution of the Jews in the synagogue attacks of Nov. 9, 1938. Many German officers were said to have been eager to overthrow Hitler.

"A British guarantee to Poland would help Hitler's opponents within Germany. The guarantee was duly given. It committed Great Britain and France to fight for a country which they could not aid; it destroyed such slight chance as there was of alliance with Soviet Russia. Yet there had been no German preparations for an attack on Poland; there had not even been a decision by Hitler to go against Poland; there was no effective movement against Hitler in Germany," Taylor writes of Colvin's advice.

Why write about these almost forgotten events today?

We, too, have our hawks and our doves. We have our foreign correspondents who report what one side or the other wants to read. We have highly placed officials who have been predicting the withdrawal of Americans from Vietnam after a victory that recedes further into the future every day.

Who will earn the title as "the man who started World War III?"

ARLINGTON, VA.,

April 16, 1965.

HON. SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: For the past few months I have followed your statements over television and in the newspapers, regarding our presence in Vietnam. I feel that your position is correct and that we should not be there, and want to encourage you to continue to express your views.

Very truly yours,

GLENNON N. MESNIER.

April 21, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

7849

HARWICH PORT, MASS.,

April 17, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your courage and initiative in asserting your congressional prerogative to point out the dangers and immorality of our war in Vietnam.

May you press on with all vigor to halt these bombings before we have reached the "point of no return."

Sincerely,

IONA S. FITZGERALD,
Mrs. H.S.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,

April 15, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I support you and Senator GRUENING in your opposition to the war in Vietnam. We should never have gone in, we should not have stayed in, we should get out. Like it or not, there can be no peace unless we agree to leave. If we refuse, the fighting will continue until we either escalate the situation into a major debacle or a major catastrophe. We cannot win. I oppose the bombing of North Vietnam because (1) it won't have the intended effect; (2) it's inhumane; (3) it could lead to World War III. In general, am highly critical of our foreign policy and most unhappy with the President's advisors.

Sincerely,

WOODY BANES.

P.S.—I call your urgent attention to the April 12 issue of the Nation pertaining to the appalling scandal in foreign aid to Iran.

BALTIMORE, MD.,

April 19, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your forthright, courageous, and thoughtful comments and statements on Vietnam. Power to you.

Sincerely,

ELEANOR AND BILL BRAINARD.

A STATEMENT BY THE IOWA YEARLY MEETING
OF FRIENDS (CONSERVATIVE)

We are deeply concerned by the developments in South Vietnam. The increasing casualties of Vietnamese on both sides and of Americans fill our hearts with sorrow. The cruelty of using incendiary bombs indiscriminately over a whole region causes anguish, horror, and shame.

These methods of warfare, the enlargement of United States combatant forces, and bombing of North Vietnam seem to us breaches of international law, the United Nations Charter, and especially of the Geneva accord of 1954 which the United States promised to respect.

We urge our Government and our countrymen to reconsider their present attitudes, to ask for an immediate ceasefire, and to start negotiations toward a coalition government on a broad popular basis with mutual guaranty of amnesty to members of the previously warring factions. We hope for neutralization of the whole area of the former French Indo-Chinese Federation under the guaranty of all the states which signed the Geneva accord of 1954, the United States and the United Nations. We also urge generous support of far reaching regional development plans by all the powers, diplomatic recognition of North Vietnam, and close economic association between North Vietnam and a South Vietnamese state, independent from, but friendly to her neighbor to the north.

If peace is our goal we have to realize that true peace can never be reached by violence.

Even an almost impossible victory in the civil war by our present and extended bombings of North Vietnam, and the employment of large American land forces could only bring about an insecure absence of open hostilities. Also there is the threat of almost certain intervention of North Viet-

namese and Chinese armies if we extend the war too far.

True peace can only be achieved through understanding and cooperation toward goals which further the interests common to all concerned. The United Nations' secretary general's proposal for a Vietnamese peace conference included plans for utilizing the United Nations' Special Fund project for the Lower Mekong River Basin as one of the bases for opening negotiations. It is not too late yet to accept this suggestion, and to use our money, influence and technical skill for the benefit of the whole Indo Chinese region and Thailand, instead of squandering them in a lost civil war.

On behalf of Iowa Yearly Meeting of Friends (Conservative),

SARA EMMONS,
Interim Clerk.

OXFORD, OHIO,

April 15, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have followed with considerable interest in your pronouncements on the situation in southeast Asia. I agree with your sentiments in many instances and offer my support for you. Certainly something must be done at the earliest moment.

I am wondering if you maintain a mailing list for newsletters to your constituents. If so, I would greatly appreciate having my name placed on such a list so that I may follow your views on Vietnam and other issues more closely.

My sincerest best wishes for continued success in representing your State and the Nation.

Sincerely,

DAVID JEROME REITH.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,

April 16, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As a concerned American citizen, I would like to express my support for your courageous and perceptive opposition to the present policy in Vietnam. Your presence in the Senate is a heartening comfort to those who feel the present military involvement both unjust and inhumane.

With sincerest respect,

COURADE JAFFE.

BRIDGEWATER, MASS.,

April 17, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Just a word of encouragement to let you know that I am in complete agreement with your views on the Vietnam struggle.

I believe that the vast majority of our people, though inarticulate, share these views. May we soon see an end to this murderous business which has brought unspeakable havoc to a long-tortured people and which, if unchecked, can involve all of us in ruin.

Thank heavens, we have a few men in Congress who, like you, are not afraid to take a stand. I predict that as the chorus of opposition to present policies swell (and it is swelling) you will find yourselves joined by some of the more timid who perhaps feel as you do but lack the courage to say so.

Sincerely yours,

HERMAN W. RICHTER.

CLAREMONT MEN'S COLLEGE,

Claremont, Calif., April 18, 1965.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Like a good many of my friends I find myself wondering if our behavior in Vietnam is really in the national interest. If the United States is in danger is this place the most advantageous place to make a stand against our attackers? If, as some allege the troubles in Vietnam are

in the nature of a civil war is it in our interest that we should be intervening on one side or the other of a civil war in a small country several thousand miles away?

I am not in the least anxious for us to be in a war but if it is in the national interest to be in one should be not go through the formality suggested by our Constitution in regard to such matters; i.e., have Congress declare war?

Much general discussion of the incredible news about what we are doing in Vietnam ends on a note of uncertainty because many of us feel uncertain about the accuracy and completeness of the news we are receiving. Should not Congress ask for more news and more complete news and share it with the public?

Sincerely,

WALTER B. SMITH.

WABAN, MASS.,

April 18, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Applaud your efforts in our behalf and in behalf of world organization and peace.

May you continue your effort with increased support for your views from your colleagues.

Very truly yours,

RAYMOND B. ROBERTS.

EVANSVILLE, IND.,

April 17, 1965.

HON. R. VANCE HARTKE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARTKE: Since receiving your letter and speech concerning Vietnam, I have been intending to write. The news broadcasts about more than 20,000 students demonstrating in Washington against the Vietnamese war pushed me into expressing my agreement with their viewpoint.

I hope that my beloved country will abandon this cowardly policy of bombing Vietnamese. Surely there can never be any worthwhile objective gained from such actions. Our children and grandchildren will have to reap the hate from this as surely as Americans today reap the hate sowed by slavery and serfdom in our own country.

Furthermore, the military superiority that enables us to attack Asians with no fear of retaliation upon our homeland will not last forever. Already the Chinese test nuclear weapons.

I believe I speak for many who voted for you when I say that the various viewpoints of Senators MORSE, GRUENING, MCGOVERN, and FULBRIGHT (to a lesser degree), are more to our liking than those expressed on the Senate floor by yourself and Senator BAYH.

In fact your position, and that of the President, remind me of ex-Senators Jenner, Capehart, Goldwater, and ex-Congressman Bruce. I believe that both Indiana and the Nation have progressed to a point where we see the fallacy of negotiation with bombs and bullets. May I take this opportunity to compliment you on your attempts to strengthen the voting rights bill.

My wife agrees, generally, with my opinions.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN OLKER.

P.S.—I belong to no radical organizations, hold a white-collar job in private industry and am a Democrat generally. This is my own letter.

BRONX, N.Y.,

April 16, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As one of many Americans, who is becoming more and more alarmed by the

7850

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

April 21, 1965

policy of escalation in Vietnam, I feel the policy you have been advocating is the only one that can bring peace to area and avoid another world war. I have written to the President, my Senators, and Congressman, asking them to adopt the policies you have been stating.

You have my full support in the stand you are taking to prevent another world war.

Sincerely yours,

ANTONIO L. BEONIO.

HOUSTON, PA.,
April 13, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE:

You are to be commended for opposing escalation of war in Vietnam. Thinking Americans are dismayed. We cannot understand that the President honestly believes he is doing right.

I can imagine you are discouraged and think you stand alone, but remember God is always on the side of right and peace.

Neither are you as alone as you may think. The Korean war is still in our memories. We were afraid of an atomic war then—we are afraid of one now.

We have written to the President asking him to turn away from military advisers. Will you keep trying to show him your conviction in this matter?

Mr. and Mrs. HOMER H. WAGNER,

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.,
April 15, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SENATOR: I thank you sincerely for continuing to speak out in the Senate and elsewhere about our indefensible policy in southeast Asia.

Since there are so few voices to oppose that policy, we urge that you not become discouraged, but continue your active opposition to our strikes against nations with whom we are supposedly at peace. We pray that you continue to hammer away on this every week or every day. Each time some few Americans may begin to think and to question. This is our only hope.

With heartfelt gratitude, I am,

Yours sincerely,

MARY GOODWIN DANIELS.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
April 16, 1965.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: Please add my name to those who concur in the appeal of the Clergymen's Emergency Committee for Vietnam of the Fellowship of Reconciliation as published in the New York Times on April 4, 1965. I would change the address thereof to Mr. President: In the name of the people of the world, stop it.

Months ago President Johnson said he did not want to get us into war with 600 million Chinese, but sometimes the right hand does not know what the left hand is doing. As of this moment, Senators Morse and McGovern are the true statesmen of this Nation and in the pattern of the greatest world statesmen of my time—the late President Kennedy.

Several years ago in a letter published in a local newspaper, I could have been the first to speak of an accidental war, quoting from Dr. Freud's "Civilization and Its Discontents," published more than 30 years ago, in which he mentioned man's ability to wipe out the human race. Now the theme is commonplace.

In the last analysis, the murder of innocent people, including Americans, in Vietnam is but a war of words—the battle of capitalism versus communism. This tragedy could be generated only by unconscious motivation (Freud) and high-level abstraction or un-

scientific communication (Korzybski). See my "plaint," "Interpersonal Relationships—Sadness, Alarm, and Chagrin," published by a crusading editor, John H. Tobe, in the Provoker, copy of which is enclosed. A statement of my background is also enclosed.

I hereby volunteer my services (and I would refuse payment) in any manner whatsoever to assist you in making a contribution toward world tranquility.

Respectfully,

JAMES EDWARD HUGHES.

P.S.—I repeat my offer of volunteer service.
J.E.H.

BOOKS—TO MAKE YOU THINK, TO BRING YOU HEALTH, TO ENLIGHTEN AND ENTERTAIN

INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS—SADNESS, ALARM, AND CHAGRIN

Any conscionable person who meditates on current interpersonal relationships cannot but be sad—and alarmed. And one who is familiar with the work of Alfred Korzybski and Sigmund Freud must also feel chagrin that much of so-called man's inhumanity to man therein might be due, in large measure, to the ignoring of their concepts.

Millions have known about Freud's basic contribution as to tricks played by the subconscious, although few are aware that in his "Civilization and Its Discontents," published in 1930, he then thought man had discovered the means of destroying himself "to the last man" and decision rested on "struggle between Eros and Death, between the instincts of life and the instincts of destruction."

Probably fewer are acquainted with the communication concepts of Count Korzybski. He came to this country prior to the Second World War, did work with patients at St. Elizabeths Hospital and wrote extensively about our errors in the transmission of thought, including "Science and Sanity" of over 1,000 pages.

As Freudian ideology furnishes guides to greater individual insight, such as in awareness of projection, identification, and transference, new ideas on communication are made available by this Polish mathematician aimed at avoiding statements which are not in accord with the facts of reality, which can cause illness, and which facilitate detection of such errors in others. It was his opinion that if statesmen had understood the utterances of Hitler the carnage wrought by that sick person might have been avoided.

It would be futile herein to attempt any summary of Korzybski's formulations. Man does not readily change his heritage of values and any attempt to explain his work meets with some of the same errors in thinking which he tried to eradicate. But one of his most important contributions was his emphasis on unwitting piling of abstraction on abstraction until there is such polarity of words in communication that group conflict is almost beyond man's ability to understand, let alone settle. Such either/or approach, whether it be in terms of liberal/conservative, Negroes/whites, freedom/slavery, et al., harms the health of humanity and retards the beneficent evolution of culture.

Notwithstanding the immensity of scientific achievement in other fields, there appears to be, indeed, cause for sadness, alarm, and chagrin about man's relationships with his fellow man. Unscientific communication could be the most important factor in a "struggle between Eros and Death."

JAMES EDWARD HUGHES.

JAMES EDWARD HUGHES

Entered Federal service as stenographer and (following graduation from Georgetown University Law School) advanced to classification of trial attorney. Fifteen years with Navy Department as head of correspondence section (including mail for signature of

Franklin Delano Roosevelt, ghost writer, and auditor. Ten years with Division of Mental Hygiene, U.S. Public Health Service, doing State law compilations and medico-legal writing (including brochure on eugenics-sterilization laws and decisions), admission of first narcotic-addict patients to hospitals, and as Legal Adviser. Twenty-three years with Solicitor of Labor on Davis-Bacon, Walsh-Healey, Fair Labor Standards, and Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Acts. Author of articles, letters, and book reviews.

Admitted to practice before U.S. Supreme Court, but not in practice.

Office activities: Elected member, U.S. Civil Service Appeals Board; president (two terms), American Federation of Government Employees lodge; delegate, two national conventions and District of Columbia Department, A.F.G.E.; president, relief association; chairman of supervisory committee (audit) and member of board of directors, Federal Credit Unions; charter president, bridge club.

Other activities: Instructor in social legislation, Washington School of Psychiatry; Advisory Board, Santa Barbara Socialization Institute; courses in WSP, General Semantics at Department of Agriculture Extension School, Public Service Broadcasting at American University; board member, National Committee Against Fluoridation; president (two terms) Capital City Chess Club (duplicate bridge); vice president, Rock Creek Golf Club.

Former member: American Bar Association, National Lawyers Guild, American Judicature Society, Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology, American Academy of Political and Social Science, American Academy of Political Science, American Association for Social Psychiatry, Beaver Dam (now Prince Georges) County Club, Manor Country Club.

Member: Federal Bar Association, National Lawyers Club, Georgetown University Alumni Association of Washington, D.C., International Society for General Semantics, (Friend) the Minority of One, the World Peace Broadcasting Foundation (participating), Washington Educational Television Association (sponsoring), the American Irish Historical Society (life), Soil Association (London), Washington Natural Hygiene Society, National Kidney Foundation, National Travel Club, Boys Club of Metropolitan Police, District of Columbia, Honorary Citizen of Boys Town, American Federation of Government Employees, District of Columbia Association for Mental Health, Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, American Contract Bridge League (master), Brooke Manor Country Club, Hook and Slice Club, Rock Creek Golf Club, Capital City Chess Club.

ALHAMBRA, CALIF.,
April 17, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Having been a long-time admirer of your political actions and utterances, particularly on the Vietnam war, I felt constrained to write you and give you some of my ideas on the problems perplexing our Nation and the world. There is no doubt the world is going through one of those cataclysmic changes that have marked the history of mankind since the beginning of recorded time. Babylonia, Persia, Greece, Rome, Spain, Great Britain, and now the United States have and are still trying to rule the world. Slavery, from absolute through serfdom and chattel to economic or wage, has been the lot of the workers through all history. The right of the strong and cunning to exploit the weak and simple has always been part of the law and morality of all ruling nations and peoples. We are now going through an era when the workers and

April 21, 1965

little people of the world are demanding a change. They insist that their labor be applied to the natural resources of the earth for the general welfare of all, instead for the private profit of those who have in some manner taken possession of the wealth of the world. I am enclosing herewith some verses that I believe tells the story; "The March of the Hungry Men."

In view of your expressed views on the war in South Vietnam, I am also enclosing my observations on the speech made by President Johnson on the subject before the Johns Hopkins Hospital group. I contend they are based on facts and the logical conclusions arising from them. It is appalling that more people do not see where we are heading and what is being done to us under the guise of seeking peace and freedom. We are so brainwashed that most of us freeze into spells of fear and hatred at the mention of the word "communism." It is thus our rulers keep us quiet while they borrow and tax us into insolvency, waste the money on unnecessary military splurges. We are told we now have enough atomic weapons to kill every person on earth 25 times, but we are spending \$56 billion this year for more military might. Perhaps that is why we are spending more billions on space exploration; we must find some other people to kill in order to keep our military production going.

Doesn't the present military, economic, and political program of our rulers give one the impression we are a nation of fools governed by a bunch of imbeciles? How else can we account for the low standards and ethics of our principles? The motivation of economic and political activities is competition. This is the law of the jungle. Only the strongest and most cunning can succeed. All of our businesses and professions are operated on that basis. "Caveat emptor," let the buyer beware is the rule. The Federal Government, every State, county, city, borough, or other municipal unit has inspectors, investigators, and examiners employed to keep the operations of free enterprise merely legal. There is no attempt to keep them moral or ethical. This causes operation by the rule of the four B's; bull, bluff, bribery, and brutality. Think it over; isn't this the way things are generally done under our system?

I am also enclosing some verses on the kind of political campaign we are inflicted with these days. Each side tries to outdo the other in its denunciation of communism; or tries to convict the opponent of friendship or softness toward Communists. In the present mental and emotional condition of our people that is usually sufficient. But the fact that you and some other Members of the Senate and Congress are telling the truth gives us hope that sense and reason may be restored to our people. Then we can have a Government ruled by truth and justice unclouded by a fog of fear and hatred. But I am afraid as long as we are trying to mix economic royalty with political democracy, the ferment caused, as in all ferments, will bring a scum to the top, with notable exceptions, of course. Thank you for letting me bother you. With all good wishes, I am,

Respectfully yours,

CYRUS A. DAVIS.

COMMENTS ABOUT PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S SPEECH BY CYRUS A. DAVIS, ALHAMBRA, CALIF.

Whoever wrote the President's speech on the war in Vietnam followed closely the precepts of Machiavelli's political doctrines and Hitler's big lie. It was a magnificent exhibition of concealing intentions with words.

First: North Vietnam, which is not attacking the United States, but being bombed by U.S. planes, can have peace any time it accepts the U.S. terms. These are unconditional surrender of the right to give or allow the transportation of any and all assistance

to the people of South Vietnam, who are rebelling against the puppet government we imposed on them, in violation of the Geneva Conference agreement. He made it clear and emphatic that we are going to maintain our fight to impose a government favorable to us on the nations of southeast Asia if we have to fight an atomic war to do so. The rest of the speech was an offer of bribes to those who will accept that kind of government.

This is an example of imperialist tactics since the beginning of history. As long as the weak accept the domination of the strong on the strong's terms, they can have peace. This is known as Roman peace as it was first named during the reign of that rapacious empire. It is the kind of peace experienced by a man who is prostrate, with a robber sitting astride his body ransacking his pockets. As long as he submits peacefully he will not be injured. In fact, he may have some of his possessions returned to him as charity. Charity is a salve concocted to ease the conscience of those inflicting and the pangs of those suffering injustice.

When Vietnam was divided into north and south nations, by the Geneva Conference, it was agreed that no foreign government should interfere with them. They were to form their own governments and in 1956 held a plebiscite election to decide if they desired to unite. Foster Dulles, the U.S. delegate at the Conference, refused to sign the agreement and immediately, with the assistance of the CIA, of which his brother Allen was the head, installed a puppet dictator as the head of South Vietnam and moved in our financial and military power to support him. This is the modern form of imperialism. Hitler used it in his attempt to conquer the world. In fact, the name of his Norway puppet, Quisling, is the contemptuous title applied to such characters. The people of South Vietnam rebelled against the dictator and the war started to dislodge him is still going on. The original dictator was ousted and murdered by a palace revolution and military junta installed, which we immediately recognized. This in turn has been followed by several other palace revolutions installing other dictators and military juntas, all of which we recognized and accepted, despite the demand of the people to elect their own ruler. These dictators and military juntas are the peoples governments the President said the Communists were trying to overthrow and we are going to maintain if it starts an atomic war. It has already cost us billions of dollars and hundreds of American lives with no observable benefit, but the President says that unless the people of Asia, and the world, agree to accept and endure this kind of imperialism, we will force it on them or destroy the world in atomic horror. In other words, we intend to rule or ruin the world. It is our way or none at all.

The President stated all he wanted was to establish peace and freedom in the world. We have already described the kind of peace he wants to impose on the weaker nations. Let us examine the kind of freedom the United States is supporting all over the world. Every dictator in the world, upholding capitalistic economy, is on our payroll. Most of them were installed by overthrowing a people elected government with a U.S. organized and financed revolution. Guatemala, Panama, Venezuela, and lately Brazil. All these countries are recognized and supported by us. Chiang Kai-shek helped take over Formosa, where he slaughtered 65,000 of the leading citizens in so doing. The people of Formosa had no opportunity to accept or refuse him. They have never had a chance to vote in a free and fair election whether they want to live under Chiang or join the Communist mainland. Yet under the pretense of protecting their freedom, we are supporting their dictator financially, and keeping the 7th Fleet of the U.S. Navy between Formosa and the

mainland to keep the Communists from removing him. We have even coerced the United Nations to seat him as the real China, while inducing it to refuse to admit the real China. The President's freedom is on a par with Roman peace. More submissiveness for the victim and more freedom for the robber.

Suppose the Bay of Pigs invasion had been successful and the so-called freedom fighters had one-half of the island in their possession. Suppose the Russians were helping Castro with air support, including the use of napalm bombs, gas and corrosive acid to destroy villages, farms and vegetation held by the invaders; that the Russian navy captured or destroyed all the ships supplying the invaders with arms and supplies and finally started to bomb bases in Guatemala and Nicaragua, would we accept their claim that they were doing so to bring peace and freedom to Cuba? Our blockade of Cuba and the threat of atomic war on the importation of guided missiles into Cuba is the answer. How hypocritical can we get?

In surveying conditions in our country and the attitude of the President, one is inclined to wonder if we aren't in a throwback to ancient times, and using the methods of these days to solve our difficulties. Bread and circuses of the Roman empire are copied by welfare and pageants; queens are crowned for all kinds of public spectacles; games and parades, radio and TV programs keep them entertained and amused. Doles maintain our unemployed and subsidies our industries. Lately automation has taken the place of millions of workers, both skilled and unskilled. It is estimated that 40,000 workers are replaced weekly by automation. Big corporation profits increase as their labor cost decreases. The result is we have a rapidly increasing army of unemployed. They must be taken care of somehow.

In olden days when rulers were affected by such problems they declared war on each other and had the surplus populations killed off. That was easy for old absolute rulers. But in modern times different tactics must be employed, so the people affected will think the war is for some high and noble purpose, or to defend against aggression. Thus we are steeped in false and hypocritical propaganda about peace and freedom and resistance to aggression in order to brainwash us into approving and supporting the war. The President's speech was a fine exhibition of that system in action.

First, he butters up the people generally by announcing a program of welfare covering social security, medicare and education. He will probably get it through the Congress and Senate, by assuring the sponsors of the Members, that it will not be in effect long, if at all, by telling them of his plan to start an atomic war, which will reduce the population to manageable proportions. This is like giving a condemned man a wonderful meal before his execution. So eat, drink, and be merry for tomorrow you may die.

Then he has secret meetings with those members, who are in on the deal, and distributes brochures to them showing how the contemplated war will work. It will diminish the population of both Russia and the United States by from 100 to 150 million each. The extermination will be greatest in the large cities and urban areas where most of the indigent and unemployed live. (See Pearson's column in the Los Angeles Times, Apr. 9, 1965). The President and those in the know will hide in specially prepared bombproof shelters in the mountains in Maryland until the holocaust is over. (See Pearson's column at the time war threatened over Russian missiles in Cuba). Then the President and his cortege will emerge and compel the survivors to clean up and rebuild the shattered cities for the privilege of living. This is the Fascist dream,

All this could be averted by allowing the people of each country to have a free and fair election in which they could choose their own rulers. If they wish to go Communist, it should be their privilege. If they do not wish to remain Communist, they can revolt against that regime as well as they can against puppet dictators. Then we can help the people instead of the puppets. It is as simple as that. No rigged or ex parte elections will do. They should be conducted by the league of nations through a committee composed of members of every economic and political belief. No election under the supervision of the army of a supposed neutral nation will do. The election in Greece under the British Army supervision was rigged to return 70 percent for the royalty ticket, according to the officer in charge as related in Reynolds News. Then after a free and fair election, the chosen leader should be protected against any machinations to start a revolt against him, no matter what ideological group seeks to remove him. It should be lawful to remove him by a vote of the people or the organization authorized to do so; like the vote of no confidence in England, or the vote of the politburo in Russia. The people of every nation should be allowed and protected in advocating and voting for any political or economical party or program they desire. And each party should be given equal and protected time to expound the tenets of their doctrines. That is real democracy.

Two world wars in which hundreds of millions were slaughtered and trillions of property destroyed hasn't taught us anything. Three-fourths of the world's population live in poverty, including one-third of our own. Our Nation and all of its municipal parts are in debt up to their ears and going deeper. Crime and unemployment are increasing daily. Most of our agriculture and industries are maintained by subsidies. The only remedies we are offered is more borrowing and spending and war on communism, which wants only to take and use the natural resources and industries of the world and operate them, not for the accumulation of individual wealth but for the general welfare. They want to substitute cooperation for competition in the economic affairs of the world. We are taught that makes them our enemies, even of our religion. I wonder if those who recite the Lord's Prayer "Thy Kingdom come, Thy Will be done on Earth as it is in Heaven" do honestly believe that God condescends out the properties and services necessary to the operation of Heaven to His favorites to exploit the population generally; or do they think He throws such concessions up for grabs so the strong and cunning can get control of them and use them to get wealthy at the expense of others. Don't you think we should reexamine our political and economic programs?

POLITICAL SESAME: A LA NIXON

(By Cyrus A. Davis)

It used to be a problem in this great Democracy,
To acquire success in politics or fame of a degree,
As a radio purveyor of scandal, news and such,
For as columnist or writer it required a certain touch.
There was need of education and an understanding mind,
With a wide vocabulary of a strong convincing kind.
There were many weighty issues; many questions were involved,
And political aspirants were assessed on how they solved
These ever pressing problems in the political lists,
But all they need today is curses for the Communists.

The old time politicians who made the welkin ring,
With their mighty perorations of the good their rule would bring,
Now are stilled; for none will listen to the issues of the day,
Though the Elephant may trumpet and the Donkey loudly bray,
From the sun of California to the rock bound coast of Maine;
From the mountains to the oceans; from the city to the plain,
Every platform, stage and pulpit, business, labor, racket, farm,
Sounds and echoes to the clamor of the unending alarm,
Of our self appointed Saviors grinding propaganda grist,
Like a broken record playing, Communist, Communist.

We sometimes miss the glamor of the old red light parade,
And the old spell binding speakers who their eloquence displayed.
As they extolled their virtues and denounced opponents claims;
Pointed to their deeds and honors and exposed their rivals shames.
But today the politicians are more sinister and sly,
And conceal their real intentions in a patriotic lie.
They cannot expound a thesis in which they are so unversed,
So they just repeat a slogan in which they have been rehearsed.
To hide their lack of learning they scream and shake their fists,
And denounce all their opponents as a bunch of Communists.

If you seek for fame and fortune in the varied ways of men,
There is one unfailling system to extoll your tongue or pen.
You don't even need to spell it or define or understand;
No one asks for explanations; all debate on it is banned.
You can charge, accuse, and slander; disregarding truth and facts,
Without fear of an accounting for the results of your acts.
All your writings will be published; your opinions hailed as wise,
Even though they lack coherence—Heaven help him who denies.
Fame as a news commentator or note as a columnist,
Waits for him who tries to teach us how to hate a Communist.
Let us do away with wisdom, all the arts and liberty,
Lest they delude and lead us into true democracy.
What's the use of constitutions or the brotherhood of man,
When they provide protection for the communistic clan?
Who depend upon our justice and rely upon our truth,
Till we destroy our heritage in fighting them forsooth.
For despite all our denials, here's a fact that still persists,
We are losing truth and freedom in our war on Communists.

THE MARCH OF THE HUNGRY MEN
(Blessed are the poor for theirs is the kingdom.)

"The lowly of earth are stirring,
Like a giant aroused from sleep.
As the host of a storm advancing;
The rumble grows steady and deep.
Give heed to the crowding masses—
From desert, dungeon, and den;
The tramp of the earth's forsaken;
The march of the hungry men.

"For the promise of old they gather;
From the jungle and cave they came;
Crawling, falling, and strugling;
Through slaughter, famine, and flame.
They follow their crucified leaders
To battle with tongue and pen—
For the heritage God has promised
The army of hungry men.

"In the ease of their downy couches—
Through the dreams of their pampered sleep;
The Lords of the World are tossing,
As terrors upon them creep;
The clamor of starving millions
Is ringing from crag and fen;
While the city canyons echo
The tramp of the hungry men.

"In vain are the pleas to Jehovah;
In vain the diversion of war;
The people ere girding for battle
Ask—"What are we fighting for?"
For quarrels and spoils of the Masters,
They will not be puppets again;
But march now as brothers united;
The legions of hungry men.

"Through the fear of created darkness,
As the dawn invades the night;
They are coming, as it is written;
Their banners ablaze with light.
Tomorrow—as God has promised,
Will come the fulfillment; when
The kingdom will be given
To the hands of the hungry men."

They ask for bread and we give them bullets; for the wounds of oppression we offer the salve of charity. But eventually and inevitably, individually and collectively, we must account to and settle with eternity on the basis of truth and justice.

NAPA, CALIF.,
April 11, 1965.

HON. ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Our heavy hearts were eased by your informed and concerned plea for a cease-fire in Vietnam, at the San Francisco Masonic Auditorium Sunday, April 4. We indeed share your view that this is the most rational and feasible means of creating the proper climate for realistic negotiations. The American Friends Service Committee and other sponsoring groups, felt that the very responsive audience of over 2,000 was the largest peace meeting they could recall here.

The periodic standing ovations must have convinced you of audience support and determination to pursue every channel to persuade our Government to reverse its blindly dangerous military policy in Vietnam.

While the President's address at Johns Hopkins University, had some hopeful aspects, the consensus here was that the administration's position was too self-righteous and we were still pugnaciously assuming the role of "world policeman"; that those even slightly informed on the background of Indochina simply cannot accept the dishonest propaganda reiterated so blatantly to sell our war strategy; that it is demeaning to one's intelligence.

A large group here met Saturday night, April 10, to hear a radio rebroadcast of Steve Allen's objective coverage of the Vietnam dilemma. Their expressed hope was that such rationality as you and he detailed should be accessible to all the Nation and that our policymakers ponder and implement this wisdom even at this late hour.

Again, we greatly admire and respect the effort, traveling-strain and time involved, which you have contributed so generously for our country and the world. We earnestly pray for your continued health and strength.
Gratefully,

MRS. GRETA SLATER.

P.S.—There are many antiwar projects scheduled throughout the bay area for all

April 21, 1965

7853

the coming weeks and all those around us are expressing marked enthusiasm to participate.

NAPA, CALIF.,
April 13, 1965.

Hon. THOMAS KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: In response to your letter received today on South Vietnam enclosing your views as outlined in speeches to the Senate, I am enclosing copy of my letter to Senator GRUENING. This expresses generally the feeling of all those we know and that of the various groups to which we belong.

In fact, the opposition to our Government's military policy in South Vietnam is so general it is noticeably uniting the common voter of both parties in this shared protest. This feeling has been so predominant that many have expressed loss of confidence in achieving world peace through political channels and are delving into the potentials of a genuine people to people's movement.

Qualified authorities on southeast Asia have made frequent references to the book, "The Battle of Dienbienphu" by Jules Roy (Harper & Row); also to "France Against Herself" by the Swiss author Herbert Luthy (Praeger, New York). It is planned by many interested here to have these books reviewed shortly at a meeting concerning our Government's most unpopular military policy in Vietnam.

In conclusion, the common comment is that one can not recall a situation where opposition to Government policy has ever been so unequivocal, articulate, and widespread as their position on South Vietnam. Sincerely yours,

Mrs. G. M. SLATER.

(Senator WAYNE MORSE, we were not eased much by President Johnson's speech at Johns Hopkins University. Everyone is terribly frightened at his adamant stand to pursue the killing policy.)

CLEVELAND, OHIO,
April 15, 1965.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE:

[From the Cleveland Plain-Dealer,
Apr. 14, 1965]

It's UP TO CONGRESS

The language of the President's speech on Vietnam was eloquent, but unrelated to the realities of the situation. If a resolution were introduced in Congress to declare war against North Vietnam, the American people would overwhelmingly oppose it.

The Congress of the United States has no right to place the responsibility or authority for this conflict upon the President. The Congress has no right to pass resolutions giving the President the equivalent of the power to declare war.

The Vietnamese want the Americans to get out of Vietnam, and that is what we should have done long ago. France won't support the United States position and other NATO allies have given at most token support. It is not our responsibility to go it alone in Vietnam. If we continue to do that, we shall be embroiled in wars all over the world.

Sincerely,

HARRY A. BLACHMAN.

UNITARIAN UNIVERSALIST FELLOWSHIP FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE, LOS ANGELES CHAPTER, LOS ANGELES, CALIF., RESOLUTION ON VIETNAM, APRIL 6, 1965

"Whereas President Johnson was elected on a peace mandate and should respect the opinions of those who elected him;

"Whereas the presence of United States forces in Vietnam is in defiance of the Geneva agreements;

"Whereas we are shamed by the actions of our country in Vietnam and revolted by the dishonest excuses and pretexts for this aggressive foreign policy;

"Whereas the North Vietnam Government does not control the National Liberation Forces which are a legitimate and real movement of the South Vietnamese people;

"Whereas our involvement in support of military dictatorships is indefensible;

"Whereas the killing of men, women, and children and the use of chemical warfare on the false and arrogant assumption of defending democracy outrages our moral senses;

"Whereas the bombing by the United States of a sovereign country could very well end in a nuclear holocaust for all of us;

"Therefore, We demand of our Government an immediate cease-fire in Vietnam and withdrawal of United States forces from that country."

This resolution to be mailed to: President Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT (chairman of Foreign Affairs Committee), Representative THOMAS E. MORGAN, (chairman of Foreign Affairs Committee), Secretary Robert S. McNamara, Secretary Dean Rusk, Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, Senator GEORGE MURPHY, Representatives of southern California and other leaders in our Nation.

FLUSHING, N.Y., April 17, 1965.

President JOHNSON,

The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I agree with Senators GRUENING and MORSE that the war in South Vietnam is a civil war, that America has flouted the Geneva Convention of 1954 and that we are aggressors.

With this concept of the actual conditions, "unconditional discussions" merely sounds like a maneuver to shift world public opinion away from them toward us.

Unless your humanitarianism and compassion, so magnificently demonstrated in your struggle for the Great Society and civil rights extends, not only to all Americans, but to all the world, you and your administration will be condemned now and in the future, if there is any, by enlightened mankind.

I urge an immediate cessation of the bombings. I urge an immediate reevaluation of our policy in South Vietnam. I urge you to focus your compassion, humanitarianism, and great powers of leadership on a genuine struggle for peace in that area of the world.

Sincerely,

BENJAMIN MATZ.

LANSDOWNE, PA.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am very much in opposition to the President on his Vietnam policy. I think the bombing should stop at once and all policy should be taken to the United Nations. There shouldn't be unilateral action in such a matter—that is for the body that represents the people of the world.

Even more am I in opposition to those who would start a preventive war—who will use some excuse to bomb China.

Johnson's blank check to use force in Asia should be revoked. I'm glad you and GRUENING voted against it but am frightened that everyone else went along.

Sincerely,

CHARLES BUTTERWORTH.

PETERBOROUGH, N.H.,
April 12, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your courageous stand against our present policy in Vietnam. I agree with you and support your ideas wholeheartedly. Do please con-

tinue to press your points until we persuade our President to order cease-fire.

Most sincerely,

EMILY B. ANABLE.

SENATOR MORSE: I am fighting this battle until somebody like you tells me that it is in the national interest to desist.

KEY WEST, FLA., April 15, 1965.

Hon. SPESARD L. HOLLAND,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HOLLAND: I have the greatest sympathy for those of you up on the Hill who have to find "yes or no" answers to such awesome questions. I would do nothing to make your task more difficult. I also appreciate highly the gracious manner in which you express your dissent from me in the matter of Vietnam, and hope that I am reciprocating.

Like you I deplore foreign aggression, international illegality, terrorism, hoodlumism, and the violation of solemn commitments by anybody, but I deplore them most when they are perpetrated in my name by my Government.

The most honorable commitment we made with respect to Vietnam was the promise not to interfere in the implementation of the Geneva agreements of 1954. This promise was not kept. For details I refer you to the enclosed document, which I have hesitated to send you because the reproduction is so bad. Key West weather, perfect for most purposes, is not very friendly to gelatine sheet duplicating machines.

My concern is that Americans know all the pertinent facts. In this matter both the administration and the news media have been remiss, and we cannot have democratic solutions to problems on these terms. To anyone aware of the facts, the President's recent presentation must seem something less than completely straightforward; this opinion seems to be shared by the most perceptive of our news commentators.

Of course we have the power to destroy Vietnam, and we probably shall. But we shall live to be sorry.

Sincerely yours,

MORTIMER GRAVES.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
April 15, 1965.

The Honorable Senator MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are all for you against U.S. policy in Vietnam. We pray every hour that the bombing and killings be stopped immediately.

We appeal to your influence to stop the war in Vietnam.

Sincerely,

ANN CHUNG.

SANTA CRUZ, CALIF.,
April 12, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is to extend to you my most deep gratitude and support—as one of the pitifully few voices of society in our legislative body—on the subject of Vietnam—in the past as well as in the recent escalation of our war there. Since the mandate given to Mr. Johnson by thousands of us, particularly women, last November, we have to stand by and see the very policies we thought we were voting against, in the period of the (undoubtedly) Mr. Goldwater, being followed by what we now realize was the very directives from the military-CIA-industrial complex of which even Mr. Eisenhower was moved to rebel against, as he was leaving office as President. There are thousands of others, unquestionably loyal, well-informed, and courageous citizens who also have been speaking out as groups and individuals for a reappraisal of our whole foreign policy, but their real power is as nothing, compared to a small, powerful group in the

April 21, 1965

State Department, and related governmental departments, who arrogantly take into their own hands, and successfully, perhaps, the fate of the whole universe itself. As you said at Stanford recently, we are entering the stage of intensified war propaganda. Thank you for thinking for ourselves.

Gratefully,

RULLO ROBERTSON.

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun, Mar. 15, 1965]

VIETNAM ANALYSIS: MAJOR WAR IS NEAR
(By Richard Starnes)

The imminence of a major war in southeast Asia is now generally assumed throughout the Government and diplomatic establishment in Washington.

Recognition of the war threat has grown with the silent speed of a malignancy, until it has invaded every chancery and quasi-official listening post in the Nation's Capital. The same alarms have been sounded before, but never with the urgency that has followed the ominous events that have taken place in the fortnight since the State Department's "white paper" sought to justify war against North Vietnam.

The white paper itself was regarded as a fateful portent, at least partly because of the obvious haste with which it had been cobbled together. Reasoned analysis of the document shows that it actually proves the reverse of what it set out to prove. The magnitude of the civil war in South Vietnam simply cannot be made to parse with the white paper's account of North Vietnamese intervention—even accepting the State Department document at face value.

The reality, which is no secret to anyone who has taken the trouble to tote up admitted weapons losses by South Vietnamese units is that Vietcong guerrilla forces are largely equipped with captured U.S. materiel. Even accepting the white paper's wholly unsubstantiated reckoning of the total number of North Vietnamese guerrillas who have been sent to the south, it is plain that the Vietcong guerrillas—like their weapons—originate largely in South Vietnam.

This reporter recalls sharing a helicopter mission in the Mekong Delta with a pilot whose plastic crash helmet had been neatly holed by a direct hit from a Vietcong sniper a few days earlier. The young man's head was still intact because in that day the Vietcong was still using homemade weapons of short range and low velocity. They gradually upgraded their arsenal by capturing (or otherwise obtaining) U.S. weapons, and nothing in the State Department's long-winded indictment can shake that fact.

(NOTE.—In this connection it is worth recording that the U.S. white paper, which listed captured supplies of Communist origin down to 16 sweaters manufactured in Ha Dong, North Vietnam, does not list items of U.S. origin recaptured from Vietcong units. The reason is clear—the ratio of recaptured U.S. arms and captured Communist arms would accurately reflect the actual equipment ratio of the guerrillas. It would show what every expert knows to be the case—the Vietcong war against the Saigon governments is self-supporting to an overwhelming degree.)

This is a tedious recital, to be sure, but it is a vitally important one, for it peels away the veneer of sham that seeks to justify the expansion of the war in southeast Asia. There is no basis in objective reality for believing Hanoi could stop the war in the south even if it wanted to.

There is, on the contrary, ample reason to believe that the mass of Vietnamese on both sides of the 17th parallel fervently wish the round-eyed warriors would pack up and go home.

Buddhists, who make up 70 percent of the population of South Vietnam, have expressed this wish forcefully. More than

that, the continuing success of the Vietcong testifies to the measure of support it finds among the peasants of South Vietnam—support that no guerrilla war can do without.

In contrast, none of the clandestine forays by which CIA-trained infiltrators have sought to turn the tables on Hanoi has borne any fruit. This fact is as eloquent as it is cheerless.

Like the rest of the truth about the war in southeast Asia it cannot be obscured by any State Department preachment. It belongs among the realities that Americans ought to be asking questions about, but apparently aren't.

Write President Johnson, your Senators, Congressmen, and your newspaper today.

Join the demonstration for peace in Vietnam, Saturday, April 10.

**AN APPEAL TO THE CONSCIENCE OF AMERICA
FOR PEACE IN VIETNAM**

With the Easter-Passover season at hand, the world finds itself on the brink of a major war in Vietnam. The escalation of the war has brought destruction and death to countless Vietnamese men, women, and children, as well as many Americans. World opinion cries out against this brutal and senseless war—a war that cannot be won with napalm, bombings, and gas. A spiraling exchange of blows and counterblows in Vietnam can lead to a nuclear war involving the United States, China, and the Soviet Union. The present tragic conflict can only be resolved by political, not military, means. Join with us in calling for an immediate cease-fire and negotiated settlement of this war. We fathers, mothers, and children, from all over the New York area are walking with this world-famous pediatrician—dedicated to life and peace—to make our voices heard for peace in Vietnam.

We start our walk from Columbus Circle at 1 p.m., Saturday, April 10. We walk to the United Nations, 47th Street and 1st Avenue.

Hear Dr. Spock and other speakers.

Pope Paul VI appeals for "Use of the United Nations in promoting mediation of disputes and restoration of peace."

U Thant calls for "Discussions and negotiations which can create conditions which will enable the United States to withdraw from that part of the world."

Senator JAVITS says his mail is running 15 to 1 against our policy in Vietnam and that most Congressmen's mail opposes continuation of the war.

Senator FRANK CHURCH, Idaho: "We lost 157,000 dead and wounded in Korea. It cost us \$18 billion. But, in the end, we had to go to the conference table for a political settlement. So it is with southeast Asia."

Defense Secretary Robert McNamara said: "120 to 149 million Americans would be killed in a nuclear war."

Walter Lippmann: "If the warhawks prevail and we become involved in a big war, they will rejoice. In the end the people will weep."

Write President Johnson to stop the widening of the war, seek a cease-fire, negotiate an international settlement.

Sponsored by: New York and New Jersey Council for a Sane Nuclear Policy, 17 East 45th Street; Women Strike for Peace, 151 East 50th Street; Metropolitan Branch, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 37 Washington Square West; Student Peace Union, 5 Beekman Street, New York City.

NEFFSVILLE, PA., April 14, 1965.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Wish to commend all who are putting forth an unending effort toward negotiations in the trouble spots of our war weary world.

"War never settled anything."

Prayerfully yours,

MARY M. PFOLTZGRAFF.

NEFFSVILLE, PA., April 14, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It is heartening that you are working for the beginning of negotiations in Vietnam.

Thankfully and prayerfully,
Mrs. CALVIN A. LEEFEVER.

SPRINGFIELD, OHIO.

DEAR SIR: I would like to commend you for taking the stand you took in South Vietnam, and how much courage you took it with.

As of a 14-year-old boy if my prayers mean anything to you, they are always behind you. I do know our God.

Please as you make decisions think of peace.

God bless you.

Yours truly,

DALE PARKS.

BALTIMORE, MD.,

April 16, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I just heard your speech at the Johns Hopkins the other week, and I would simply like to reinforce the balance of your mail in favor of your courageous and circumspect position. (I agree with you on a good number of issues at any rate.)

That a man like yourself can continue to be elected to the National Government strengthens my faith in the system.

God help you, though, if you must rely on an insignificant few million Vietnamese peasants to get a new dam for the State of Oregon.

Sincerely yours,

ANTHONY M. PAUL.

EVERETT, WASH.,

April 15, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate.

HONORABLE SIR: We have admired you and Senator GRUENING for your outspoken efforts to get the United States to hand the problem of Vietnam over to the United Nations and to get our troops out of there.

However, Technocracy Inc. informs us that in the past 25 years, the United States has spent \$980 billion, \$973 million, for war, and preparation for war.

Technocracy Inc. has suggested that if war seems to be such a necessity to our economy, that we should declare war on the millions of square miles of the Pacific Ocean, as this would be an area that could never surrender, nor fight back, and it could absorb all of our production for many years to come.

Having peace would make it imperative that we solve some of our domestic problems, perhaps this would involve social change, and we could start creating a civilization that would be worthy of man's intelligence.

Enclosed please find some of our literature for your earnest study, and comment.

Please continue your efforts to get the Vietnam war stopped.

We thank you in advance, for your reply

Very truly yours,

DAVID E. LIVINGSTON.

[From the Technocracy Briefs]

SABOTAGE BY PLANNED APATHY

For many years Technocracy has warned the people of North America that the arrogant disregard for basic social and physical trends, at home and abroad, by the front men for the North American price system would jeopardize the security and welfare of North America.

Since the launching of Russia's sputnik we have suddenly heard a great deal about science and technology, and their fundamental importance to this continent.

Thirty-seven years ago Howard Scott, director in chief of Technocracy, Inc., was interviewed by Charles H. Wood, associate editor of the New York World, on the subject of the social effects and importance of technology on this continent. During that inter-

view, on February 26, 1921, Mr. Scott outlined the key to the unique social problem before North America. The Technical Alliance, of which Mr. Scott was the director, was composed of leading technical personnel of North America, and had, by 1921 developed a clean technological perspective of social and physical trends in this civilization. Mr. Scott's technological views of social affairs astonished Mr. Woods; for example, that North America's problem was really an engineering problem, not a political or financial one. Such astonishment was not justified by the facts that were available even 37 years ago; it was the measure of how far ahead of social thought Technocracy has always been in its views of social affairs. Time and events have vindicated Technocracy's position and original statements.

Technocracy, Inc., since its inception as a field organization, formed to carry on the research-educational program that was begun in the winter of 1918-19, has continued to convey an accurate picture of developing trends affecting this continent. More than that, Technocracy, Inc. has given the people of North America the organizing vehicle to do something about their problem.

The central problem before North America is the conflict between science (and the requirement of scientific social operation) and the obsolete methods of the price system. At an incalculable cost, which is only now becoming apparent, politics and business have kept the price system afloat for the past 20 years—years in which a new social system should have been born and flourishing. The measures which have been taken in the framework of the price system to prevent the arrival of a technological social control in North America constitute the worst example of calculated sabotage against a social area in recorded history. At no time in history has so much been at stake for so many people.

A succession of arms programs and wars, which have proved useless, and were declared so by Technocracy before we became involved in them, gave temporary relief from the depression. These moves to preserve the price system have kept people fat, dumb, and happy for the past few years. And though many of them knew better, today they are not above pleading ignorance. At any rate, all of us now are reaping the fruits of price system sabotage and the social emergency that has been created.

LACK OF OBJECTIVE

Now that some of the arrogance has been knocked out of us by current events on the international scene, some people are giving pause to look at our social circumstances a little more objectively than in recent years. Outstanding is the total lack of a national objective of any kind. There is no social unity, and little national pride except in our bigness and in certain philosophic words, phrases and ideas that no longer apply in this age of science. These things aren't reason enough in a world that is moving as fast as this one. The cult of individualism, which we think we believe in, but which in fact we can't even practice, dominates the social attitude required to survive and progress upward and forward in this scientific era.

We are finding that it was most unfortunate to allow reactionary minorities to intimidate and belittle those individuals who could appreciate and work with science; and to make science almost a dirty word to citizens of this continent, especially the youngsters. It is too bad that the social consciousness of the average youth is at the moronic level of burning rubber from the tires of his "hotrod" or listening to "rock 'n' roll." Among the older generations, it can't seem to be so smart any more to have "sold out" to the price system in an attempt to amass a few pieces of shoddy goods and an

inferior dwelling, most of which aren't paid for now and probably won't ever be paid for in full. All of those hours in a semistupor before the television set don't seem to have been wisely spent either. The past critical years have been marked by a succession of mistakes, individual and national. They add up to an extremely high social price for this continent. It's pretty hard to pin the responsibility for the sabotage of this civilization on any particular group of individuals. Too many people have welcomed it, and participated in it.

A SCIENTIFIC INTEREST

If, today, we are to consider ourselves in scientific competition with the Soviet Union, we are in pretty sorry straits, for we are pitted against a people in whom a lively interest in science has been generated. These people are moving collectively to accomplish certain national objectives. According to reports, they seem to be getting a kick out of what they have done and are doing. What we think about their brand of politics couldn't matter less under the circumstances. On the other hand, we of North America are about as unorganized for any social objective as we can be and, furthermore, we are without any evident desire to get organized. Technocracy, for years, has been addressing with telling effect only a minority of the citizens of this continent. We are just beginning to emerge from a period of years when it didn't make the slightest difference to more than 95 percent of the population how correct an analysis one might present; people weren't interested. Nevertheless, Technocracy, Inc., has built and maintained under the most difficult conditions for its type of thought a nucleus of personnel to whom nothing that is occurring on the North American scene is a surprise. What some people are becoming alarmed about is "old stuff" to Technocracy and Technocrats.

In less spectacular, but more socially important, ways than by beating the United States in the ballistic missile field, the Russians are acknowledged to be forging ahead of the United States. While the social system of the United States has been making salesmen, the Russians have been making scientists. While the emphasis in Russia has been on science, the emphasis in the United States has been on business enterprise.

In comment on international affairs more than 20 years ago, Howard Scott told an audience in New York, and since then he has repeated it many times at public meetings across the continent, that: "If the United States, in the conduct of its foreign affairs, continues to be dominated by the policy of business expediency, the day will come in the next three decades when the United States will be compelled to eat international dead crow served with Russian dressing and Tartar sauce." We are now being forced to eat a liberal serving of this international dead crow. It doesn't taste very good.

ARROGANT DISREGARD

Collectively, North Americans have looked upon their great land area, which they have regarded as their birthright, only as a wonderful opportunity to exploit for their personal benefit. This idea has been hammered into them by the educational system, politics, business, and numberless other sources from the time they were first able to read and understand words. For a time this continent was able to tolerate such a social attitude, despite the damage that it inflicted upon natural resources. A loose political control favored and rewarded the most adept chiselers. Graced with a great wealth of natural resources and an accommodating climate for the white man, North America has fostered the growth of a mighty industrial civilization, which grew at a tremendous rate with the application of technology by technically trained personnel. The rate of growth soon

rendered obsolete the social attitude and the price system of the continent. But that occurrence has not stopped us from continuing to use the old system. Therein lies the crucial conflict. It is a battle to the death for one or the other. No one can say with absolute certainty what the final outcome will be. We do know that we live by science and technology; therefore, the decision of each North American had better be in favor of these social forces. Our utter failure, as a people, to recognize the problem and to act is pushing us into the category of a second-class power, with the prospect of much worse social consequences to come, unless there is a widespread revival of social consciousness.

Since the North American Continent is without a governing mechanism that is capable of supplying the leadership and direction required to guide us out of the present mess, the question arises: What can anyone else do about it?

At some point in time in the future, probably all too soon, the mass of people on this continent is going to be jolted into action by the pressure of events. When this mass movement begins, it had better be directed by an organization that knows the score. As conditions become more intolerable, a social ferment will develop, producing the mass movement which will be largely devoid of intelligent understanding.

While Technocracy, Inc. is not designed to be a governing mechanism, Technocracy, the method, is so designed. When we consider that 40 years of engineering and scientific research have gone into Technocracy, we begin to understand why it is qualified to discuss comprehensively, and with the correct insight, problems before North America. What we are attempting to make clear is that we North Americans have a course of action to take to solve our problems. Technocracy is born of science, it is being presented in an organized way, and its organization has the leadership to see us through social change on this continent. What more do we want?

SO WHAT? HERE'S THE ANSWER

America, the greatest potential on earth.
 America menaced by inefficiency at home.
 America demanding action.
 Americans can and will solve this riddle of disaster and inefficiency on this continent of abundance.

America is in the midst of a struggle to fulfill its social destiny—a destiny made possible by its wealth of resources and technology. We are in the midst of a battle between the old and the new—scarcity versus plenty; hand tools versus technology; the status quo versus social change. Political bungling must be replaced by flow-line social control. Confronted by this battle, every American sooner or later must make the choice of either futile apathy or active assistance—or America will go under.

BUILDING THE NEW AMERICA

Only Americans under American leadership can build the new America. No importations of European social philosophy—communism, socialism, fascism, clericalism, or any other "ism" can be permitted to retard America's progress. A new technique of social operation is required. North America alone has the tools and the trained men for this technique. Technocracy lays the issue squarely upon the American people. You cannot escape responsibility.

TECHNOCRACY

Technocracy had its origin in the Technical Alliance in 1919, when prominent technologists, scientists, educators, and engineers under the leadership of Howard Scott, chief engineer, began the study of the impact of technology on our social structure. The method of social analysis and research founded at that time has made many im-

portant contributions to the design of the new America. To enable the expansion of its work, to make possible a general understanding of its principles and purposes, and to guard against distortion and subversion by abortive organizations its leaders organized Technocracy Inc., with Howard Scott as director in chief.

Technocracy, on the basis of exact scientific data, projects the operating design for the new America. This is the first time in history that such a design has been projected. This planned social operation is technological in structure and will replace political and monetary methods with a system in which the design itself will be the determining factor. Technical achievement will be raised to the highest possible level and used to serve all citizens in an adequate and impartial manner.

Technocracy was the first to point out that our modern technology, coupled with the vast resources of this continent, makes it possible to increase production so that we can provide an abundance of goods and services to meet all the requirements of each and every North American.

Technocracy builds on the solid rock of fact and is not involved in emotional vagaries or political chicanery. It invites sincere individuals to make an earnest study of its factual approach to America's social problem.

Technocracy's social design includes the entire North American continental area, with its enormous wealth of physical resources, for purposes of operation and defense against foreign aggression. This area of over 10 million square miles must be consolidated and operated and defended as one unit.

EVERYTHING TO GAIN

Here are some of the results to be realized by operating this continent on the basis of a planned, technological social design:

Standard of living: A higher standard of living for everyone—highest in the world. All productive capacity would be released from artificial restrictions. A maximum, unrestricted distribution would be made to all citizens without differentiation in incomes, based on the total goods and services available in any given time period.

Housing: Redesigned housing—machines for living—for the entire population, measuring up to the standards of modern technology. There would be no mortgages, taxes, or financial assessments.

Hours: Reduction of working hours in direct ratio to the diminishing total of man-hours required. Ultimately, under planned operation, hours could be reduced to 4 hours per day, 4 days out of 7.

Retirement: Full income, after retirement, until death. This is not an old-age pension, but continued participation in the abundance of available goods and services.

Production: Capacity operation of physical equipment on a balanced-load basis.

Education: Education of a new, high standard for all up to the age of 25 with specialized training for all in chosen fields.

Health: Full medical and dental attention for everyone as a compulsory service through the continental public health sequence.

Freedom: Full opportunity for everyone to spend leisure time in any manner desired. Freedom from restraint in religion, speech, culture, sports, and hobbies.

Opportunity: Equal opportunity for every boy and girl, every man and woman, to take his or her place in society to the degree of his or her attainments and ability.

Charity: Elimination of the necessity for public and private charity handouts and poorhouse methods of subsistence.

Money: Elimination of money and consequently of debts, taxes, insurance, etc.

Politics: Elimination of the inefficiency of politics through replacement by a system of operation based on the ability of the citizens to perform and to accept social responsi-

bility. There will be a vertical alignment of functional capacity in all branches of social service and for the first time in history the individuals charged with responsibility will continue to hold their positions only on their demonstrated ability to serve their fellow citizens.

Utopia? Sounds like it; but technocracy does not guarantee to make people happy—only to provide abundance, security, and freedom from toil through an efficient operating design.

THE TECHNOCRACY ORGANIZATION

Technocracy states that a social transition of such a magnitude and of such a nature neither requires nor permits of a revolution or a coup d'etat, but must proceed within the channels of a planned and orderly progression—that progression which is unique to this Continental Area. The failure to accomplish this imperative demand of our advanced technology will bring chaos to the North American Continent.

Technocracy, Inc. is building a trained and disciplined organization capable of meeting the demands of the march of events. This organization—the technological army of the new America—is designed to show the people of this continent how to assure the continued functioning of the equipment on this continent. A severe break in the continuity of our physical processes would spell chaos. Such an organization requires the participation of all types of people. Individuals who are citizens may obtain membership. Aliens and politicians are barred.

Technocracy, Inc., at its continental headquarters and through its units in the field, publishes several periodicals and a variety of standard official literature; these are available to interested persons.

Read. Learn. Participate. There is no time to be lost. The battle of America—the battle against poverty, malnutrition, scarcity, and disease—will have a greater effect on history than all the battles of Europe. Enlist now before you are drafted by the march of events.

To: All North Americans.

Subject: Information On Technocracy.

Greetings, fellow North American, Technocracy is receiving the attention of an ever greater number of citizens of North America as the trends today bear out Technocracy's observations of many years ago.

There is a growing apprehension among North Americans concerning what the future holds for them. You may recall that Technocracy was first by many years to point out the fundamental conflict between North America's growing technology and its price system. This conflict now has assumed the proportions of a death struggle as to which will survive, with the life of every citizen of this continent at stake.

For your convenience in learning about Technocracy, we are attaching to this letter a subscription order to Technocracy field magazines.

We trust that you will appreciate the literature enclosed on Technocracy, and we suggest that you contact this organization for more information without delay. Technocracy plays North America to win. How about you?

Very truly yours,

TECHNOCRACY, INC.

SWARTHMORE, PA.,
April 11, 1965.

DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am enclosing a check for my 1964 income tax (balance due). As I wrote last year, I have strong feelings about so much of our tax money going for the military. In particular I wish to register my objections to the Government foreign policy on South Vietnam, which seems very wrong. I support Senator WAYNE MORSE in all he

has to say on this situation. There are many others who feel the same way and I expect to join some of them (my Quaker friends) on April 17 on the protest march in Washington to end the war in Vietnam.

I am glad that the President is offering unconditional discussions on the matter. I hope that the aid we give will not be unilateral and that the goal will be to seek a reunification of Vietnam through a United Nations trusteeship.

If withholding tax money would help I think I would have the courage to take this step, but I know that the money would be taken from my bank account with an addition for interest, so that in the end the Government would have more money.

I applaud the Government's efforts in education, medicare, etc., but not war and destruction.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. MARY C. FOSTER.

P.S.—In checking last year's income tax form I discovered this 1963 withholding statement which supposedly had been sent with my form and check last year. I also have the copy for my records. Perhaps it is a duplicate.

Copy to Senator MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I was thrilled with your speech (on film) shown at this rally at Swarthmore College. I admire your continued courage to speak out. There are many who feel strongly against our Government policy on Vietnam.

P.S.—I carried this with me to Washington yesterday when I went on the protest march on Vietnam (but didn't pass a mail box). It was thrilling to be a part of such a large gathering but today I wonder, How can we really make our voices heard and have things changed? God forgive us for what we have done and are doing.

MARY FOSTER.

Some of the children in our group said the police tore down the message that the leaders of the March posted on the doors of Congress but a wire was also sent to the President.

SWARTHMORE COLLEGE,
April 1965.

Contradiction and confusion have been the norm of the war in Vietnam. There is hopeful talk of negotiations from both sides, but there has been in recent weeks a steady expansion of the war by the United States.

We must assess events of the past months and closely examine the directions of conflicting policy. We must, as citizens deeply concerned about peace, consider possible courses for the future.

Therefore, while registering our protest of present policy, we are following the examples of the University of Michigan, Columbia, Temple, and the University of Pennsylvania by calling for a teach-in at Swarthmore on April 7 from 8 p.m. to 3 a.m. The proposed program includes speeches by professors and outside experts and general discussions in which all may participate.

Solomon E. Asch, psychology; Robert Barr, dean of men; Carl Barus, engineering; Monroe C. Beardsley, philosophy; George T. Beech, history; Andrew Boelskey, German; William C. Denison, biology; John R. Dixon, engineering; Lewis R. Gaty, economics; Walker Gibson, English; Mark A. Heald, physics; Olga Lang, modern languages; Erika A. Mares, mathematics; David Wiesen, classics.

John A. Nevin, psychology; Clair W. Nielson, physics; Martin Ostwald, classics; Kenneth S. Rawson, biology; Hedley H. Rhys fine arts; David Rosen, mathematics; Albur M. Rosenberg, biology; Charles J. Seigman economics; Gilmore Stott, philosophy; George Von der Muhll, political science; Robert M Walker, fine arts; James F. Wanner, astron-

April 21, 1965

7857

omy; Clair Wilcox, economics; M. Joseph Wilks, engineering.

(Our apologies to all faculty members who wanted to sign, but whom we did not have a chance to contact.)

At 8: Introductory remarks.

At 8:15: Heien Lamb, spent 2 years in Vietnam, now writing a book, formerly a faculty member at Smith College.

At 8:45: Paul Booth, coordinator of the peace research and education project of SDS.

At 9: President Johnson's speech on Vietnam policy from Johns Hopkins University.

At 9:30: Franz Gross, head of Political Science Department at Pennsylvania Military College.

At 10: Clair Wilcox, head of Swarthmore Economics Department.

At 11: Break for seminars and discussion.

At 11:30: Film of WAYNE MORSE speaking on Vietnam.

At 12: Folk sing with Nick Warren.

Jesse Allen, presently on the staff of Newark community project, may speak.

Wednesday, April 7, 1965, Friend Meeting House.

BOSTON, MASS.,
April 14, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The issue is no longer war or peace in Vietnam. The men who are advising the President want war with China, quickly, before they get atomic weapons. This is the policy we must challenge and oppose.

We will not build the Great Society on the corpses of half a billion Asians. Let us for God's sake hold our hands from a crime worse than anything Hitler ever dreamed of.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN HOLT.

STORRS, CONN.,
April 13, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please accept my long overdue thanks for your vigorous quarrel with the administration policy in southeast Asia. I disagree with you on a couple of important points, but if it weren't for people like you and Senator GRUENING there's no telling what would have happened to the entire body of dissenting opinion. Thanks again, and please keep it up.

Sincerely,

JAMES BAKER HALL.

RANCOCAS, N.J.,
April 14, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Ever since having heard the commencement address you delivered at George School, Pennsylvania, back in 1961 (if my memory is accurate) I have been impressed with your ability as a statesman. Let me now tell you how grateful I have been for your opposition to the administration's course in Vietnam. Surely your story should be added to the other "Profiles in Courage." It does seem incredible that, in this nuclear age, war is still used as an instrument of policy. Aren't there enough thinking people in this Nation to change our present collision course? Or must we just sit back and await the holocaust?

You have expressed so well the fact that our presence in this area is wrong, that the whole area should be under international supervision. I believe most Americans agree. What can we do further to help?

Very sincerely,

Mrs. COLIN F. TAIT.

ALLEN J. REINER & Co., INC.,
Hicksville, N.Y., April 13, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Although not from Oregon, I am writing to you to express my complete agreement with your views concerning the Vietnam crises. It seems to us that almost everybody in Washington must have completely lost their sense of perspective or just be reluctant to speak out.

Today I have written again to Senators KENNEDY and JAVITS (as I am a New Yorker). I have also written to Senators AIKEN and COOPER.

If you could give us some suggestions as to how we might make our opinions known and felt to the right people then I would be happy to make these suggestions known to a great many people who feel as we do.

Yours truly,

ALLEN J. REINER.

LONDON, ENGLAND,
April 14, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
The Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I hope that you will not be fooled by President Johnson's Johns Hopkins speech. It does not offer unconditional negotiations, but only conditional ones: that the Vietnamese National Liberation Front give up all that they have been fighting for for 20 years, before beginning to talk. Even Ho Chi Minh does not call for withdrawal of U.S. troops before the opening of negotiations (New York Times of today). Please keep speaking out vigorously for real negotiations and peace in South Vietnam.

I wonder if you would be so kind as to pass this message on to your colleagues, Senators GRUENING and MCGOVERN.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

STEVEN JONAS, M.D.

[From the Friends Committee on National Legislation, Action, Apr. 14, 1965]

VIETNAM CRISIS MOVES TO NEW, MORE DANGEROUS PHASE

President Johnson's speech to the Nation, April 7, marked a watershed in American public opinion on the war in Vietnam. Whether it will have any real effect in altering the escalating course of the war there remains to be seen.

In past military-political crises, the figure of the American eagle with a bundle of arrows in one claw and an olive branch in the other has symbolized the national policy of arming to parley, of negotiating from strength, and preparing for war in order to secure peace.

What has so distressed many in the public, in Congress, and in the press is that since February 7 when the policy of retaliation and escalation in North Vietnam began, the United States has emphasized military policy in Vietnam almost exclusively. Only after 2 months of strong and increasing public pressure, plus adverse reaction to the use of gas and the loss of much support from allied and nonaligned nations, did President Johnson come to the traditional "arrows and olive branch" policy.

The President's comments on U.S. willingness to negotiate and to aid the region economically drew the applause of many of his previous critics, such as the New York Times; Senator FRANK CHURCH, of Idaho; and Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, of South Dakota. At the same time they drew the fire of some who had supported his no-negotiation policy and those who criticize economic assistance programs.

There was one crucial missing ingredient in the President's speech—he did not say he was suspending air bombardment of North Vietnam in order to facilitate the negotiating process. Indeed, the continued and intensified U.S. military action may well be answered by increased Vietcong and North Vietnamese military action, rather than by steps to the negotiating table.

SOME COMMENTS ON THE PRESIDENT'S SPEECH

1. The proposal for a greatly expanded cooperative economic development effort by the countries of southeast Asia including North Vietnam was most welcome. The President pledged to ask Congress for a billion dollar American investment in this effort when it is underway. He hoped other industrialized countries, including the Soviet Union, would join in the effort. He called on the U.N. Secretary General to help initiate such a plan. This proposal was along the lines urged by Gilbert White and others for the development of the Mekong Basin.

2. The President's statement that the United States is prepared for "unconditional discussions" now was urgently needed, but an important limitation was added.

President Johnson indicated that there might be many ways to peace: "in discussion or negotiation with the governments concerned; in large groups or in small ones; in the reaffirmation of old agreements or their strengthening with new ones."

This broad statement, however, was immediately modified by Government spokesmen who noted that the National Liberation Front (Vietcong) which controls well over half the territory in South Vietnam is merely an agent of North Vietnam and is therefore not entitled to sit at the conference table. Senator ERNEST GRUENING, of Alaska, charged April 9 that "the refusal to concede that the fighting in South Vietnam is essentially a civil war and that to bring that fighting to a halt it is necessary to discuss the issues with the principals—the Vietcong—is tantamount to retaining a precondition to our willingness to negotiate." It is interesting to note that the appeal of the 17 nonaligned nations, to which President Johnson was responding in his Johns Hopkins speech, was delivered to the National Liberation Front as well as North Vietnam, China, and others, thus indicating a neutral view that the NLF is a real party in interest.

3. The President's proposal for an "independent South Vietnam" clarified U.S. goals but does not make a settlement easy to achieve. In his speech he suggested the essentials of a final settlement: "an independent South Vietnam—securely guaranteed and able to shape its own relationships to all others, free from outside interference, tied to no alliance, a military base for no other country."

The goal of an independent South Vietnam is not consistent with the Geneva Accords of 1954. Those accords referred to the 17th parallel as a provisional military demarcation line and contemplated general elections in 1956 to bring about the unification of North and South Vietnam. Those elections were opposed by the United States and South Vietnam and not pressed by North Vietnam. They were never held. Former President Eisenhower states in his book, "Mandate for Change," that Communist Ho Chi Minh was a popular national leader who would have received 80 percent of the vote in Vietnam during the war with the French.

On the timetable for withdrawal of U.S. troops, President Johnson said in his formal reply on April 8 to the 17 nation appeal that the United States would be "ready and eager to withdraw its forces" from South Vietnam "when conditions have been created in which

April 21, 1965

the people of South Vietnam can determine their own future free from external interference."

4. The President indicated the United States will continue its policy of bombardment of North Vietnam without letup. He thus rejected the advice of Canadian Prime Minister Lester Pearson who had urged a pause in the air attack, and of Senator GEORGE McGOVERN, of South Dakota, who had urged a 2-week moratorium.

Since the President's April 7 speech, U.S. air attacks on North Vietnam have continued and increased in intensity. Over that 2-month period these attacks have escalated in the sense that more and more vital targets such as bridges and roads are now being hit and the bombs are falling closer and closer to Hanoi. While this policy was supposed to bring the North Vietnamese Government to the conference table, indications are that there is even less willingness to negotiate now than 2 months ago.

U.S. military policy in Vietnam has seemed to be a military juggernaut inexorably gathering speed. There seems to be no readiness within the administration to halt this escalating bombardment, even briefly, in order to create an atmosphere in which Hanoi could indicate a readiness to talk.

5. Continued U.S. bombing of North Vietnam violates the United Nations Charter, according to Senators WAYNE MORSE, JOSEPH CLARK, and ERNEST GRUENING. Article 2, section 4 provides: "All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations."

Article 33 states: "The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, inquiry, mediation, conciliation * * * or other peaceful means of their own choice." This section, which the United States has signed, would clearly seem to require negotiation before bombing, not after.

Under article 51, the United States reported to the Security Council on February 7 that the bombing raids on North Vietnam were "defensive action." Article 51 provides that: "Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. Measures taken by Members in the exercise of their right of self-defense shall be immediately reported to the Security Council."

South Vietnam is an observer, but not a Member of the United Nations. The implication of United States reporting to the Security Council is that it feels the United States itself is being attacked by North Vietnam. But since the beginning of the year, the United States has done nothing to call a session of the Security Council as is implied in article 51.

6. President Johnson for the first time put his prestige behind the view that Mainland China is a major party in the war in South Vietnam. The President said: "Over this war—and all Asia—is another reality: The deepening shadow of Communist China. The rulers in Hanoi are urged on by Peiping. This is a regime which has destroyed freedom in Tibet, attacked India and been condemned by the United Nations for aggression in Korea. It is a nation which is helping the forces of violence in almost every continent. The contest in Vietnam is part of a wider pattern of aggressive purpose."

For some time, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara has been arguing publicly that Communist China is the real enemy and that China is seeking to prove to the world

that it can overthrow, by covert means, a non-Communist government of an emerging nation even when the United States aids that government.

Senator WAYNE MORSE has charged that there are those in the Pentagon who propose that the United States bomb Chinese nuclear installations and he has predicted this may happen within 4 months. Such a step would be a moral and political catastrophe of immense proportions for the United States.

Lasting peace in Asia can only be promoted by intensive and direct negotiations between the United States, China, and other involved parties to achieve political settlements, a comprehensive test ban treaty and major steps toward world disarmament. The Vietnamese war only makes more difficult and postpones the day when these wide-ranging talks between the United States and China must begin.

7. Although the President suggested that U.N. Secretary General U Thant could play a useful role in initiating the economic development program, he did not call upon the Secretary General, or the U.N., or other third parties for their mediating service or other good offices.

In this difficult situation, the intercession and mediation by third parties ought to be sincerely welcomed and actively encouraged by the United States. All the countries of the world have a direct and immediate interest in restoring peace and stability in southeast Asia.

8. The President did not spell out, nor could he be expected to at this stage, the amount of Vietcong participation in an independent South Vietnam Government. Would the United States and South Vietnam agree to NLF representation in the Cabinet? If so, how many would there be? In what posts? If South Vietnam is to be an independent country, would the United States be prepared to see South Vietnam move, over the course of a few years, to union with North Vietnam—as envisaged by the original Geneva accords of 1954? Would the United States be prepared to support a Titoist type government in Vietnam? These questions ought to be faced and discussed openly in the United States if there is to be any hope for a negotiated solution in Vietnam.

On the Senate floor March 25, Senator GEORGE ARKEN, of Vermont, stressed that North Vietnam does not want to be a Chinese satellite. Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, noted that there has been more than 1,000 years of enmity between the Vietnamese people and the "Chinese colossus to the north."

In a little-noticed speech at Johns Hopkins, March 12, Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, made a general remark relevant to the situation in Vietnam: "I think we ought to ask ourselves, hypothetically, whether a Communist regime that leans away from China is worse or better from the viewpoint of our political and strategic interests than a non-Communist state, such as Indonesia or Cambodia, that leans toward China."

WHAT OF THE FUTURE?

Many close observers feel the U.S. position in Vietnam is deteriorating rapidly. In this situation it is felt that moves either (a) to the conference table, or (b) toward a major U.S. military involvement in Vietnam will take place in the next month or two. Military involvement could mean 300,000 to 1 million U.S. servicemen in Vietnam, according to Hanson Baldwin of the New York Times, vastly increased draft calls, huge new military appropriations, and a possible spreading of the conflict to other areas such as Korea and even beyond.

Given the current position of the Vietcong, Hanoi and Peiping, the steps to the conference table are not easy and the negotiating process may be difficult, frustrating and complex. But there are moves which

the United States could make which might brighten the prospects for a settlement including, for example:

(a) An end to the bombing of North Vietnam and U.S. troops movements to South Vietnam;

(b) A willingness to negotiate with the NLF;

(c) A readiness to abide by the results of a free and supervised election in South Vietnam and to support moves toward a reunified Vietnam as proposed in the Geneva Accords of 1954; and

(d) Some indication that the United States is prepared to begin extensive negotiations with the People's Republic of China on a broad range of issues.

There are difficulties involved in all courses of action, but is it not better to come to the conference table before rather than after widespread violence and war?

CROWN POINT, IND.,

April 12, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your courageous stand on Vietnam.

Respectfully,

Mr. and Mrs. DAVID GRATNER.

APRIL 12, 1965.

HONORABLE SIR: May God's blessings be upon you, for informing your people, on the wrong being committed in Vietnam and the threat to all mankind if this war is not controlled. Peace, through negotiation is our only hope. For it is only in peace can a war against poverty and other ills be most effective. I fervently pray that our Nation will take the lead in seeking peaceful solutions, as not only would we gain honor and dignity—but all of the peoples on this earth would be forever grateful. It could begin with this Easter week—calling for a moratorium, as suggested by Lester Pearson (Prime Minister of Canada). In the meantime—above all else—please keep on talking.

Respectfully yours,

CLEO DORMAN.

KALAMAZOO, MICH.,

April 13, 1965.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I certainly agree with your stand against escalation of the Vietnam war.

Further, any talk of bombing China would be sheer folly. It would be an open act of war.

Keep up the good work.

Respectfully,

HERBERT A. TOMPKINS,
Secretary, Michigan Fellowship
of Reconciliation.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your stand for peace in Vietnam. In order for a nation to stand there must be some righteous and peace-loving people in its land. Again my prayers are with you and thank you for your efforts.

Sincerely,

Mrs. DONNA LOWER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,

April 10, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You, singularly, deserve the thanks of your fellow citizens for a valiant and effective battle against foreign aid—that coercive taxation which is proliferated upon barren foreign fields, their dictators and tribal chiefs.

We admire your courage in challenging the epileptic policy in southeast Asia. Truly, it is an American tragedy when a President arrogates the power of Congress to wage war in order to mask his blunders in foreign pol-

April 21, 1965

7859

icy. Can we or will the history tell a boy, whose father was sent to Korea or South Vietnam to die, that his father truly died for his country and that he did not die in vain?

Senator Morse, it appears to me that the only way to check the warring power of the executive is to introduce a constitutional amendment to limit the President's term of office to the term in which he wages war.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL VERBA, JR.

APRIL 13, 1965.

DEAR SIR: Although I am not one of your constituents, I admire keenly your stand on the issue of Vietnam.

And I urge you to keep up the good work. I have wired and written the President, protesting his heedless course, and, of course, have received no acknowledgment.

Is there any possibility that the whole issue could be put to a popular referendum? I'm asking the same question of my Congressman, GEORGE BROWN, JR. I believe the results of such a referendum would be very revealing. According to what I read, public opinion is running high against not only this reckless, ruinous escalation, but involvement at all. We should get out.

Sincerely,

JACQUELINE D. TUNBERG.

JAMAICA, N.Y.,

April 13, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: It seems that you and a handful of other Senators are the only sane people in Washington these days with regard to our Vietnam policy.

Keep up the pressure on the administration.

We're behind you 100 percent.

Very truly yours,

ARTHUR EDELSTEIN.

SILVER SPRING, MD.

April 13, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We have read in the Baltimore Sun a portion of your April 8 speech on the Vietnam crisis, and want to tell you how much we agree with your views.

Yours sincerely,

FRANZ L. ALT.
ALICE M. ALT.

BOLTON, MASS.,

April 13, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I heartily support your stand against the war in Vietnam. Legally and morally, our position there is indefensible.

I am going to Washington this weekend with thousands of others from all over the country, to try to make my protest against Pentagon madness visible.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM H. CARY, JR.

WELLESLEY, MASS.,

April 12, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Permit me to congratulate you. Your courageous campaign against our cruel, immoral, and disgraceful war against a small country located 10,000 miles away, is most commendable, and worthy of admiration and support.

Today, the New York Times devotes only four inches of one column to your speech of day before yesterday in Ohio. Do you have copies of this speech for distribution?

If so, I certainly would like to receive one. Thank you.

Yours truly,

MANUEL PEDRO GONZALEZ.

ELMONT, N.Y.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

HONORABLE SIR: As a loyal and Government employed citizen, I wish to express my deep admiration for your views on the present Vietnam crisis. The little amount I have read of your attitude about the above has given me great satisfaction in that our country is blessed in having you as a representative in our Government.

In reading the newspapers I find very little information about your speeches and views. It seems to me that since you advocate a more sensible and logical approach to many things your avenues of making your views publicly aired by all mediums of information is held to the barest minimum. Even the great New York Times gives very little attention to your views or other similar attitudes.

I am most interested in reading all about your speeches, views, and other points that will give me great pleasure in knowing you better. May I please request material about the above or information where I might attain them.

Very truly yours,

BENJAMIN HOCH.

CEDARHURST, N.Y.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

We support the ceasefire Vietnam and immediate application of U Thant's formula for negotiations.

Dr. IRWIN HOFFMAN, M.D.

GARY, IND.

Thank you and the few others who are trying to extricate us from the crazy Vietnam war. We are dead wrong over there and could well use all our available funds for better purpose than establishing fake governments in other lands.

PAUL FIRLEY.

SANTA MARIA, CALIF.,

April 9, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for your courage in keeping up the fight to get out of Vietnam. I think if the people who elected the President, myself included, were to vote today, he would be in for a surprise.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. SANFORD.

APRIL 11, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: It is with great admiration and hope that I was privileged to listen once again to your words of reason and logic concerning our unwarranted military presence in South Vietnam.

You and Senator GRUENING, of Alaska, give courage to all those of us who believe that might is not always right.

I am speaking for myself and family, am 78 years of age and believe in peace.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. LUDMILLA O. SALK.

APRIL 10, 1965.

DEAR MR. MORSE: You're fantastic in urging the United States to get out of Vietnam. Don't give up. Keep trying, even if our cause might be hopeless.

I read your statements in printed material published by the War Registers League and the American Friends Service Committee.

The United States is not humane while we remain in Vietnam.

Respectfully,

Miss ROBIN VELTE,

University of California, Santa Barbara.

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY,

St. Louis, April 9, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to thank you from the bottom of my heart for your courageous stand on our Government's Vietnam policy. I am convinced that if our foreign policy was made by men like yourself it would be a far better world for all of us. Your courage in speaking out again and again despite the pressures you must feel to change your views or remain silent is an example for all of us and a reminder that there is hope for democracy.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM M. BOOTHBY.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,

April 9, 1965.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Thank you for fine efforts for a cease-fire in Vietnam.

Negotiations—not war.

Thank you.

PEARL A. LaFORCE.

APRIL 1, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: I join with Pope Paul VI and U.N. Secretary General U Thant in urging:

An immediate cease-fire in Vietnam.

A conference of all nations to negotiate peace.

Please continue to work toward these ends.

Yours truly,

VICKI TANENHAUS.

CHICAGO, ILL.,

April 13, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In refusing to recognize the war in Vietnam as a civil war, our Government is committing the same error as the racial bigots in this country. Unless the people of South Vietnam have a real voice in their government, no amount of military or financial aid can bring about peace.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. RAMONA SCHUTT.

ENUMCLAW, WASH.,

April 5, 1965.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Our presence in Vietnam has neither moral nor legal justification.

Our actions there are contrary to all our declared principles.

We should get out.

C. K. STEDMAN, Ph. D.,

Research Consultant.

OCONOMOWOC, WISC.,

April 12, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The press, and the younger Members of Congress tossed their hats in the air over a few crumbs of peaceful talk from the President's table at Johns Hopkins, but I am pleased to see that you remained calm amid the tumult. The refusal of the United States to face the fact that this is a civil war which in fact has been lost, not by us, but by the 21-odd Saigon governments we have leagued ourselves with leaves things pretty much the way they were before the President launched his equivocal peace overtures.

I'm enclosing a news article which appeared in French in the Paris paper, Le Figaro Littéraire, written by Max Clos. It is not that Clos has said anything that has not been reported before in the better news media here and abroad, but he does say it pungently, and also throws some light on how the Saigon government's defeat has come about, and what program and future the Vietcong are holding out to the people of Vietnam.

The guerrilla war professionals in the U.S. Government have spent so much time poring over the propaganda of Mao and General Giap that they have swallowed the Commu-

nist line that South Vietnam represents a model for Communist insurgency against U.S. counterinsurgency, and that if a Vietcong government comes to power in Saigon, shaky governments all over the world will topple. Shaky governments don't need a domino to push them over. They all will fall of their own weight without popular support and a sound domestic program.

The flames of war inevitably and tragically can only leap higher and higher unless Washington will start to base its policies on a mental image of the South Vietnam of 1965 that has some basis in reality. It would be nice if we could go back to 1954 and have another go at it, but unless we think we are some kind of gods this faculty is not accorded us in either our private or our public lives.

I think Clos' piece and Stanley Hoffman's letter in the New York Times of April 10 complement each other nicely. They are both charming and lucid, qualities which seem hard to come by in discussions of Vietnam. We can only hope that the still small voices of reason heard here will gradually swell to a mighty roar which will make the Selma uproar seem like only a mild breeze.

MOLLY KEALY.

P.S.—Please give Clos' article what circulation you think it merits.

VIETNAM

(By Max Clos)

(Translated from *Le Figaro Littéraire*, No. 984, Mar. 3, 1965, M. Kealy)

The bar on the fifth floor of the Hotel Majestic in Saigon overlooks the harbor. At night from time to time muffled explosions can be heard from the other side of the river. From time to time a brilliant flare shoots up and glitters for some minutes. What we have again is a probe by a Vietcong patrol.

Some young American officers with crew-cuts and with the red patch of their Vietnamese parachute battalion tilted over the ear are drinking whiskey amid peals of laughter. They are charming and just like the French officers who 10 years ago were sitting in the same place recounting their exploits in the rice paddies and in the jungles.

Don't they know that this war is lost, that their deaths will accomplish nothing, that their hardships are useless and their sacrifice without point, that we have seen the start of the usual comedy of threatening statements which are the prelude to settlement talks? Probably not. It is no doubt part of the charm of young officers that to the very end they do not realize that their death in Vietnam will be futile.

The Cantho area 75 miles southwest of Saigon is one of the most far gone of the delta. A night operation is in progress. For 3 days the Vietnamese battalion has slogged through the mud without finding anything. Some villages were burnt, some hundreds of scared peasants were terrorized, and to vary the menu a certain number of chickens and black pigs which squeal unbelievably shrilly have been commandeered. And then just when everyone thinks that it is all over the leading company is ambushed. In a flash: 8 dead and 30 wounded. Night has fallen. Nearby the day's dead, already turned gray, are piled up under canvas. I was seated at the side of an old friend, a colonel in the Vietnamese army. Let us call him X.

"The Americans," he said, "are jaunty fellows, but they are inexperienced. Like a young dog they wish to dig out everything. The sad thing is that here the war does not obey the rules of the textbooks, and of the manuals. My last corporal knew perfectly well that if we went in a certain direction we would find a 'bone.' My people were not eager to go, but the Americans insisted."

X used his fingers to show the number of dead, saying, "This was the result."

"The truth is," he said, sipping a cup of coffee, "That the game is up. We are fed up with this war now, and no one wants to prolong the killing. Take me. I've been in the army for 20 years. If I were given a choice between stars and a discharge, I'd take the discharge without a moment's delay. You know wars are not won with men who think of only one thing: to become civilians again."

The relations between Vietnamese and American officers are cool, not to use a worse term. The Vietnamese are critical of the Americans for understanding little or nothing about this war. The Americans often have a poor opinion of the Vietnamese generals, find their officers mediocre, and their soldiers without stomach for combat.

But it is certainly not a matter of the Vietnamese lacking physical courage. At the end of the first Indochinese war, practically all of the French units were half "yellow," and most of the officers would agree that combat operations were first rate. The Vietcong who attack well-defended positions, are exposed to heavy artillery fire and to the government's air power, undergo at times frightful ordeals, and always display real courage, if not fanaticism. Their opponents admire them for their courage. And these men, with the exception of a small majority who have come down from the North, are peasants of Indochina who have got their training at places only miles from the American training centers in South Vietnam.

What then is the explanation of the combat inefficiency of the government forces? In a few years when this war will be over, it will be seen that the American defeat in Vietnam was caused by two things. First, the guerrillas depend not merely on military training and professional skill, but also on the creation of warm personal ties between their men. Second, they make a detailed and exact analysis of the political and social setting and climate in which the war is carried on. In these two areas the second Indochinese war is ending in an American defeat.

In Vietnam the American "advisers" do a job, or, if you prefer, they perform their duty with conscientiousness. They serve with devotion and competence. But all this is not enough. They are merely guerrilla warfare professionals. The French when they were here made of the Indochinese war a sentimental and romantic adventure. French officers and men fell in love with the country, infected with what Larteguy aptly calls "the yellow sickness." They played their part in a stirring adventure, which, it is true, ended badly, but which gave them a sense of glory. It was because of this that they were able to make contact with the Vietnamese, to form emotional ties with them, and to draw them into that cruel adventure. Contrary to appearances, there exist few peoples more passionate, more sentimental, and more sensitive than the Vietnamese. They have a need to be loved. The stiff ways of the American military, its love for formality, its taste for following military regulations to the letter greatly upset the Vietnamese. The Vietnamese can't understand how a military order can be treated as anything else but a topic for debate and discussion. In this they found that the French often shared their point of view. This divergence in military philosophy creates problems, and in the case of Vietnam it is evident that it has taken its toll.

Intimate contact has never been established between the Vietnamese and the Americans. The French, spellbound with the exotic, took up the Vietnamese way of life. They were delighted with Chinese soups flavored with exotic ingredients, they smoked opium, they organized uproarious parties with their yellow friends, and topped

off the night in their company with the girls. This of course was not particularly decent, but what connection is there anyway between decency and war?

The Americans, on the other hand, have tried to introduce puritan morality in Vietnam and the American way of life. At the doors of hotels restricted to Americans there are signs reading: "Women are forbidden to enter." Their food comes directly from the United States in sealed packages. A recent article written by one of the better American war correspondents describes the Vietnamese war. It is all a matter of bad odors, of food contaminated by the natives, and of the resulting stomach aches. In short, it is a hell from which each American is eager to escape. In Saigon marine sergeants in mufti sport silk jackets on which you can read embroidered in yellow letters: "When I die I shall go straight to heaven. I have put in my purgatory here." At Camau at the south end of the peninsula another sergeant told me that he didn't like Vietnam. I asked him where he was stationed before.

"At Frankfurt."

"Were things better there?"

He frowned and thought for awhile. "You know, things are better here than in the States."

The 25,000 American advisers live in Vietnam "like in the States." At Cantho, for example, the headquarters for one of the four military districts, it's like this. At staff headquarters every Vietnamese office is duplicated by an American opposite number. At 5 p.m. it's closing time, and the Americans return immediately to their compound at the edge of the city. It is a big camp ringed with barbed wire and protected by Vietnamese guards. The lowest private is entitled to quarters of his own furnished with a refrigerator and air conditioning. He has a shower with hot water. A PX supplies him with all that he can desire, from shaving cream to record players with whiskey in between—all at ridiculously low prices. The bar offers 30 brands to choose from. Every night at 8 there is a new movie shown on a wide screen in color at a theater furnished with lounge chairs.

Vietnamese officers are rarely at American messes. It is not that they must eat separately, but Americans and Vietnamese do not enjoy one another's company. I went to the compound at Cantho with Colonel X whom I mentioned before. On leaving, he said to me: "I have a feeling these Americans have come from another planet."

Then he told me: "When I came out of school in 1948, I was assigned to a French port unit. The first night at table I was a little shy. I didn't know how to use a fork very well. The CO was a naval lieutenant. He said to me: 'Tell me, X, do you eat with a fork, or a pitch-fork?' Afterwards, we made the rounds of the girls together. With the Americans there is no danger that anyone will talk about anything of this kind. No one goes to the girls anymore."

Now there is no objection to movies, hot water, and refrigerators. Except this: If you want to persuade people to join your side, it's not a good idea to set up what in the eyes of the Vietnamese soldiers appears to be excessive luxury.

More or less confused, Nguyen, a Vietnamese GI Joe of the second class, tells himself that it's not normal to see people engaged in the same war treated in such an unequal fashion. He not only says this to himself, but the Vietcong tell it to him. Communication is easy. There are women who act as messengers. They are the ones who spread the good word. They have only simple things to explain. This, for example:

"The Americans which you see down there in their well-lit compounds are the masters. As for you, you are poorly fed and poorly paid. You are going to die for them—and for nothing."

Nguyen gets 1,750 piastres a month, about \$18. His lieutenant receives a salary of \$80. Eighteen dollars is not a small sum in Vietnam, but Nguyen thinks he would be more useful in his own village. But, it's not only a question of this. Theoretically he is drafted for 3 years, but this is already the 5th year he's been in uniform. The war continually gets harder. The Vietcong continually are better armed. Life for him is very tough. The Vietcong propaganda says: "Why do you fight us? The war will eventually end. The Americans will leave. Go over the hill now, or do not fight when you are attacked. Keep still, and nothing will happen to you."

Nguyen, to say the least, is upset. He knows his village is controlled by the Vietcong. He knows also that if he is wounded, he will be poorly cared for because there is a scarcity of doctors and medicine. Moreover, the military hospitals are crowded with wounded. They are stacked four and five high under the tarpaulins which extend the roofs of the hospitals. The wounded painfully line up to go to the latrines which are always jammed and to get a drink of water at the scarce fountains. Nguyen knows also that if he loses an arm or a leg, he will be left without any chance to make a living—and he is not more than 20. So, sometimes, when he is on guard around the compound of the big-shot Americans with their laughter ringing in his ears, he asks himself what he will do if the Vietcong attack.

The Americans are bitter. They have been disillusioned by Vietnam. They say: "These people are incomprehensible. We come here to save them from Communist slavery, and they couldn't care less."

The Americans carry with them their almost insane horror of communism. They apply here all the fatuous ideas they have on the subject in the States. For them the problem is simple: The Vietnamese are divided neatly into two groups, the Vietcong and the anti-Vietcong, that is, the pro and the anti-Communists. These two groups, by the iron law of logic and history, cannot but hate each other, and fight each other to the death.

This is unfortunately a mental picture which in Vietnam has little basis in reality.

In the first place because the pro- and anti-Vietcong are not isolated from each other. There hardly exists in Vietnam a single family which is not divided between the two factions. It is rare that a Government minister or general does not have one or more relatives more or less close to him on the other side. Between the two sides of the family the ties are not cut. News is exchanged, and sometimes, visits. It is necessary also to take into account the problem of nationalism which complicates things even more. On this core ambiguity existed all during the first Vietnamese war. Large numbers of anti-Communist Vietnamese fought with the Vietminh nevertheless in order to get independence for their country. Today there is a bit of the same problem. The continuous line of Vietcong propaganda is that the Americans have stepped into the shoes of the French, that national independence is again in jeopardy, that the Vietcong fight chiefly to end the interference of the foreigner. You have a pretty ignorant of the Vietnamese to imagine that this line of argument does not carry weight.

Officially, the American intervention has for its objective "the fight against communism." This is a notion which to the Vietnamese peasants means absolutely nothing. The Vietcong never mention the subject of communism. They don't present themselves as the exponents of an ideology. The whole thing is infinitely more simple than that. Their political staff doesn't hold meetings of the peasants to conduct seminars in poli-

tical theory. What they do is propose concrete solutions to concrete problems. These problems are not difficult to state. They are, in the order of their importance, the return of peace, the reestablishment of law and order, and better management of public affairs.

What the Vietcong leaders say to the peasants, and what all the officials down the line repeat, is this:

"You have nothing to pay to the landlords who have taken refuge in Saigon. The land belongs to the man who farms it. Don't worry, if someone tries to persecute you, we will protect you."

When, under Diem, the program of strategic hamlets was tried, the Vietcong argued: "Don't let yourselves be locked up in disguised concentration camps. No one has the right to force you to leave your homes. Resist. We will help you. If you can't help it, cooperate, but help us later to destroy the hamlets."

When the Government tries to draft, the Vietcong tells the parents: "Don't let your children go. The Saigon government wants them to be killed to advance the objectives of the Americans. Hide them. In an emergency, send them to the areas we hold. We will make use of them."

The families with boys in service are told: "Have them desert, and no harm will come to them. If they don't we will be forced to kill them."

In a revolutionary period, propaganda is worthless if it does not put out a concrete action program. The Vietcong tells the population: "You are oppressed by corrupt men representing a government which has sold out to a foreign country."

On hearing this the peasants look around. The chief of the province appointed by the Saigon Government lives in a big house, drives a Mercedes, and loads his wife with jewelry. The Governor is a man of importance who is approached with deference, protected by police, soldiers, and assistants. His Vietcong opposite number can be seen every day. He is out among the people. He is dressed like a peasant, in black calico and with sandals cut from an old tire. He makes his rounds in his district on foot, walking along the public roads. You can be sure of one thing: he is not on the back of the people getting rich.

When the Vietcong began their revolution in 1959 and 1960, it was opened with a wave of terrorism. In isolated places, in hamlets, then in villages and cities, officials and private persons loyal to Saigon were assassinated. Government propaganda strove mightily to exploit these facts to arouse popular indignation. This backfired. It was understood too late that in most cases the peasants had fearlessly helped in the brutal liquidation of the men on whose death the Saigon Government was basing its case. Instead of murderers, the terrorists were considered dispensers of justice.

All this was not exactly an unplanned reaction. The Vietcong do not leave anything to chance. The heart of their system is always to explain the reasons for the course of action they adopt. Before killing a man they explain at length, repeating tirelessly the same arguments, giving the reasons for which the victim must be punished. And they don't stop there. The population too must repeat the arguments, learn them by heart, and tell everyone about them. The Vietcong want the people themselves to demand the punishment of the guilty. And no one is satisfied with mere lipservice.

The difference between the two Vietnams, official Vietnam, that of the Saigon Government, and the real Vietnam, that of the Vietcong, is undoubtedly here. The Vietcong is a great, perfectly oiled machine which organizes the people after winning their inner

conviction, after becoming master of their heart and head. The Saigon Government also has tried to win over the people. This was under Diem, but it was all a matter of externals. I was well acquainted with Ngo Dinh Nhu, the brother of the dead President. He was the regime's man of theory. He was obsessed with the idea of having at his command, as the Vietcong does, an army of fanatical partisans who would go from village to village, from man to man, doing the kind of work the Vietcong has done. He never could develop a corps of this kind, however, because there are no competent people of this kind who side with the Saigon Government, and he didn't have time to create them.

With the fall of Diem the Vietcong machine preempted this field of activity. One Saigon government after another fell. There was a confusing succession of heads of state and commanders in chief. There was a continual turnover of important civil and military officials who were killed, jailed, silenced, fired, and recalled.

The people have this picture to look at. On one side there is a real government, law and order, and responsible people. On the other side, chaos, anarchy, and disorder. The people chose those who had won the contest. Against this bombs and strafing mean nothing.

If the National Liberation Front imposed itself by clever propaganda and by professional leadership, it also offered a political program designed to win adherence.

The Vietnamese are by nature distrustful and sensitive to possible trickery. They don't swallow naively the arguments of the Vietcong leaders. They know perfectly well what they have to fear from the installation in South Vietnam of a government comparable to the one imposed by the Vietminh on North Vietnam. They don't want a government of that kind at any price. They passionately want two things: First, not to be subjected to the North Vietnamese Government which they detest, and second, not to see installed in the south a political and economic system less humane than that of Hanoi.

The National Liberation Front, with the approval of Hanoi, gives pleasing assurances on all of these different points. First, it stresses that it is a question of a front, and not of a single party. It's not the Marxist Party alone, but the Popular Revolutionary Party—a party made up of 20 other groups. It is therefore necessary to make out the Popular Revolutionary Party plays an essential role in the conduct of the struggle, but it is known that neither the president nor the secretary of the front are members of the Popular Revolutionary Party, and that only one of the front's five vice presidents is affiliated with the Popular Revolutionary Party.

The program of the front is one that could not be more reassuring. To read it, it is for a sort of liberal Socialist government. It is precise in providing for the retention of the right to private property, that private industry and commerce will be encouraged, that the property of French citizens will be protected. In foreign affairs, diplomatic relations will be established with all countries "without distinction as to political system." Economic, cultural, and technical aid will be sought from countries "having different political systems." It is the same as saying that Vietnam will be a friend of the United States. Lastly, the separate existence of South Vietnam is promised. On reunification of the two Vietnams the program says: "The question will be determined by the two parts * * * subject to the proviso that one part will not swallow up the other."

All observers are in agreement on one point: The program and the conduct of the National Liberation Front have won it the

April 21, 1965

adherence, enthusiastic or resigned, of a very large part of the Vietnamese population. This is a fact which becomes particularly clear when one interviews middle class and intellectual people in Saigon. One of them summarizes the problem in this way: "We have a choice between two solutions: to wage an endless war while every day placing ourselves more at the mercy of the Americans, and without any guarantee that this will end in a clearcut victory, or categorically to demand the end of the war and trust to the good faith of the National Liberation Front's leaders and to their willingness to carry out a program which to us appears acceptable."

Before that vast majority who above all want peace and the fulfillment of their hopes, there is one minor obstacle: some generals who command troops ready to die like the troops of all ages. There is also a major obstacle presented by the open intervention of the United States in the Indochinese war. One thing at least is sure: the fiction that American military power has been introduced upon demand of a people fighting communism no longer holds today.

Senator MORSE, as Senator from Oregon and a welcome critic of the official policy in Vietnam, I particularly want you to read a copy of my letter to the President:

SAN JOSÉ, COSTA RICA,
April 11, 1965.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I want to thank you for your on-the-whole, excellent speech at Johns Hopkins offering a new resolution to the Vietnam crisis.

I am thrilled with the offer of an extensive development plan for southeast Asia which is to be cooperative in nature and to be administered by the U.N. The sum of \$1 billion seems adequate to do the job and is certainly generous. I approve of your naming Secretary of the U.N., U Thant, as a man who would be in a particularly good position to know the problems and to bring a peaceful solution to this strife-torn area. I was very pleased to have you call upon all the countries of the U.N. to participate in the plan, including Russia.

However, I was not entirely pleased by all of your speech, by any means. You stated that U.S. forces will remain in South Vietnam so that the people of that country will be governed as they wish. I believe that until the whole Vietnam area is neutralized, both North Vietnam and South Vietnam, and all foreign soldiers and equipment are removed from the area—which means American, as well as other—then there will be no hope for a democratic government there. There certainly is not such a government in South Vietnam now. Walter Lippmann has pointed out that even the military dictatorship which is now functioning in South Vietnam only counts the large centers of population under its control and not the open countryside. When we examine American reasons for being in Vietnam, we find them full of superficial thinking and confusion.

I believe that your insistence in the Johns Hopkins speech of continuing air raids against North Vietnam is part of the confusion of U.S. policy toward Vietnam. You offer peace and bountiful self-development with one hand and armed destruction with the other. Which policy is the real policy? Which is what you really mean?

It is time to decide for the peaceful policy of construction with the help of U Thant and the U.N. It is time to face the futility and foolishness of continuing an aggressive military policy in southeast Asia. Such a policy can only stave off the day when you have to come to terms with mainland China on a

live-and-let-live policy for southeast Asia.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. CHESTER M. PATTERSON, Jr.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.,
April 13, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senator FRANK CHURCH.

DEAR SENATORS: You deserve the deep appreciation and utmost support from every citizen, for your efforts to end the disgraceful war in Vietnam. If only the true facts could be presented to everyone, through our mass-communication media, then the war would end tomorrow. Forgive me for not writing three separate, individual letters to each of you, but there are so many letters of protest (not commendation), that I must send to those who favor the administration's insane "escalation" policy.

No doubt your mail is heavy, so I will be brief. I am enclosing a copy of a letter which I wrote to President Johnson (before his recent double-talk speech). Part of his speech seemed conciliatory, but his actions show that he is still following the advice of Goldwater and the military strategists.

I am writing this letter while in a mood of despair and near desperation. Many of my friends say I am just wasting time, sending protest letters to President Johnson, Dean Rusk, McGeorge Bundy, etc., that the ball is rolling too fast now towards big general war for everyone to stop it. If President Johnson will not listen to the advice of wise, principled statesmen such as MORSE, GRUENING, and CHURCH, then there is no chance that an ordinary citizen can make his voice heard.

But, somehow the voices of protest must not be silenced. I have never before taken part in any demonstration, or march for peace or civil rights or anything. But now—now perhaps there is still time for me to take a plane to Washington and join those who will be marching to end the Vietnam war, on April 17.

Please do not allow the war hawks to silence you and I pray that the list of legislators who support your views will grow bigger and bigger. Now I must hurry. I will write protest letters while in Washington.

Most sincerely,

J. L. MINER.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.,
April 4, 1965.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is not easy for an American citizen who loves his country dearly, to speak out critically against actions taken by his President. Yet I cannot keep silent about the horrifying, impractical, and indefensible (both morally and legally) actions which are now being carried out in Vietnam by the U.S. Government.

Last fall I was one of many trusting citizens who really believed that you fully intended to take positive steps toward disengagement in South Vietnam, just as soon as the elections were over. Yes, millions of us ordinary citizens believed your campaign statements and we gave you the "mandate for peace" that you asked for. But now—now you are embracing, and carrying out, the worst aspects of Goldwaterism.

Why, just think how terrible to be sucked into a long, hopeless war such as France tackled for 8 years? What if our casualties should equal those suffered by France? Also the end result would be the same. Are we in South Vietnam at the request of a freely elected and popular government? We do not need a beachhead in southeast Asia anymore than we need a beachhead in Korea, as the advent of nuclear power and ICBM's has made such beachheads obsolete. We have had about 55,000 soldiers guarding the 38th parallel for 15 years. It would take three or

four times that many soldiers to guard the frontiers of South Vietnam, if we should win and then would the Pentagon be satisfied? And would the South Vietnamese people then be allowed to have the free elections that were promised them in the Geneva agreements, or would we find another Diem? Then the military strategists would increase pressure on Cambodia and Laos, saying that we must make the "domino theory" operate in reverse. Then Russia and China would patch up their differences and we would face worldwide nuclear war.

Mr. President, I sincerely believe that you really want to be a good President and to be remembered in our history books as a man of peace. But you are under tremendous pressure. As Columnist Marquis Childs wrote in the Republican San Diego Tribune on April 1, 1965:

"While he [Goldwater] approved the steps taken to carry the war to North Vietnam, he went on to say he had a terrible feeling that turning tail and coming home is what the Johnson administration has in mind. In short he [Goldwater] was identifying the political trap, and if his opponent of last November should fall into it, he will be heard from loud and long."

Mr. President have you forgotten that this man's views were repudiated at the polls overwhelmingly, just last November?

Yes, the Goldwaterites will howl loudly (if you turn away from suicidal war), but not for long. A few Gallup polls will show that the millions who voted for you will applaud your courage, and will reelect you again, and even more overwhelmingly. The moderate Republicans would also applaud and only the Goldwaterites would say you were turning tail but, if you continue to appease the Goldwaterites then you will be handing them a campaign issue on a silver platter. The Republicans will soon begin to talk and act like a peace party saying: "The Democrats always get us into war. Eisenhower stopped Truman's Korean war and now we must elect Gov. George Romney as President so he can stop Johnson's war in South Vietnam."

Mr. President, please listen to wise statesmen like Senators MORSE, GRUENING, and CHURCH.

Sincerely,

J. L. MINER.

CLEVELAND, OHIO,
April 11, 1965.

TO SENATOR WAYNE MORSE:
Re Vietnam.

THE PLAIN DEALER, CLEVELAND, OHIO,
To the Editor:

The President's speech re Vietnam was eloquent but unrelated to reality.

If a resolution to declare war against North Vietnam were introduced in Congress the American people would overwhelmingly oppose it.

The President is responsible for the death of every American boy killed in Vietnam and his illegal, undeclared war there. Furthermore the U.S. Congress has no right to place either the authority, or responsibility for war through resolutions, which give the President the equivalent of the warmaking power which is granted only to the Congress by the U.S. Constitution. Granting the altruism which prompts us to want to aid others, let us not destroy our country in the process. For that is what we shall do, if we allow the President to declare war.

By and large the Vietnamese people want the Americans to get out of Vietnam. If we virtually continue to go it alone in Vietnam, for we are not a world police force, we shall become embroiled in wars all over the world, to the private delight of our allies, who chuckle at our stupidity in sacrificing our men for them in distant parts of the world.

We have no foreign policy except force. We delude ourselves in thinking there is no alternative. The first thing we should do is to

April 21, 1965

Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300150023-8

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

7863

get out of Vietnam forthwith and stop sacrificing the lives of our boys needlessly. By getting out we shall not lose face, but we shall gain the respect of our allies. What our enemies will say is meaningless and so much tripe to be ignored. It is what we do that is important.

We should certainly give our surplus food and more to the hungry peoples of the world. We should not force our presence where we are not wanted, we with our high standard of living, while they struggle to keep body and soul together with their rice plantings.

Our first line of defense is not a battle line. All nations, wake up before we destroy the world. All peace-loving nations join hands and work together, not just the United States.

HARRY A. BLACHMAN,
CLEVELAND, OHIO.

ROSEVILLE, CALIF.,
April 8, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I hope you will permit a Californian to congratulate you on your consistent opposition to President Johnson's policies in South Vietnam. I have just witnessed your reply to the President's speech at John Hopkins University last night and wish to state—for whatever it is worth—that I find myself in complete agreement with your remarks.

California would be fortunate to have such a man as you representing her in the Senate; we have, unfortunately, no such man of your caliber. I have written my Representative [HAROLD JOHNSON], and both my Senators about the atrocities being carried out in the name of democracy in Vietnam; but all, apparently, subscribe to the falling dominoes fallacy.

Both my wife and I want to express our appreciation of your efforts and to beg you to continue in your search for a foreign policy which approaches decency or, at least, eschews the near-genocidal crimes America is responsible for in Vietnam.

Respectfully yours,
DOUGLAS DAVIDSON.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
April 2, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR: Just want you to know how very much I admire your courage to speak out on war in Vietnam and the many other things you stand for. Why can't we have more honest men to represent us in Government. When those leaders in Washington say they are speaking for the masses of this country they are sadly mistaken. I get heart-tick when I hear those Democratic Senators say they are for extending the war in Vietnam. Wish I had the words to express my true feelings toward you few Senators that stand up for justice. I pray for your continued good health and courage.

Sincerely yours,
MRS. LOUISE P. WHITEMAN.

MERRIMAC, MASS.,
April 6, 1965.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I support your views on the Asian situation and commend you for your efforts for peace. I hope you continue. With my thanks.

Sincerely,
JOHN R. RING.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
April 5, 1965.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: May I express my endorsement and appreciation for your position on Vietnam?

We have long come to expect courage and sanity from you on such vital matters as war and peace, and we are fortunate, indeed, to have a man like you in the Congress.

Sincerely yours,
JEROME ENNIS.

WESTPORT, CONN.,
April 5, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I support your position on Vietnam most heartily. Negotiation, through the U.N., and eventual withdrawal of U.S. military forces from Vietnam are policies for the long range—but an immediate stop in the escalation into North Vietnam is essential.

I recently received a copy of a Senate speech from Senator Dobb, which, I believe, completely distorts the facts of the situation. Would you please send me material, such as articles you have written, or speeches you have given, with which to counter Senator Dobb's statements?

Sincerely yours,
GERALD HARRISON.

DEAR SENATOR: I fully support your views on the Vietnam tragedy and have written letters to Senators CHURCH, GRUENING, and MCGOVERN as well as President Johnson to this effect. What else can one do?

Please send, if possible, a copy of your speech last week in Portland.

Truly,
MAC WADDELL,
Naples, Fla.

MARSHALL, VA.,
April 2, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It has been some time now since I have heard your firm voice on TV and I hope I can rouse you on this Vietnam holocaust. The policy this administration has indulged in is progressing from bad to the ludicrous. The people here at home have been advocating our withdrawal from the very beginning and urging it every way we know how but still we are ignored. You know, as we all do, that the mess in Vietnam is far more important than voting rights in the South and yet Martin Luther King is actually dictating to the President and furthermore getting away with it. Just what is our form of government coming to when one black man can say what he wants and gets it and the billions of us who have been pleading for the President to get us out of the mess in Vietnam have made no headway at all. This I cannot understand and I have been asking everywhere what can we do to make ourselves heard.

There's a very intelligent article in the April issue of Pageant called "A Program for Winning the War in Vietnam." I hope you will read it and present it to Congress. This is the way I have always believed freedom should be won; and not by combat. As I have said many times before, wars have never won anything and whatever the outcome we are still the losers. We never have peace but only a lull until we can raise more sons to go at it again. To force us here at home to sacrifice our boys for peace and freedom is indeed the most ridiculous command I have ever heard of. We are not stupid although the administration assumes we are complete idiots and this hurts us as much as an actual slap in the face.

I hope you can provide me with some ammunition to carry on my crusade for a settlement in Vietnam more effectively and that you will read the article I mentioned and get in there and fight for us.

Yours truly,
MRS. FRANCES P. ASHLEY.

PASADENA, CALIF.,
March 23, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to express my full sympathy with your remarks, as reported by the press, on American involvement in Vietnam and American foreign policy in general.

I would be most appreciative if you could send me full texts of pertinent statements made by you during recent months.

Sincerely yours,
GEORGE AID.

WESTWOOD, N.J.,
March 31, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I strongly support your position on Vietnam and I regret that there are so few men of your moral courage and intellectual honesty in American public life today.

There was mention in the press of your intention to make a detailed critique of the State Department's White Paper. Have you made such an analysis? If so, could you tell me now I might obtain a copy of it? I would, of course, be interested in reading any of your other analyses of the situation in Vietnam.

Thank you for keeping up the good fight.
Sincerely,

RAPHAEL J. ETIGSON.

MARCH 31, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: With greatest gratitude for your stance and continuing fight for sanity and for constitutional government.

Very sincerely,
L. T. WYLY.

P.S.—Please send me any available copies of your speeches on Vietnam; one each of what you can.

P.P.S.—I welcome any suggestions for anything I can do.

WILMETTE, ILL.,
March 31, 1965.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On March 5 I sent the following Western Union public opinion message to President Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, Senator Everett M. Dirksen, Senator Paul H. Douglas, and Congressman Donald Rumsfeld, Washington, D.C.:

"I urge you support position 400 professors from 20 universities, New York Times, February 16.

"L. T. WYLY."

In addition to the carefully weighed and convincing reasons which the 400 professors gave in support of their position I urge, also, the following:

1. Our country was founded on the principles expressed in the Declaration of Independence.

2. The meaning of the Declaration of Independence: The first obligation of government is the protection and preservation of the personal security and liberties of the individual.

3. The Constitution and its amendments, the supreme law of the land, was planned and written to implement the Declaration of Independence, to insure a rule of law based on justice and liberty, responsible to the people.

4. Our relations to other nations should be based on justice to all. In the long run, only such a policy will serve our own best interests.

5. All justice is founded on the search for truth.—SOCRATES.

6. The search for truth can be conducted, with hope of success, only by the methods of scientific inquiry.

Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300150023-8

April 21, 1965

"It is the progress which has been made in physics, chemistry, and experimental biology which gives everyone confidence in the procedures of the scientist." Conant, "Science and Common Sense," (1952, p. 45).

7. The search for truth by the methods of science is an intellectual operation. The following do not enter into this search for truth:

Authority, power, force, belief, hope, public opinion, official opinion, personal opinion, propaganda, public relations, vote of legislative body, vote of committee, wishes of a man or group, policy of any nation, or self-interest of any nation.

EXAMPLES: AUTHORITY TRIES UNSUCCESSFULLY TO DECIDE TRUTH

Galileo: Church tried to decide cosmic truth by authority, 1633.¹

Dayton: State tried to decide evolution by authority, 1925.²

Russia: State tried to decide genetics by authority, 1936.³

PERTINENT COMMENT

Trial by ordeal was forbidden by church in 1216.⁴

Trial by combat was outlawed in England in 1819.⁵

Duels were outlawed in England in 1879.⁶ Attempts to obtain court evidence by torture were outlawed in the United States after the Revolution.⁷

8. Roadblocks to search for truth are the following:

(i) Any deceit or falsehood in evidence.

(ii) Any secrecy or suppression of evidence.

(iii) Any ex parte evidence.

(iv) Any bias, prejudice, or conflict of interest on part of judges, witnesses, jurors.

(v) Any attempt to prevent the giving of testimony by harassment of witnesses, coercion, bribery, or undue influence.

(vi) Any attempt to interfere, by force, or otherwise, with freedom of speech, thought, press, investigation, peaceable assembly, or communication.

9. In attempting to solve international controversies truth should be sought in a court of justice; by methods of science as provided by and safeguarded in the U.S. Constitution and its amendments, implemented by modern court procedure.

Wigmore: "The Science of Judicial Proof," 1937.

10. An idea cannot be killed by force. Witness: Christianity and the Roman Empire.

11. Justice between nations, as between men, must conform to Cicero's natural law; "the law of right reason—which is in accordance with Nature."

Hutchins and others: "Natural Law and Modern Society."

Montagu: "On Being Human," 1950, Scientific basis for Cicero.

PERTINENT COMMENT

Cicero's natural law is consistent with and has been embodied in the doctrine of the Christian church.

Montagu's book furnishes a scientific basis for the interpretation of Cicero.

The above two books may easily be the most important to appear in the past century.

EXAMPLES

Three times within the past half century we have seen great dynasties or reichs,

¹ Britannica.

² Britannica.

³ Zirkle: "Death of a Science in Russia," 1949.

⁴ Radin; Anglo-American Legal History, pp. 35-36.

⁵ Radin, pp. 227-228.

⁶ Britannica.

⁷ Radin, pp. 244-246.

planned to endure 1,000 years destroyed apparently by the natural revulsion of mankind against aggressive war.

Plainly, the leaders who planned and directed national policy in these reichs did not understand life, or natural law.

12. It is seldom safe to attempt firm conclusions regarding interpretation scientifically of historical events. However, answers to the following questions, if available, would be pertinent to our situation in Vietnam:

(i) Why were the Romans, despite the use of terrible tortures of thousands of Christians over long periods, unable to stamp out the new religion?

(ii) Why, after nearly half a century of planning, with meticulous attention paid to everything, except human nature, did the Kaiser and his war party lose the Battle of the Marne, and hence lose the war and the Second Reich?

(iii) Why, with the great advantages of armament, initiative, and overwhelming numerical superiority, did Hitler and his war party lose the Battle of Britain, and hence lose World War II and the Third Reich?

(iv) Why, despite the very great amount of arms and money poured by the United States into the support of Chiang Kai-shek's regime, were the Communists able to take over all of China?

(v) Why did the French lose the Battle of Dienbienphu and with it lose Indochina?

(vi) Why, despite the very great amounts of money and armament poured by the United States into Vietnam, have we not won the war?

COMMENT

Mr. President, you have inherited in Vietnam a problem and a policy. The policy has not worked and the problem has steadily worsened. An Asian war now threatens.

Why not work out and establish a new policy? It has been said that the proper subject for the study of mankind is man. Why not study man?

SUGGESTION

(A) Set up at once a high-level Presidential Advisory Committee to seek answers to the questions on page 3 of this letter, and to recommend a policy on Vietnam, with time limit set.

Suggested personnel: Ashley Montagu, Martin Luther King, Jr., Sargeant Shriver, Robert M. Hutchins, Virgil M. Newton, social scientists.

(B) Refer to the World Court, via the United Nations, for adjudication, the problem of Vietnam, together with your proposed new policy: the Johnson policy.

(C) Accept the World Court verdict and implement it wholeheartedly.

NOTE.—The above suggestion is entirely consistent with the recommendations of the 400 professors from 20 universities in the New York Times of February 16.

Sincerely yours,

L. T. WYLY,
American Citizen.

MARCH 30, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I had, in the past, written my approval of your attempts to encourage negotiations in Vietnam.

On March 20, the western edition of the Christian Science Monitor carried an article entitled "Air Raids: U.S. Lid on Debate." The sense of this article along with others point to a movement toward ever greater involvement in a questionable war without even considering alternative solutions.

Since even consideration of alternatives seems to be successfully squelched by proponents of further escalation in official circles, it is more important than ever that alternatives be examined in the light of day by the public. I can think of no greater tragedy than a deepening involvement merely because we didn't think the issue through.

In line with this feeling I would like you to send me some copies of your speech dealing with Vietnam. These will be placed on the social concerns committee table of my church.

Sincerely,

NORMA LITMAN.

SUSQUEHANNA UNIVERSITY,
Selinsgrove, Pa., April 5, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I was very pleased to hear a portion of your public statement of March 30 in which you so courageously called for an end to warmaking by our Government and a beginning of peacemaking in Vietnam.

In this you certainly have the support of more Americans than you may be aware. I hope that this note may be some support to you in your efforts to put a stop to the current illegal and immoral activities being carried out in the name of "freedom" and "justice." It is becoming increasingly clear that the only sensible solutions to the Vietnam impasse are economic and social. If present policies are continued, the results can only be political and moral disaster at home and loss of any semblance of justification abroad.

Yours very truly,

ROBERT G. MOWRY.

CHAMPAIGN, ILL.,
April 5, 1965.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
The Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am horrified by the position and the actions of the administration in the war in Vietnam, and believe that all warlike procedures should be canceled immediately.

I wish to encourage your position on Vietnam and ask you to use any possible influence or powers to bring about:

An immediate cease-fire in Vietnam.
A conference of all nations to negotiate peace.

Sincerely,

MRS. BARBARA BRANDT CHEN.

HEMPSTEAD, N.Y.,
April 4, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORRIS,
Washington, D.C.:

Feel present Vietnam policy too dangerous for expected benefits. Recommend immediate institution of negotiations steps through and if possible or other available channels.
ARNOLD FRANCO.

THORNE, STANTON, CLOPTON, HERZ, &
STANEK,

San Jose, Calif., April 5, 1965

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Those of us who supported and worked for you in the election did so because we felt you would do your utmost to stop the killing of one human being by another anywhere in the world, especially where it involved our own citizens. Polls of all kinds can be taken to give you any answer you might desire, but let me assure you that a poll of the entire American population would undoubtedly overwhelmingly endorse the idea of our getting out of Vietnam.

I think a most effective step that you could take at the present time would be to meet with Senator GRUENING, of Alaska and Senator MORSE, of Oregon. These are fine Americans with the best interests of their country at heart, and I do believe they have something to say which has the support of the vast majority of their fellow Americans.

I think the gesture of your meeting with them to discuss the situation in Vietnam could have great impact, not only here in the

April 21, 1965

Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300150023-8

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

7865

United States, but around the world. Perhaps it could be the start of getting to a conference table where negotiations for ending the senseless war can be culminated.

Very truly yours,

JOHN E. THORNE.

ELCERRITO, CALIF.,
April 3, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I commend you for your customary high purpose and honesty with regard to public criticism of the brutal aggression by our Government in Vietnam. Sincerely yours,

ROLAND R. AUSTIN.

TORRENCE, CALIF.,
April 2, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: Although not a constituent, I have thought for some time to write to commend you, and to express my appreciation, for your courageous, unswerving, and steadfast opposition to American military policy in Vietnam.

But as those responsible for American policy seem determined to pursue their folly to the ultimate folly of nuclear confrontation, if not disaster, it behooves one to encourage those who seek to enable rational resolutions of the conflict in southeast Asia. To that end, I hope this letter will let you know that a great many of us look to you for the spark of leadership to crystallize and effectively make known our opposition to the present course of events.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN F. HORGSON II.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
April 6, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

Urging you to implore Adlai Stevenson resign as protest of administration's insane escalation of Vietnam war.

OLIVER HENDERSON, M.D.
Psychiatrist.

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF.,
March 27, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: At a speech at the University of California last night by Kenneth Armstrong, of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, he referred you as a "Ninny" for your stand on Vietnam, to a group of students discussing the situation after his talk.

It would interest me greatly to know who paid his fare out here and if the Plain Dealer paid his fare, why? And/or who paid them?

Did the USIS maybe pay him, or the Plain Dealer, or a nominee, under a new directive I read about lately by which they are now allotted money to propagandize us domestically as well as our overseas brethren?

Very truly yours,

HUGH FRENCH.

ARLINGTON, VA.,
March 26, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your stand on our actions in Vietnam is heartening to all of us who oppose the administration policy and see around us the signs of a war escalating up and up with no foreseeable end.

It is sad to see the once free and independent press towing the line of McNamara and the Bundy boys. More and more columnists are sounding like Defense Department press releases (William S. White, Alsop, etc.).

Our criminal use of so-called nonlethal gas is just one more sign of our desperate situation in Vietnam and of the hard-headed stupidity of our military planners.

STEVEN HENDEL.

JELINEK & GLICKMAN,
COUNSELORS AT LAW,
New York, N.Y., March 29, 1965.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: Since my last letter, you have received the qualified endorsement of the National Review, that well-known proponent of Barry Goldwater and all that he stood for.

In the issue dated March 23, 1965, the following was written:

"Are these just isolated incidents, of no importance? Do they portend a major strategic turn in U.S. foreign policy, a decision to take a hard line against aggression of all sorts and to protect every last acre of the free world? Probably not. Certainly it's too soon to pronounce the verdict, one way or the other. But these are signs of at least a temporary tactical turn, of a coolheaded effort to test out the will of our own people, of our allies, and of the enemy."

Although one should never be judged by the company one keeps, it should be little source of comfort to you to know that your activities in Vietnam are approved by that voice of extremism.

We can only guess what their reaction will be to the use of gas warfare by the United States for the first time in five decades.

Once again, I join with many in strongly hoping that you will immediately negotiate our withdrawal from Vietnam.

Respectfully yours,

DONALD A. JELINEK.

(Copies to Senator MCGOVERN, Washington, D.C.; Senator WAYNE MORSE, Washington, D.C.)

ARLINGTON, VA.,
March 29, 1965.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: While not a constituent of yours, I feel impelled to write to express my admiration and support for your courageous and outspoken stand on the situation in Vietnam, and to urge you to continue to press for negotiations. Our "save face escalation" in that unfortunate little country seems to have cost us the support of the world. The support which we claim to have from the British Government seems to be most reluctant and uneasy. I am enclosing a troubled editorial from the March 10 edition of the Manchester Guardian.

I hope that those of you in the Senate who support a sane, humane, and constructive policy will exert all your influence to change the perilous course upon which this Nation has almost unwittingly embarked under the urging of our overzealous military establishment.

Very respectfully,

ELIZABETH NORTH.

MR. WILSON ESCAPES FROM VIETNAM

Whether or not the Prime Minister's statements on Vietnam in the Commons yesterday satisfy his Labour critics they are probably as good as we can expect. Disingenuous, of course—particularly the quick references to the 1954 agreements (a very complicated story), and to the change which he sees in the war in recent months. It was not to be supposed that in present circumstances he would flatly contradict the American line. Nor would it have done any good if he had. In fact, his only harsh words were directed neither at Mr. Rusk nor at the critics of his own attitude in the Labour Party, but at Tory attempts to exploit the disagreement between these critics and himself.

Moreover, he did give an impression of activity—talks with Mr. Gromyko next week, the Foreign Secretary's journey to Washington the week after. Probably these efforts will have only a marginal effect on the course of events; the end of the war will almost certainly be determined more by what happens

in South Vietnam than by what happens in London, or even in Paris, Peiping, Moscow, or Washington. So it has been throughout; what Mr. Wilson thinks matters less (as no doubt he realizes) than what a handful of Saigon generals and monks and a whole countryful of other Vietnamese think. That is an additional reason for not wanting to offend the U.S. Government pointlessly. But meanwhile the British Government's efforts combine with those of U Thant, Mr. Lester Pearson, President de Gaulle, and other statesmen to create an atmosphere in which negotiations come to seem natural and inevitable. Here again it is important that some of those adding their mediatory pressure on President Johnson should seem sympathetic to his dilemma.

There are, of course, limits. Washington's good opinion is not the sole factor in our foreign policy. It is deeply disturbing that a report has been circulated giving the impression that the British Government supports the U.S. air strikes against North Vietnam. This report has been printed in foreign newspapers and broadcast in the United States. It naturally shocked Mr. Vladimir Dedijer, as he made clear in a letter to the Times yesterday and it must have shocked many others whom we like to feel well disposed toward us. Apparently it arose from a misunderstanding of something a Government spokesman said. It must be untrue; when Mr. Wilson was asked yesterday by a Conservative Member of Parliament for an assurance that the Government was "supporting the U.S. Government in the actions which they have taken," it was noticeable that he evaded a direct answer. Instead, he took refuge in the truism that "if the 1954 agreements were observed, there would be no problem." But a more definite denial of the harmful report is needed. The British Government may not feel able to condemn the raids, but it is not called upon to approve them.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
March 29, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It becomes increasingly clear that our Vietnam policy is lacking any kind of moral or ethical base and I know I speak for many friends when I ask for an immediate cease fire in Vietnam and immediate use of U Thant's formula for negotiations.

Sincerely,

JAMES D. PROCTOR.

BRONX, N.Y.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I appeal to you to urge the President to replace Gen. Maxwell Taylor with a civilian representative as envoy to Vietnam. His (the General's) questionable advice and statements seem to have outraged public opinion—both home and abroad, have escalated the war tremendously and dangerously, and created distrust of our declared policy of negotiation in Vietnam.

A military mind can furnish only a military solution to a political problem.

Sincerely yours,

SOLOMON SCHIFF.

SYRACUSE, N.Y.,
March 5, 1965.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The strafing and bombing of installations in North Vietnam and Laos can be interpreted only as another serious step in the escalation of the war in southeast Asia. In this thermo-nuclear age, such an action by the U.S. Government must be termed highly dangerous. Given the

Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300150023-8

harsh realities of the South Vietnamese conflict—the indigenous nature of the Vietcong troops and the authoritarian and unpopular character of the Saigon ruling clique—it seems to be a desperate and futile measure as well.

As a group of Syracuse area faculty members who have studied the growing American involvement in what was formerly Indochina, both in terms of America's moral posture and American national interest, we urge you to consider a solution to the crisis which will involve an end to the unilateral U.S. military presence and an effort to neutralize the area under international control.

Very truly yours,

Elias Balbinder, Irwin Deutscher, Joseph Julian, Keith Olsen, Arnold Honig, Harry Schwaylander, J. W. Trischka, Roland E. Wolseley, Seymour Bellin, Stewart Kranz, Reginald Manwell, Earl George, Louis Skoler, Byron Fox, Henry Woessner, Klaus H. Heberle, David H. Bennett, George Moutafakis Nanavatie, R. James A. Smith, Gordon Kent, William W. West, Robert H. Hardt, James L. Brain, Louis Krasner, David Dobereiner, Robert Root, Peter G. Bergen, Erich M. Harth.

CLEVELAND, OHIO,
March 27, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Keep up the good work you are doing in trying to help us stop this war in Vietnam. My husband and I are 100 percent behind your efforts.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ELMER S. NEWMAN.

WILLOWS, CALIF.,
April 2, 1965.

HONORABLE SIR: I have been thinking how stupid it is for us to be bombing North Vietnam. It would be just as logical for us to bomb Canada or Mexico to make Cuba submit. The old proverb if you build a better mousetrap they will beat a path to your door. Well we have had a better trap for years. But I have begun to wonder if the spring hasn't been broken. If the right bait is in the trap the mouse will come—get in by himself. But you can set a trap and try to drive the mouse in—it is impossible. Seems we are trying the latter. I admire you very much.

Respectfully,

ROY BEEVERS.

SILVER SPRING, Md.,
April 3, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your firm stand for negotiations to end the Vietnam fighting.

You have demonstrated tremendous courage in bringing the real issues to the attention of the American people. Please continue your good work.

Cordially,

JEROME OELBAUM.

EL CERRITO, CALIF.

DEAR SIR: I would like to congratulate you for your stand on Vietnam. That this hoax is being perpetrated in the name of freedom and democracy is incredible. The acceptance of this hoax by the American people is saddening. The platitudes voiced by the bulk of the U.S. Senate are sickening. Your voice is refreshing. I thank you.

Sincerely,

DENNIS C. WRIGHT.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,

April 4, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just a note to let you know that I agree with your position on Vietnam.

I have written to this effect to the White House, especially pointing out my agreement with the ad in today's New York Times, "In the name of God, stop it."

Very truly yours,

AUGUSTUS MORRIS.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,

April 3, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We thank you for your stand demanding negotiations in Vietnam.

We hope you will continue to speak up in this cause. We believe that American withdrawal from Vietnam will have to be part of the most satisfactory possible solution.

Respectfully,

Mr. and Mrs. HERBERT MENZEL.

NEWTON, MASS.,

April 3, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My daughter who is in sixth grade came home a few weeks ago in a rush of resentment and chagrin. Only she and a few others had taken the position after a class debate on Vietnam that we should get out of the place and out of Asia as well. What particularly disappointed her was that some of the smartest kids in the class were for keeping it up in Vietnam.

Well, sixth graders don't have much power, but people in high places do, even the smartest ones. We know people like yourself have a tough position to maintain. We want you to know we're all for you. We have written to President Johnson and our Senators expressing our firm opposition to our dangerous policy in Vietnam.

Sincerely yours,

MIRIAM SIPERIN.

P.S.—My daughter has not given up trying to convince the sixth grade of their folly. She, as well as our junior high daughter, say you're "cool."

BROOKFIELD, WIS.,

April 3, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I read with a great deal of interest the report in today's Milwaukee Journal of your debate with Senator PROXMIER at Portland. I heartily approve of your position. The situation, a mistake from the beginning, is worsening all the time with a useless outlay of billions. We must get out for the sake of erasing the negative image and the charge of imperialism which is arising in so many countries, especially in Asia and Africa. Some way must be found through the mediation of the U.N. or some other peaceful means of "saving face" if that is necessary. But we must get out.

Congratulations to you. Keep up the good work. I have expressed my disappointment over his stand to Senator PROXMIER; and I did it with a great deal of real regret as I agree with him on more issues than I disagree. But this time he is just on the wrong side.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. LAZENBY,
Professor Emeritus,
University of Wisconsin.

APRIL 1, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to thank you for representing us so well in your courageous stand on Vietnam.

Several weeks ago I was asked to spend a Saturday afternoon passing out leaflets urging negotiations on Vietnam for the Women's Strike for Peace. I was about to say no when I heard on the radio that you were urging the same course of action. Your statement made me feel that if someone as respectable and prominent as you took such a stand it certainly must be OK to follow my own inclinations on the matter. I passed out the leaflets.

I cannot help but feel that the horrors we are perpetrating in Vietnam will eventually be visited on us and, as a mother, I thank you for your effective leadership on behalf of sanity.

Sincerely,

Mrs. MARGARET BONNEFIL.

LAGUNA BEACH, CALIF.,

April 1, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I strongly admire the stand you take against the American war hawks. President Johnson preaches peace and practices war to the utmost.

I hope sanity will return to the White House in time to save the world from utter destruction by the war lords.

More strength to you and those like you.

Respectfully,

FOSTER WILLHIDE.

MARCH 31, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I thank you from the bottom of my heart for your courageous position on Vietnam. If we do not get out now, it will be to our eternal shame and the world will not forget. We brandish our powerful arsenal like any bully on a street corner. If we live, you will soon be in the majority. The American people's hearts are not in this burning and bombing of peoples even though they may not be too clear on where the truth lies. Goldwater is gloating.

Again I thank you.

Sincerely,

MARION KINNEY.

NEW YORK CITY,

April 3, 1965.

Senator JACOB JAVITS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: Heartfelt congratulations to you, Senator COOPER, Senator AIKEN, for blending into a responsible voice demanding more than news management by the President to explain the use of power without policy in southeast Asia.

Your 4-point "general principles for honorable negotiation" (cease-fire * * * super vision thereof * * * a South Vietnam with free institutions * * * and normalization of * * * economic relations between North and South Vietnam), though 11 years late, is of course the sine qua non of preventing further escalation.

However, I predict, based on my analysis of the situation (you may not be willing to publicly admit your concurrence), that the following will ultimately be proven correct:

1. As price for election support Johnson agreed to permit Goldwater escalation campaign planks to go into effect if elected:

a. Pentagon would practice—policy statements, or managed rationalizations would follow:

b. Weapons testing (gas, etc., what next?) in South and North Vietnam and neighboring countries would be a purely military de-

April 21, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

7867

cision, and Johnson would voice no protest if used;

c. The consensus of American opinion expressed to House and Senate Members, if against escalation and testing above, would be an exception to Johnson's obedience to his politics of consensus rule.

2. An agreement exists with Chiang, made God knows how long ago, pledging United States might to risk and if necessary fight China (and any allies) in his interest, regardless of changing world situations or justice to Asian peoples. This agreement also provides that United States will (would) never sit down in the same U.N. with representatives of the 700 million real Chinese. And it provides (a later codicil in a world suicide pact?) for the earliest possible nuclearization of Japan.

3. That in the 1950's American economic policy (the National Economic Council abnegating world leadership by example) subverted civilian economic and human productivity (butter) to military overkill stockpiling and space programs—a parasitic growth profiting the few via incredible waste of technical human manpower and hardware at the expense of domestic nonhardware industry and the use of America's productivity of real humanly needed goods and their distribution around the world.

In short, by economically planning the parasitic, wasteful, growth in hardware and space industry, America in the 1950's and 1960's became in all major civilian industries a second-rate producer in world markets * * * ruined its banking and gold standing in the world * * * and caused the following:

Two-thirds of America's paycheck dollar earned by working for Overkill and space-racing;

Only token funds available for domestic programs to create better than 97 physicians per 100,000 population (1963 figures) * * * for new teachers and new schools to replace firetraps * * * for nursery schools * * * for programs against pollution of air and water, waste and plunder of our natural resources * * * for the rebuilding of civilian industries like shipbuilding (we built 40 in 1964, while Russia built over 600, and Japan captured the free world markets), like fishery technology (we are 20 years behind, hire foreign advice), like railroads (the mayhem here needs no comment), like housing (outmoded building designs and methods—and outrageous graft—keep building down, and so make slums of old and new the source and result of our rapidly increasing impoverishment and demoralization of fully one-third of our citizens, black and white), like machine tool and printing equipment companies (lack of economic planning has forced these to produce overseas, or import, in epidemic proportions) * * * and so on ad nauseam.

The export to the developing nations around the world of similar parasitic growth, the subversion of their populations' energies and budget to similar economic planning, which their economies can even less endure than our, and the creation around the world of an image of United States pursuing military power and space technology out of all proportion to human needs, morals, and alues at home and abroad.

The above analysis, from a variety of sources and researches far superior to my humble same, will appear increasingly in the near future, in a variety of forms. I send it to you now in hopes it will stimulate your more careful analysis of the Vietnam situation and its sinister implications, and open up your mind to the larger picture of the depletion at epidemic rate of America's resources and people in the service of "guns" at the expense of "butter."

I am sending copies to my friend JOHN LINDSAY, as well as to Senator KENNEDY (ROBERT) and Senator WAYNE MORSE. I would

welcome any communication supporting weakness in any part of my argument.

Respectfully yours,

HOWARD PLUMMER.

Copies, per above final paragraph.

NEW YORK CITY, N.Y.,

April 3, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: Realizing full well the probability of its quick trip to the wastebasket, I send you the enclosed comments on the Vietnam situation, its political prelection background as I feel forced to view it, and an overview of the depletion and subversion of the real human and economic strengths of our country.

All for your consideration in depth, comment welcome of course.

All presented with the utmost dedication and skill of which I am capable, and hoping against hope someone will prove I am wrong or, if I am right, set partisan politics and greed aside long enough to commit themselves to the revolution necessary in American military and economic policies to alter our suicide course in both areas.

Publication will result, in time I trust, from a more careful presentation of the above. Your comments now will be of course extremely helpful in making that piece true-to-fact and well-balanced. However, the briefest of comment will be profoundly appreciated.

Respectfully yours,

HOWARD PLUMMER,

Enc.: copy, letter this date to Senator JAVITS.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,

April 3, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
The U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: You have consistently spoken out against this deplorable war in Vietnam, correctly foreseeing our increasing involvement and the impossibility of our goals there. Unfortunately, most others in public office are unwilling to discuss openly the issues involved, and the premises upon which our policy is based. We are grateful for your outspokenness. You inspire in us a mighty urge to move to Oregon.

Your admirers,

CAROL and ANDREW DUNCAN.

WELLESLEY, MASS.,

April 4, 1965.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your courageous fight for negotiation and peace in Vietnam has my wholehearted support. Many others I know who are not writing you also support your stand.

Sincerely yours,

KATHERINE LEVER.

TOWARD FREEDOM,

CHICAGO, ILL.,

April 3, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your continuing fight against our Vietnamese adventure. The prospects for negotiations look slightly better now—probably due in large part to the efforts of you and your colleagues of like mind—but there is still a long way to go.

I am enclosing back copies of "Toward Freedom" which illustrate our long-time interest in giving the Vietnamese people a chance to determine their own fate. In addition, your name is on our regular list and you should have received our January issue with a main article by Hoang Van Chi, an anti-Communist Vietnamese, who courageously examines American misconceptions and mistakes about his country. If your copy

of this issue has been misplaced we will be glad to send you another on request.

Permit me to call your attention particularly to our suggestion of a "pro people" swap agreement: we would accept popular elections in all Vietnam in return for Soviet acceptance of all-German elections. Elections may seem a long way in the future in the present excruciating Vietnam situation, but I feel that we must envisage and plan for a turn toward ballots instead of bullets unless we are to make a mere propaganda pitch out of democracy. After all we con- nived in depriving the Vietnamese of the chance to use ballots in 1956, so it's not too surprising that they turned to bullets instead. We certainly must have proposals for going back and taking the ballot way.

The British were the first to push the partition idea in 1954, and now they have come up with something almost equally poisonous: the garrisoning of Vietnam by Red Chinese and American troops to maintain order. How can it be called a peace move to bring United States and Chinese troops face to face? India provided 6,000 troops for the prisoner exchange supervision in Korea, and neutral troops could also be found for Vietnam—say a combination of Philippines, Burma, Malaysia, Ethiopia, and Ghana.

I believe that constructive moves on Vietnam are of the utmost importance. Let me know if there is anything I can do to help.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. LLOYD, JR.,

Editor.

PRINCETON, N.J.,

April 4, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to thank you for the courageous stand you have been taking in opposing American escalation of the war in Vietnam. In doing so you are performing a great service for the people of your State and the entire United States. If there were more men of your caliber this would be a safer, more prosperous, and happier world to live in. Keep up the good work.

Cheers,

JOEL EPSTEIN.

APRIL 3, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I only wish we had more people like you in important places who would speak out against the folly of southeast Asia. People who do not have to worry about what may happen to them in the future for speaking their piece.

May God give you the grace to keep up the good work. There are not enough like you.

ARCHIE J. JAMES.

MESQUITE TREE RANCH,

THERMAL, CALIF.,

April 1, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My reason for taking your time with this letter is the serious dilemma of Vietnam and your interest in finding a way out. I want to suggest a possibility, based on "War, Revolution—or Co-operation on the Mekong," the main article heading the Wells "Between the Lines" Newsletter of March 1, 1965.

Walter Lippmann, in his March 19 column says our present policy will not work and will lead to disaster, either by military defeat, escalation of the war, or our expulsion from the area by a Vietnamese deal with the Vietcong. Mr. Lippmann says our policy is all stick and no carrot. The missing ingredient is a sketch of the settlement our bombing is designed to bring about.

Quoting the March 1 Wells Newsletter:

The most tragic shortcoming of U.S. policy in southeast Asia has been the failure to cooperate with and use the great Mekong

April 21, 1965

delta development program as a means for curbing and defeating communism. * * * This is an immense and bold plan for land, agriculture, water, and power * * * that unites all factions in the four nations of the delta, Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, and South Vietnam. * * * This imaginative project provides a framework in which all free nations could join under the U.N. but with very little U.N. expenditures. * * * It could be supported by only a small fraction of the cost of the war.

Instead of bombing the fragile industries of North Vietnam we could be offering them incalculable benefits for cooperation. * * * The United States could use the project as a basis for a negotiated peace, withdrawing our military and substituting a new free Asia emergency peace force—troops from Thailand, India, Japan, the Philippines—while concentrating all strength and energy on the development program. The Communists would not dare alienate all Asia by attacking such a representative peace force, nor would they dare to sabotage the Mekong project.

Mr. Wells lists reference articles on the Mekong project. Before we destroy Hanoi or bomb Red China, why not explore this possibility? If you do not read the "Wells Newsletter" and desire a copy of the March 1 issue, I could have one sent to you.

I am a conservative Republican.

Very respectfully,

HORACE HAGERTY.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,

April 4, 1965.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I express my gratitude for your courageous and conscientious effort for negotiations in the Vietnam war. I wrote to President Johnson in support of the pleas by the clergymen's emergency committee on Vietnam "In the Name of God, Stop It" (New York Times of April 4, 1965).

This urgent plea by the thousands of men of God deserves the support of every humane Senator, and thank God that we still have a Senator like you in these critical days.

Respectfully,

I. A. BRUNSTEIN.

(P.S.—The tragedy of it all: We defeated Goldwater only to see Goldwaterism triumphant.)

NEW YORK, N.Y.,

April 3, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: May I express my sincere support of your courage and consistency in calling for U.S. withdrawal from South Vietnam and the placement of the problem before the United Nations.

Sincerely,

JOHANNA GRANT.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,

April 5, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We encourage your efforts to bring responsible discussion of the Vietnam war before our Nation.

MENNONITE CONGREGATION OF BOSTON.

POMONA, CALIF.,

March 23, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As an American citizen I am firmly behind you in your fight to find a better solution to Vietnam than the one the present administration is now following.

I believe our actions over there have erased all of the good will our country has won throughout the world. Unfortunately our

actions have unmasked us as a naked aggressor in a land thousands of miles from our borders. Any justification for this must go down in history as a rebirth of the Nazi Weltanschauung.

It is impossible for me as an American, who has been brought up in the traditions of equal rights before the law, self-determination, and fair play, to accept that for the first time in our history the rest of the world can justifiably label us as an out-and-out aggressor in a foreign land.

I fear that if things continue as they have in Vietnam the "war hawks," who seem to be controlling the situation, will resort to nuclear weapons and probably bombs in desperation. Our action over there must be stopped before its too late.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM T. ANDERSON.

APRIL 3, 1965.

SENATOR MORSE: This is to endorse your position regarding the peaceful settlement of the war in Vietnam.

Respectfully,

HERBERT E. ISAACSON.

PAULA D. ISAACSON.

BRONX, N.Y.,

April 3, 1965.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I wish to state my support of your opposition to the administrative policy in Vietnam.

Yours truly,

STEPHAN FRIEDBERG.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,

April 2, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: While I am not one of your constituents and will probably never be able to cast a vote for you as Senator, still I find that you most frequently speak for me on a majority of issues. For this reason I am writing you today to urge you to continue your efforts to conclude our involvement in Vietnam.

This situation may already have gone too far to avoid general war, but so long as there is any hope, do please use all your powers of persuasion not only to prevent further spread of the fighting, but also to end our military participation in the affairs of Vietnam.

It does not seem to me the proper way to correct an old mistake by making new blunders.

Sincerely yours,

ROSEMARY H. DAVIS.

KIMBERLY, B.C., CANADA,

April 8, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: From time to time, I have been reading your anxious views on the conflict in Vietnam. I am interested to know what you think of President Johnson's offer (April 7, Johns Hopkins University) for unconditional talks to end the dreadful war in Vietnam. Mr. Johnson said the United States would not leave South Vietnam until the country has secure peace free from outside interference. Are we to assume from this that the President has not changed the U.S. position? I thought his ideas for reconstruction in southeast Asia excellent. However, if the United States remains ready to carry on its military effort in South Vietnam and against the north, in the final outcome will there be anything left to reconstruct? Make no mistake, we in this country share your grave concern over this costly war.

I would sincerely appreciate hearing your views on the latest development.

Yours truly,

Mrs. EARL PEDERSON.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,

BERKELEY, CALIF.,

April 14, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I heartily endorse your stand on Vietnam and am quite thankful that there is still a visible, vocal and intelligent opposition in the Senate. I sincerely hope and pray that you and others like you have some effect on U.S. policy in Vietnam.

I would appreciate any material or literature, including the State Department's white paper, on the Vietnam situation.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR LIEBMAN.

MANSFIELD, OHIO,

April 13, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Many thanks for your service to the people in giving much needed information on the war in Vietnam. It is hoped that your voice will never be stilled by the threat of dams or any other favors to your State, for if the present policy is pursued to its ultimate conclusion there will be no need for dams or anything else anywhere.

In all wars of history, religion has played its part either in instigating or blessing the participants and there are vague hints that there are religious issues at stake in Vietnam. Otherwise, it doesn't seem that those Buddhist monks would seek to publicize their side of the controversy by such violent means as burning themselves to death. Such behavior suggests that a way of life is being forced upon them that is inimical to their sense of justice.

I am wondering if you could give me information or suggest reading material concerning this phase of the war.

Again thanking you for your almost single-handed fight in the Senate and urging you to remember, in lonely moments, that there were "7,000 in Israel who had not bowed the knee to Baal." All people of good will will be grateful to you for your fearless advocacy of a more lenient policy in Vietnam.

Very sincerely,

ALICE G. BEER.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.,

April 16, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have recently read an article by Bertrand Russell entitled "Free World Barbarism: The War of Atrocity in Vietnam" (Minority of One, December 1964) which has left me seriously disturbed and anxious to discover additional and reliable information on the political nature of the struggle in South Vietnam.

Russell and others have described the national liberation front as "indigenous" and have asserted that the uprising in Vietnam against the Diem and subsequent governments is a national one. It seems to me critical that one know the truth of this assertion for the reason that one cannot pass judgment on the political validity of the U.S. role in the suppression of the Vietcong (NLF) without understanding just what and who our Government has determined to crush.

A document that would indicate the origins of the front, its leadership and their backgrounds, and the nature and source of its support is sorely needed. This kind of information is simply not available (as far as I have been able to discover) in the American press. I cite to you David Halbertram's article in the January edition of Commem-

tary magazine, "Getting the News Out of Vietnam," as illustrative of the distortion and unreliability of American news coverage in Vietnam in most recent years.

I would be most appreciative of any references you are able to suggest that report a comprehensive and reliable description of the national liberation front. Foreign periodicals (British, French, or German) would be most acceptable. In addition, I would like a copy of the U.S. white paper on Vietnam.

I know that you for one have been most critical of our role in Vietnam, and I assume that your position is based on information and facts that do not give credence to our present Vietnam strategy. The abysmal horror and destruction of fellow human beings in that far off land by Americans does not rest easy on this citizen's mind. I would appreciate any information you are able to provide.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID M. BLICKER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
April 12, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: A friend has lent me a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the Senate for April 1, 1965, and I want to congratulate and commend you on your courageous stand demanding a United Nations cease-fire order as the beginning of a negotiated peace in Vietnam.

However I have not been able to finish all the excellent statements which you succeeded in getting printed in the RECORD for April 1, since I had to return the copy, and I would like if it is possible to have this issue of the RECORD for my files.

You probably don't remember me but if you think back to the days when you were dean of the University of Oregon Law School and an arbitrator for the longshore union you may remember a young United Press correspondent going to the university in Eugene and working on the Eugene Register-Guard who used to pick up copies of your decisions. I was that reporter and it was my job to digest the decisions and wire overhead to Portland a 100- or 150-word version for news stories that went up and down the Pacific coast, and I suppose also to the east coast if the dockside issue was important enough.

Now I have my own news agency in Los Angeles, serving weekly neighborhood papers with reports on local government. The publishers who buy my service are almost uniformly conservative and would not print any column of mine stating my views pointblank about our aggression in Vietnam. But I am enclosing a column which contains one single paragraph which compares the Asian situation to George Orwell's predictions of "1984" so you can see how I feel.

Without voices such as yours and Senator GRUENING's the United States would be in a sorry state. The conservatives control the pipelines of news and opinions and those of us who feed material into these pipelines are often foreclosed from warning our readers and listeners of the dangers of nuclear disaster. But I at least write the truth as I see it and if I can't take a stand against would never write a word apologizing for what I think is morally wrong and stupid in the bargain.

I wish you well. I've followed your career for more than 25 years and you are a credit to Oregon, the Senate, and your country.

Very cordially yours,

RDGELY CUMMINGS.

P.S.—You are free to insert this into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD if you think it would do any good.

RDGELY CUMMINGS.

CIVIC CENTER SPOTLIGHT
(By Ridgely Cummings)

Phase II includes animal exhibit groups in five continental areas with each area planted with trees and shrubs native to that continent. Actually there are six continents if my grade school geography was accurate but Europe and Asia are being combined into one, Eurasia. This for some reason reminds me of George Orwell's "1984" and the constant wars between three world powers, two of them ganging up on the third, then switching sides and rewriting history to make it appear they had always been allies with their present partners. This may come to pass yet in our time with Red China, Soviet Russia, and the United States and its economic dependencies as the three, but I had better get back to the subject at hand, the safer subject of animals and my little daughter's reaction to same.

BRONX, N.Y.

Senator W. MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Every U.S. Senator should read Hans Morgenthau's article in the April 18 edition of the New York Times magazine section. His analysis of the course of our present policy and actions in Vietnam are terrifying and foreboding.

The President should be urged to revise the present policy to conform with a pragmatic political policy suggested by Morgenthau, otherwise an ensuing Asian war could have catastrophic consequences for us and the rest of the world.

SOL SCHIFF.

BERKELEY, April 18, 1965.

SENATOR MORSE: Many of us are with you in your struggle to stop the senseless killing in Vietnam in the name of what has been called the big lie.

President Johnson is branding the world with his deadly L.E.J. in the name of "peace, freedom, and America." Immune to words of sense, of mercy, of humanity, he would use those instead and profane their meaning. Like the King of Lilliput, he makes a benevolent proclamation and proceeds to his dastardly deeds of bombing.

I have marched, I have written, and will continue although it sometimes seems futile. We cannot give up—yet, I wish I could be more effective—have you any suggestions? 15,000 march on the White House and President Johnson refuses to stop bombing as he speaks of peace.

Please, please continue your heroic and sensible efforts—shout the truth as loud as you can, for as long as you can—I, we, see it is our only hope in a world rapidly heading toward its own destruction.

Sincerely,

SANDRA DIKSHA.

SEATTLE, WASH.,
April 18, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As Johnson's war in Vietnam is escalated toward a global conflict, we are ever more grateful that you and Senator GRUENING continue to speak out against this shameful action by our beloved country.

More and more Americans join you in efforts to achieve a cease-fire and negotiations. Yesterday 200 of us marched in a peace witness in Bellingham instituted by the American Friends Service Committee. We heard two University of Washington professors talk on the right to protest and the wrong of the U.S. war in Vietnam. One used much of your argument in calling for an end to our shameful participation in this civil war.

We work for peace here and know you will continue to do the same in the Senate. For peace.

LYLE MERCER.

OSWEGO, N.Y.,
April 17, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Keep up the fight against our murderous activity in Vietnam. We are proud of you for your courage. Hope you can get through to the President and Dean Rusk but it seems hopeless.

We are with you. Wish there were direct aid to give. Is there?

Sincerely,

WARREN E. STEINKRAUS.

FREMONT, CALIF.,
April 5, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As a graduate of the University of Oregon, I feel that I am an Oregonian. I have long supported your courageous stand on South Vietnam, that the problem should have long since been submitted to the United Nations. Such action would not only have demonstrated our genuine willingness to preserve world peace, but would have branded the Communists as aggressors in the eyes of the world. Our continued support of a corrupt regime which lacks the moral and material support of its citizens seems destined to failure. At best all we can hope to create is an artificial situation which will collapse soon after our troops are withdrawn.

McGeorge Bundy, on a press interview Sunday, April 4, 1965, appeared to evade directly answering questions posed to him on American opposition to our policy in South Vietnam. Bundy's remarks on television seem to lend support to former State Department adviser Owen Lattimer's charge that the State Department "hushes everybody up by saying, 'we know all the facts.'"

I feel that such State Department high-handedness is doing irreparable harm to our democratic institutions. It seems that our State Department officials are presuming to act for the American people without consulting the very people whom they profess to represent. Perhaps the present administration should be reminded that the Constitution was created by and for the American people.

Yours truly,

BERT K. ROBERTS.

APRIL 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Without fail—everytime we hear on the radio—what you have to say on any issue—and particularly Vietnam, we are overwhelmed with gratitude that you are there and saying what you are saying.

SANDRA SKAVDON.

BELMONT, MASS.,
April 7, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We ask for an immediate cease fire in Vietnam and for prompt application of the U Thant formula for negotiation.

Sincerely,

LARRY BADER.

VALLEJO, CALIF.,
April 8, 1965.

President JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: We want you to know that we are against the war in Vietnam. We support Oregon Senator WAYNE

7870

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

April 21, 1965

MORSE and his views on the terrible things that the U.S. Government is doing in Asia.

Stop this dirty, unjust war against people of Vietnam.

Yours truly,

cc: Oregon Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We have also written this same letter to California Senators GEORGE MURPHY and KUCHEL.

IRENE BYERS,
WARREN BYERS.

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF.,
April 7, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As I recall it, the Constitution says Congress has the right to declare war. Of course, it did not define war exactly; but it seems to me that bombing another country every day regularly might well be considered a state of war.

It seems to me there might be considerable mileage in some Senators or Representatives attempting to assert the ancient rights of Congress at the present time?

Best wishes,

IRVING F. LAUCKS.

JERSEY CITY, N.J.
April 8, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from Oregon,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It was mentioned over the air Saturday morning, April 3, that you had a discussion or debate with Wisconsin Senator PROXMIER in San Francisco or Los Angeles, on our private undeclared war on the Vietnam people who are fighting for freedom from their oppressors, the rulers we in the United States are forcing on them in the name of preserving democracy for the freedom-loving people in South Vietnam, and that our democratic and freedom-loving warmongers in Washington will fight for that freedom even if they have to kill every non-combatant man, woman, and child living in North or South Vietnam by incendiary bombs, napalm bombs, gas bombs, and ordinary dynamite bombs dropped by the tons by our men serving as consultants or advisers to the Vietnam armed forces we are creating, training, supporting, and paying for with our sons' lives and with our own taxpayers' money in the billions.

It's our men, planes, and ships that are doing most of the killing and committing wanton murder like Hitler did to the Jews and to all others who opposed his ideas of solving the race problem.

I believe that we are committing a greater crime against humanity than Hitler because it was the United States that plunged into World War I and II, which wars took over 75 million lives and property destroyed worth hundreds of billions of dollars to make the world safe from future wars and hatred and to permit self-determination of governments by the people and for the people—not governments forced on them by outside powers. Colonization and slavery was supposed to be out.

What are we doing in southeast Asia? What kind of an example for freedom and peace are our ruling clique in Washington displaying for the newly created governments?

How can our President, and my friend, Lyndon B. Johnson, who is fighting so hard for rights and improvements to our people in our United States criticize and condemn the crimes and shameful acts committed by our own extreme right group, yet permit the shameful crimes we are committing in Africa with the Tshombes and in southeast Asia with the gangster rulers whom we have put in a position to rule their people by oppression and mass murder. These rulers are

sitting on top of a government supported by our bayonets, money and military might—not by the wishes of the great majority of their citizens.

Dear Mr. Senator, what can we do here in the United States to arouse the conscience of enough Senators and Congressmen to stop this shameful undeclared wanton murder of innocent people who are paying the supreme penalty for something they don't know what it's all about.

Does our war clique in Washington really want to bring this undeclared private war to an atomic war climax? What then?

I am certain that there are enough decent and liberal thinking Senators and Congressmen in the Senate and House, and many millions of citizens in the United States who are willing to support them morally, and financially if necessary, to stop this shameful undeclared private war which is being pursued under the guise of saving democracy for the freedom-loving people.

Why the hypocrisy? Why not have the United Nations take over the responsibility of handling this situation as proposed by U.N. Secretary U Thant?

Smart people are those that admit their mistakes and try to make amends without face saving and schemes.

Please mail me a copy of your recent debate with Wisconsin Senator PROXMIER (in San Francisco or Los Angeles) who was elected on a liberal platform of the LaPollettes but is now singing a different song.

Very truly yours,

SAMUEL KIPNIS.

DAYTONA BEACH, FLA.,
April 6, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I am so disgusted with the stand our Florida Senators take on the war in Vietnam, that I am writing to you. The U.S. image is being blackened by bombings, strafings, and burnings of peasants and homes in Vietnam. This is in direct opposition to our policy at home—where we oppose such acts on a lesser scale by the KKK, White Citizens Council, etc. If we oppose terror at home, why should we not oppose it in Vietnam?

From what I can understand the people of Vietnam want to be left alone—and only a few Vietnamese plus military personnel want the war to continue.

My plea to you—please do all you can to stop this war.

Sincerely,

Mrs. E. L. BAKER,

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
April 8, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am glad to see the beginnings of a change in our Vietnam policy and I must commend you on your stand. I must add, however, that I would like to see an immediate cease-fire there and use of U Thant's formula for negotiations.

Sincerely yours,

PAULA JHEWIN.

APRIL 8, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You may feel very much in the minority but I know many Americans support your conscientious stand on U.S. involvement in Vietnam. Stay strong.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. HOBSDON.

FLINT, MICH.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I wish that, if possible, you would get time for a national broadcast in

reply to President Johnson's message to be delivered tonight. I believe "our action" in Vietnam are uncalled for. I have protested to the President and to some of the Senators about U.S. action there. I consider it an invasion of North Vietnam.

I may not have agreed with you on any other controversial question, but I am glad you have spoken out against our war there. When "our" approved rulers had charge there, there were murders, I believe, until they were slain.

Yours for a responsible America,

FRANK REEDER.

SEATTLE, WASH.,
March 5, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
The Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You have honestly and fearlessly voiced your opinion to some of the gravest issues facing the world today.

I fully share your views and pray, the Lord may give you strength and time, strength enough and time enough for your noble efforts to make this world a better one.

I pray for you, and I thank you from the bottom of my heart.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH GUENTHER.

I most heartily commend your stand regarding Vietnam. Many of us are definitely opposed to present administration policy there. In my opinion our tactics there—just plain war—are dangerous, illegal, and expensive in life and money.

More power to you.

Very truly yours,

MARIE LANDEN.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
April 5, 1965.

Once again I heartily agree with your remarks re Vietnam. It seems to get us nowhere—but don't stop hollering. Will you?

K. H. BALD.

APRIL 8, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR: I agree that peace cannot be bought in Vietnam.

The first "condition" of peace is a stable regime—on the ground—and this seems to be what the NCF has.

General, world reaction will be—beware of Greeks bearing peace in bombing planes.

Respectfully,

HARRIS RUSSELL.

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
BUFFALO, N.Y.,
April 7, 1965.

HON. WAYNE L. MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to let you know that I have the highest respect and admiration for your position on Vietnam and on the other issues of international policy.

I admire your honesty, integrity and courage. You are serving America, Americans, and mankind.

God bless you.

Sincerely yours,

KAREL HULICKA,
Professor of History.

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.,
April 6, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Again we are grateful to you for your courageous efforts to oppose the majority opinion in Washington—in this instance, our failing policy in Vietnam. We are appalled at the methods of warfare being tried against the Vietcong and North Vietnam, and at the unwillingness of our policymakers to see the immorality of our position and the frightful danger of an ex-

panded war. Please continue to make every effort to get us into negotiations.

Thank you for representing a saner point of view.

Yours sincerely,
CLARK and PAT BOUWMAN,
Florida Presbyterian College.

ST. HELENA, CALIF.,
April 5, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to tell you that I am in wholehearted accord with the views you recently expressed over the radio concerning the Vietnam situation. Why we are there I cannot quite understand. I do hope you will continue to express your views. Thank you.

Very truly yours,
WILHELMINA M. COLLENBURG.

FRESH MEADOWS, N.Y.,
April 7, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As longtime admirers of your, valiant and lonely stand against the administration's policy in Vietnam we hope you might, if at all possible, and in some way, participate in the march on Washington to protest the war in Vietnam on April 17, sponsored by sane, Women's Strike for Peace, and Students for a Democratic Society. You have earned the praise of all thinking Americans for your persistent dissent in this matter.

Sincerely,
Mr. and Mrs. JOHN KAUFMANN,
OAKLAND, CALIF.,
April 7, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

SENATOR: I am deeply concerned over the Vietnam situation and am writing you in the hope of a brief explanation for our presence there. You happen to be my favorite Senator and that is my reason for directing this letter to you.

There appears to be much confusion and diversity of opinions, reports and explanations for our involvement in Vietnam. My questions are as follows: Did the United States enter into the 1954 Geneva Agreement as a formal party? It is frequently reiterated that a breach of the Agreement is the sole reason for our intervention in Vietnam. Are the North Vietnamese directly and solely responsible for the civil and political disturbance in South Vietnam? I have not read or heard of any North Vietnamese troops or aircraft being employed in the south.

Finally, if our presence and objective in Vietnam is as vital as generally alleged, I am extremely curious to know why our allies are not rendering us any assistance. Would not the outcome in Vietnam affect them as drastically as the United States?

Is it true that the European nations are trading and selling goods to the North Vietnamese while we are engaged in military conflict with them? If true, this situation appears ridiculous.

Needless to state I am quite confused with respect to Vietnam and would indeed welcome even the slightest clarification.

Sincerely yours,
Mr. WALTER DUDA,
NEW YORK, N.Y.,
April 8, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I'm much heartened always by your readiness and willingness to "speak truth to pomposity."

As for Mr. Johnson's speech last night—which did not answer world criticism of United States havoc in Vietnam, North and South—at this point it's as though he's trying to get the world to chip in on what is all too clearly our reparations bill there for 10 years of dislocation, devastation, death, and destruction. Is there any unscorched

earth left? Are any villages left? Did Operation Sunrise ever really end?

Above all, though, Mr. MORSE, is our continued pledge to force North Vietnam into the war. How the Pentagon must be vexing at the North's refusal to rise to our bait. And we continue to bomb and burn with impunity.

A Japanese report earlier this week, likening the NLF of South Vietnam to the French resistance movement of World War II seems to best state the situation. This Washington can never concede for with it would have to die our lie of the NLF as a Red subversive, outside-directed group. It would also reveal that there is no substantial government in South Vietnam except the NLF.

Negotiations, then, with whom? The United States and North Vietnam?

No. Rather the NLF in conference with all southeast Asian governments.

Again, thanks for your strength which gives so many of us strength and courage and determination to do something every day—even if it's only letterwriting.

Yours devotedly,
SIDNEY D. BERFER,
VALLEY STREAM, N.Y.,
April 7, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We support a ceasefire and immediate application of U Thant's formula for negotiations.

We strongly urge you, Senator, to continue your fight to prevent the escalation of the Vietnam war by giving your support to U Thant's call for negotiation to settle this conflict.

Yours truly,
JOSEPH SCHACHNER,
CHARLOTTE SCHACHNER,
CAROL SCHACHNER,
JEFF SCHACHNER.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
April 7, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: L.B.J. just finished his speech on Vietnam. He gives his views on this conflict and he still gives a stance that hasn't changed.

He speaks of the adversaries' atrocities, but doesn't mention the atrocities committed by the regimes we support.

The newspapers have been full of pictures of how the South Vietnamese torture captives.

If you were to go through the "letters to the editor" columns of all the Chicago papers in the last couple of months you would judge L.B.J. as akin to Goldwater.

Senator, what recourse do 40 million disfranchised voters have?

I recommend peaceful negotiations, immediately, under international supervision.

Respectfully yours,
TONY MALLIN,
NEWTON, MASS.,
April 6, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We ask for an immediate ceasefire in Vietnam and for prompt application of the U Thant formula for negotiation.

Yours truly,
MAURICE J. SILVER,
NEW BRUNSWICK, N.J.,
April 8, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Although I am not a member of your constituency, I feel compelled to voice

support for your efforts to uphold the validity of international agreements in the face of such transgressions as the advisory action of the United States in Vietnam. I feel that negotiations must be undertaken immediately or we risk nuclear destruction. It has been a sad time in world history. We speak of democratic government and do such things as attempt to assure the civil rights of minority Americans and we conjure up a consensus foreign policy which acts against the interests of democracy and civil rights in Vietnam. Despite the legal arguments against United States actions in Vietnam, there has long been substantial evidence that the Saigon governments which we have supported work against the people of Vietnam. There is also the obvious and apparent censorship of the American press representatives in Vietnam, I feel that this acts to deceive the American people and further injure the interests of the Vietnamese people. Again, I must congratulate you on the position which you have defended in the face of gross unreason in the Congress of the United States of America.

Very sincerely,
JAN PHILIP BRAVERMAN,
NEW HAVEN, CONN.,
April 5, 1965.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: These days when letters from friends say "Thank God I did not vote for Johnson, I am sad that I did not have the same kind of insight last November, for I did vote for you.

Many, many people who voted for you did so because Barry Goldwater said he would increase military aid to Vietnam. Of course you can say you did not say, as President Eisenhower did about Korea, what you would do but you know you gave the impression you could be trusted to decrease rather than increase military activity there.

You talk about "democracy and freedom." What does democracy mean for the ordinary person? Mail against the present policy in Vietnam is running up to 500 to 1 against what is being done now. Senator JAVITS' mail is 50 to 1 against. I have not been to Washington recently but friends who have come back sad and discouraged. These people are not Communists, either. Those who knew Germany best under Hitler say Washington reminds them of early Hitler Germany with what they call your "arm twisting" to force Senators and Representatives as well as governors and mayors to back your policy in Vietnam. Our minister and best rabbi friend call the present policy illegal, inhumanitarian, stupid, and immoral. Personally, I agree with Senators MORSE and GRUENING.

The ordinary person feels so helpless and cynical about the lies we get from our highest officials and the talk about "freedom" for the people of South Vietnam. You and all the war hawks know the United States has not been willing to have free elections in Vietnam. The United States has violated the Geneva agreements. In spite of all the propaganda about aid and aggression from the North, you and the Washington war hawks know, as do many, many of us ordinary people, that it is the United States that is really providing most of the arms for both sides and that in the truth the United States is the aggressor half a world from home.

The dear lady who made a torch of herself in Detroit trying to awaken you barely escaped Hitler's gas chambers. Your orders to burn helpless people, including babies, with napalm are just unbelievable. This Nation that claims to be Christian is about the most barbaric in the world now—terrible bombs, napalm, gas, etc., etc. I hope you cease using the name of God. He can have nothing but condemnation for us, it seems

April 21, 1965

to me. Certainly a loving God would never, never do what our soldiers are being ordered to do in Vietnam.

I know the pressures on you are great. World opinion is against us and we are hated; but because we are rich we have power to be used for good or evil. Most people at home think our foreign policy is wrong. Many are terribly confused and afraid. They want to live and fear you are rushing us toward the complete destruction of the world.

Please bring military men home instead of sending more and lose all the face necessary to stop the war. Stop unilateral action and ask the United Nations to take over the job in Vietnam.

I am thankful for every speech you make. Copies have been made of the tape you made for Yale students and is being widely used.

Sincerely,

(Mrs. W.) OLA H. UPHAUS.

CONCORD, CALIF.,

April 6, 1965.

Mr. McGEORGE BUNDY,
Special Assistant to the President, The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BUNDY: Your appearance on "Meet the Press" telecast last Sunday inspired me to write this letter. You rather indicated that your mail regarding Vietnam was not being counted, and I do not expect this letter to be counted, either. I do not know when I have heard such a weasel-worded conversation as you put on. My wife said, "Well, at least he didn't tell any outright lies." That may be so, but neither do I recall you telling any outright truths. The nearest to an outright lie was your contention that we are not aggressors in Vietnam. I doubt that the majority of the people of the world would agree with you, and perhaps not even a majority in this country.

I say that you have a lot of blood on your hands, and I should imagine psychiatrists are wondering how you can sleep. There will undoubtedly be a lot more blood on your hands, unless and until, the President gets rid of advisers such as you.

Very truly yours,

M. C. BELKNAP.

cc: Senators ERNEST GRUENING, WAYNE MORSE, MICHAEL J. MANSFIELD, and THOMAS H. KUCHEL.

APRIL 6, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to let you know that I support you and you are speaking for me when you urge that we negotiate over the Vietnamese situation.

The area should be neutralized and we, as a nation, should get out. Morally, we are all wrong, and politically, we are cutting our own throat before the world.

Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

Mrs. CAROL TYSON.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,

April 6, 1965.

President L. B. JOHNSON,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: Recent events, taken in conjunction with the evidence summarized below, have forced me to come to the reluctant conclusion that you are taking the United States down a path which bears a terrifying similarity to that taken by pre-war Germany.

The evidence forcing me to this conclusion follows:

1. The U.S. Government claims that the present war is an instance of Communist aggression is authoritatively refuted by the noted historian Devillers in the China Quarterly for January-March 1962.

2. The U.S. Government states that actions of the Vietcong are only made possible by the infiltration of personnel and equipment from North Vietnam and that the Com-

munist in North Vietnam are attempting to conquer South Vietnam.

Data obtained from the recent White Paper, and from the Pentagon, indicate that Communist-made weapons constitute less than 2½ percent of the weapons used by the Vietcong.

The White Paper names only six native-born North Vietnamese who have infiltrated into South Vietnam in the 5-year period prior to and including 1964.

Therefore, the Government's own figures contradict its claims of significant infiltration from the north.

The above items indicate that the U.S. Government has deceived the American public. This is corroborated by the New York Times editorial of July 29, 1964, which states that "unpalatable facts were suppressed and the truth subverted" and also by an American in Saigon who is quoted in Newsweek of February 10, 1964, as saying, "Washington repeatedly lied to the American people during the last 3 years."

3. The use of torture, poison chemicals, and gas, the leveling by bombing of villages suspected of containing a few Vietcong, the willingness to inflict a horrible death by burning through our extensive use of napalm, and the bombing of North Vietnam on the false pretext that significant quantities of arms and men have been infiltrated, are contrary to morality and international law and have caused death and misery to countless innocent people. Many American boys have been killed and maimed in carrying out the Government's policy.

4. Foreign policy has apparently been taken over by the military. Except for a few courageous Senators such as MORSE, GRUENING, MCGOVERN, and CHURCH, Congress has abdicated its responsibility and goes along with the actions by which we are being led deeper into an immoral war which will kill and maim millions, if not hundreds of millions, of human beings.

When a government deceives its people and uses methods which have shocked the world to gain its ends, it does not deserve the respect of its citizens.

If the American people do not demand that their Government tell them the truth about our actions in southeast Asia, we are going to reap the nuclear holocaust which you seem determined to bring about.

The crimes tried at Nuremberg were a Sunday school picnic compared to those of which these responsible for world war III will be guilty.

Yours truly,

THOMAS AMNEUS.

Care of Senator WAYNE MORSE, Senator ERNEST GRUENING.

ST. LOUIS, MO.,

April 5, 1964.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Big Brother Johnson's administration is soon going to have us in an atomic war, as you recently predicted on TV, the way things are going. I have come to the conclusion that we will be lucky if we have an economic collapse that will put us out of the war business before we get into an atomic war that will end it in an even more unpleasant manner, and perhaps the rest of the world as well.

The only people who are satisfied with this war are the industrialists and military who have been making huge profits from the cold war, and never want it to end, except by escalation into a hot, or at least lukewarm war, through which they can make even more in graft and profits.

These are the people Big Brother is taking care of, and no doubt it was they who backed his campaign financially as well as Goldwater's. Big Brother ought to be impeached for the administration's whitewash of Bobby Baker because it is obvious why.

LAWRENCE STRICKLAND.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.,

April 4, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This is simply to express my deep admiration for your stand on Vietnam. I fully agree with your position.

We are indeed fortunate in having a man of your courage in the Senate.

Very truly yours,

ROSS VON METZKE.

OLD LYME, CONN.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Keep fighting! We don't belong in Vietnam in the first place and our current effort there is one of simple brutality. Not only is our bombing immoral, but it is clearly the one thing that can make the Indochinese accept the Chinese protection they fear. You've been a voice of reason and a tower of strength throughout this dark time. We urge you to keep up the good fight.

Sincerely,

WALTER KAYLIN.

BOSTON, MASS.,

April 6, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want you to know that I appreciate your long-time criticism of our policies in Vietnam. Your article in "Progressive" plus your CONGRESSIONAL RECORD statements of protest and explanation following the Gulf of Tonkin business have been substance for my own debating.

My reasons for supporting negotiation and withdrawal of military machinery are, I believe, substantially the same as yours; we never belonged there in the first place, and we've bungled it while we've been there.

I was really disappointed by the recent "White Paper" which attempted to cover up the whole fiasco. We are really getting desperate. I just hope we can get smart and get out before bombing Chinese targets becomes as accepted as bombing North Vietnam and Laos has become.

Keep up your good work. There are some of us out here who think you're on the ball. I'm one of them!

Sincerely yours,

DAVID GOTHARD.

NORTH CONWAY, N.H.,

April 4, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have always admired you, but never as much as I do today when I see you stand against a mob who are "Hellbent" for war.

I believe that now is the time for all true patriots to rise and be counted.

Sincerely,

J. HAROLD KLOCK.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,

April 4, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: The last line of the enclosed letter is rhetorical; however, it seems you and Mr. GRUENING stand almost alone in the Senate.

Two aspects of this matter seem to me to demand much more than a routine protest—one, the wrecking of the United Nations spoken of in the attached letter, and two, the fact that the power of making war now resides de facto in the hands of the President alone. This is a monstrously revolutionary condition for our country. One-man war, undesirable any time to our way of thinking, would seem in this epoch to be simply fantastic.

I suspect the popular protest against our policy in Vietnam is enormous, as reflected in congressional mail. And yet the press as well as the Congress seem determined to support this policy, apparently feeling that as soon as we can get enough Americans killed

April 21, 1965

Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300150023-8

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

7873

public sentiment will change. A frequent comment is that the "Government" must know something we (the people) don't know, or the Government would not be so persistent in this outrageous course. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, could you make a public statement on this specific point?

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM BRANDON.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
March 31, 1965.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: You state that you believe it would be unwise to commence negotiations in Vietnam when the prospects for success are unfavorable—this seems to say that if we are losing we will throw away the rulebook. But the only real test of a set of rules is to lose under them. Are we to cripple or even demolish the United Nations to keep from losing in Vietnam?

If our present policy of stepping outside a rule of law and pulling a gun succeeds and gains us a more favorable position, surely such a fine policy will then be used again and again in the future? And surely other nations will follow our winning example? If our present policy fails, we shall find ourselves involved in an inexorably widening war. In either case, the United Nations will have been most neatly dismantled.

This seems a high price to pay. Is what we are "losing" in Vietnam of equal value? Is it possible that the President's advisers are laboring under "a profoundly and dangerous false notion," in the words of Walter Lippmann, as to what constitutes winning and losing in Asia?

The unlovely arrogance of our Pentagon diplomacy in operation in Vietnam is abhorrent to the whole world. Every pillage burned creates thousands of new friends for world communism and thousands of newly dedicated anti-Americans. The serene cynicism with which we pour out massive destruction in "retaliation" for any Americans killed by underground terrorists makes this enormous nightmare an enormous Operation Lidice. The violent brutality toward those "who threaten the stability" of South Vietnam (i.e., those who object to American policy); the "hunting trip" raids of U.S. airplanes looking for "random opportunity targets"; the "experimenting" with splendid new antipersonnel weapons that cause "extremely painful burns extremely difficult to heal"; bombing of a countryside by the map grid numbers—all these recall Mr. Hitler in his finest hour.

Is the United States to conclude its record of reasonably civilized leadership of the last 20 years by becoming a Fourth Reich? Are you yourself willing to cap your heretofore distinguished record in foreign affairs by quietly acquiescing?

There are many Americans who are appalled at being cast in the role of the Nazis this time around, and are doing their utmost to make vocal and effective their dissent.

Are there no such Americans in Congress?
Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM BRANDON.

ESMOND, N. DAK.,
April 5, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to congratulate you on the stand you have taken on the Vietnam question. I believe it should be given to the United Nations. That would show the world the United States is willing to abide by the decisions of the United Nations. It would certainly raise the prestige of the United Nations and at the

same time I believe the United States would be leading the world a step nearer peace.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. LLOYD STADIG.

MIAMI BEACH, FLA.,
April 6, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Because of your boldly stated stand on the Vietnam situation, may I add my voice to the great masses who demand an immediate cease-fire.

You are truly a great and fearless leader.
Respectfully yours,

MILTON F. GOLDSTEIN.

ATTLEBORO, MASS.,
April 3, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to express my appreciation of the stand you have been taking on the Vietnam issue. I am convinced that in the future Americans will be very ashamed of this period in our history. There may be some legitimate debate about whether we should withdraw from southeast Asia or from South Vietnam, but we certainly should stop this insane bombing of North Vietnam.

Yours truly,

PAUL JOLLY.

LEWISTOWN, N.Y.,
April 6, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We strongly urge a policy leading to a ceasefire in Vietnam and urge application of the United Nations and U Thant's formula for negotiations.

Sincerely,

BERT K. LEFFERT,
Counselor at Law.
LOUISE LEFFERT

GRANITE CITY, ILL.,
April 2, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Thank you, Senator, for your speech expressing your outrage with actions of U.S. Government in Asia. My native land has been brought to point where humanity requires the United States be brought to senses or to knees. Many citizens share your deep revulsion. I was unable to learn where and when this speech was made. Can you furnish me copy so that I can distribute. Letter follows.

ROBERT L. WOLF.

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY
LAW SCHOOL,
Baton Rouge, La., April 6, 1965.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I wish to add my voice as a citizen to those of the ministers, priests, and rabbis who appealed to you to reverse our course in Vietnam and work for an immediate cease-fire and self-determination for the Vietnamese people. There are disturbing indications that our actions are resulting in the suffering of the people of Vietnam. The enclosed photograph from the Baton Rouge Morning Advocate of March 29, 1965, is one of them.

While expediency may seem to dictate a different course, God and history teach us that righteous action is the most expedient policy—the best policy for securing (1) the peace and welfare of the United States and (2) the love and esteem of other countries

and peoples toward the United States and its people.

Please, Mr. President. The people will thankfully and joyfully follow your lead toward peace in Vietnam.

Sincerely yours,

BENJAMIN M. SHIEBER.

(Copies to Senators CHURCH, FULBRIGHT, GRUENING, JAVITS, RUSSELL B. LONG, and MORSE.)

FLUSHING, N.Y.,
March 31, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to express my support of your opposition to the administration's program in South Vietnam.

At this time when it appears that our foreign policy is being governed only by rules of expediency and brutal and unthinking force, I am thankful that you and some of your associates have undertaken to represent the responsible opposition to the administration policy.

Be assured that you have my support in every possible way in this matter.

If I can in any way be of aid or assistance to you in this endeavor, I volunteer my services.

Sincerely,

ALAN M. URIS,
Counselor at Law.

(Copies to Senator ERNEST GRUENING and President Lyndon B. Johnson.)

SEATTLE, WASH.,
April 5, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to commend you on your position on Vietnam.

You are right and Johnson is following the policy of the late A. Hitler.

Sincerely yours,

NELS EHROTH.

WINCHESTER, MASS.,
April 6, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please accept my warmest thanks for your efforts to restore U.S. foreign policy on Vietnam to the course of decency, humane behavior, and respect for international agreements. I hope that you will be successful in your effort to secure open debate on our activities in Vietnam, which threaten the future of our country. Perhaps such debate might result in the willingness of the administration to negotiate the issues of the war in Vietnam.

I pray for the preservation of your health, energy, and sense of humor that you may continue this fight with unabated vigor.

Sincerely yours,

RUTH O. TERZAGHI,
Mrs. Karl Terzaghi.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
April 5, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to express my gratefulness and admiration for your consistent, courageous stand against the evil that is continually occurring in the Government. I follow your valiant fighting the sinister force (I read the I. F. Stone weekly and have other people read it) since 1963, your January 6 speech, June 29, 1964, March 16, 1964, March 4, 1965, and many others. I had the rare pleasure of hearing you speak at Cooper Union, New York City (heard it a second time when it was broadcast on New York City

April 21, 1965

station, in company with friends I had invited to my home to hear you).

The time is drawing near, very near to a third world war, really, a world war. In my 85 years of life I have observed and heard much. The First World War, World War II, the Korean war, and yet I continually ask myself and (others if they are willing to listen to me) why this brutal murder of innocent people? Why this wanton destruction? I continually talk about the Korean war, and tell the people how the American officers were supervising Korean soldiers with their hands tied in their backs and others digging their own graves, it told that when they will finish digging their graves they will have their hands tied also and they will all jump into their graves, alive. And what was our gain from the Korean war: 198,000 Americans dead, the flower of our youth; a corrupt Government and millions of dollars lost, and millions still give the gangster government in South Korea, and what a fiasco. What is the reason to repeat this tragedy? Do you know what the name for Americans is? "The American Killers." This was told to me by two people of integrity, one a writer, woman, the other a publisher. They both speak several foreign languages, and their pleading that they were not American by birth could not convince the people that they are not as evil as those Americans who make wars, directly and indirectly (that was 8 years ago). What a pity. Oh, for those years when Americans were known the world over as liberty loving, democracy loving, generous, friendly people. No more. I have experienced only disdain (because I did not speak Spanish) when I was in Mexico in 1954 and again in 1959 (the second time not so much hatred) it was right after the American Ambassador who boastfully acknowledged in speech and print, in the Times, that he came into the President of Guatemala with two pistols and so forced him to flee the country. The Mexicans, and not only the literate; even the illiterate, the street vendors, wanted to know why the Americans destroy the Latin American peoples. Oh, I could go on, but I know that you hardly have time to read my letter. I could say so much more to relieve my anger and anguish, but I shall close with my gratitude to God, that there are men like you even if few in number—very few indeed.

Gratefully yours,

FANNIE PADWE.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
 March 23, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
 U.S. Senate,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are very fortunate in having at least a few Senators like you who can be a voice of dissent against the excesses of the United States in Vietnam. I do not believe that the administration can be allowed to conduct a war in any name without the approval of the legislature and the populace.

I write this letter as an individual, but I know I am also representative of most of my acquaintances. Please continue the work you are doing.

Respectfully,

HERBERT WEISS.

WOODMERE, N.Y.,
 April 8, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
 Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Please add my small voice to the many great voices who have called for cease fire in Vietnam and an application of U Thant's formula for negotiations.

Sincerely,

SUZANNE GELLER.
 DANIEL GELLER.

BERRIEN SPRINGS, MICH.,
 April 9, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are very seriously disturbed at our present policy in Vietnam. Quite clearly we are responsible for escalating the war in that sector of the world; this is fraught with grave dangers militarily and diplomatically. Once again we present the picture of the "ugly American" which works so well to the advantage of the Communists.

We want to commend you for your foresight and courage in this matter and to urge you to continue to use your influence to dissuade us from this path and to recommend active peace negotiations.

Sincerely,

MARTIN SORKEN
 Mrs. RUTH SORKEN.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
 April 6, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
 U.S. Senate,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It seems obvious to almost everybody except Gen. Maxwell Taylor and the administration that the policy in Vietnam has gone very sour indeed. Instead of breaking the resistance of the North Vietnamese, we are strengthening it, and even driving them into the dubious embraces of Communist China. How stupid can we get?

Our whole policy appears to be calculated to strengthening the Communist world, pushing Moscow and Peking closer together, turning all of Asia and Africa against "white imperialism"—the best weapons in the Red propaganda arsenal, in addition to actual military materiel, have been made in the United States of America. When will we learn?

Worse than that, the actions of the administration have sown dismay and distrust in this country at a critical time when we should be united. The people have been lied to and betrayed. After repudiating escalation of the conflict at the polls, we find that our expressed hopes have been cynically tossed out. Goldwaterism without Goldwater. The press releases from the White House, the white papers of the State Department are such obvious lies that it is impossible to take them seriously, if it were not for the fact that they have such serious results.

How is government by the people possible when the people are misled, bamboozled, and denied access to information vitally affecting their safety and welfare? "Big Daddy knows best" is hardly in the American tradition.

We are not at war with North Vietnam. Why, then, are we committing acts of aggression on a par with Pearl Harbor? If we are at war, the Congress should exercise its constitutional duty of making a legal declaration, and not leave it to the Executive to wage war unconstitutionally. This tendency to bypass the Constitution, to me, is a far graver threat to our Republic than the feeble efforts of Ho Chi Minh. The Congress should reassert its duties as representative of the people, and not slip into an emasculated role of a rubberstamp, like the Roman senate under Augustus.

All the way with the American people. The President should execute the will of the people, not impose his own.

Respectfully,

JOSEPH M. SHELLEY.

EMMANUEL CHURCH,
 Baltimore, Md., April 7, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
 Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Keep up your good fight against the insane policy being followed in Vietnam. There is a rising tide of public

opinion supporting your efforts, and thousands of us who are clergy are doing all we can to help your cause.

Sincerely yours,

ALFRED B. STARRATT.

NORWOOD, PA.,
 April 3, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to express my gratitude for your firm and courageous stand against extending the war in Vietnam.

Sincerely,

Mrs. MARTHA ADAMS.

ADEL, IOWA,
 April 6, 1965.

HON. SENATOR MORSE: Want to voice my appreciation for your opposition to the war in Vietnam.

This war is not only too inhumane but also too dangerous to continue.

Why not turn this over to the U.N.? This war must be brought to a close and it seems to me it would greatly strengthen the U.N. to allow them to mediate a peace.

Sincerely,

VIRGIL I. MARSHALL.

LONG BEACH, CALIF.,
 April 3, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am 100 percent with you in your opposition to the war in Vietnam. I believe there is nothing to justify the administration's position there and everything to make the risk intolerable.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM V. MCCAY.

DEARBORN, MICH.,
 April 4, 1965.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: Our recent bombings of the defenseless inhabitants of Vietnam, north and south, are costing us all of our influence and prestige in Asia, not to mention American reaction at home and elsewhere.

You have stated that our purpose is to end Communist aggression and terror in South Vietnam. How true is this? Judging from reports most Vietnamese, except for Saigon, seem to prefer the Vietcong.

From almost every viewpoint our position seems to be coming more and more untenable. Let's have a cease fire before the situation deteriorates still further. Then we can plan to rebuild and if possible regain some self-respect.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. PAUL KERBER.

APRIL 5, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I heartily endorse your position for negotiation in Vietnam.

ANNE KABACK.

DEAR SIR: You are one of the most courageous and honest men in the United States. If it weren't for you and men like you I would lose faith in our Nation. I only hope that your fervent pleas for peace in Vietnam, for a halt to the awful horrors which the United States is perpetrating are answered.

I am thrilled that you will visit my college, Union, and await your talk eagerly.

Sincerely,

ROBERT S. HOFFMAN.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
 April 7, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
 U.S. Senate,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Although I am not a constituent, I should like to express my admiration for your courageous and far-seeing position on ending the conflict in Vietnam.

April 21, 1965

Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300150023-8

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

7875

You may be sure that when you advocate immediate negotiation to end this unjust and unnecessary war that you speak for Americans across the Nation. The fear of this thing escalating into another Korea-type conflict or erupting into a major disaster haunts us all.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. EVELYN S. SMITH.

APRIL 7, 1965.

HON. ERNEST GRUENING,
Member, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I offer my thanks for your patriotic efforts to bring about the liquidation of the stupid adventure in Vietnam.

Every Senator ought to read "Letter from Saigon" in March 20 New Yorker.

Yours truly,

HENRY W. CHERRINGTON.

THE SAVANNAH SUN,
Savannah, Ga., April 2, 1965.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE:

Would you read the enclosed and if you approve of its general content, have it inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

I believe the majority of the American people are strongly against this increased involvement in Vietnam. Parents of sons who are now in Vietnam are especially bitter.

If this war continues another month, we will have "escalation" of friction in Germany, the Middle East, Africa, all over the world.

I met Representative JOHN CONYERS yesterday (he's in Savannah for a voter registration drive for the NAACP), and he spoke out strongly against our involvement in Vietnam; he said many Congressmen are strongly against it.

Thanking you for your continued fight for world peace and sane government, I am,

Sincerely,

ABRAM EISENMAN.

P.S.—Sent you my book; you never have told me whether you read it, liked it, or disliked it.

HOW TO GET OUT OF VIETNAM

Five thousand years ago, Confucius said: "Easy to save face in Asia—just keep body in native land."

Today, I say: "Easy to get out of Vietnam—let's become part of the world."

We have no more right in Vietnam than the Chinese would have had intervening during our Civil War.

But, there we are in Vietnam, and seemingly hellbent on starting world war III, if necessary, so that we can save South Vietnam for Democracy.

But, are we not there to stop communism?

If we don't stop them in Vietnam, what country is next?

Well, there's communism in Cuba, 90 miles from our shores, but we don't bomb them. There are Communists in Italy, but we don't bomb them to save them from communism. There are Communists in France, India, England, we don't bomb them. There are allegedly Communists in the United States—should we bomb ourselves to keep ourselves safe from communism?

This is the age of geographical schizophrenia: There's a North and South Korea, and a North and South Vietnam; there's an East Germany and a West Germany, a West Pakistan and an East Pakistan—and the only reason we haven't got an East Pole and a West Pole is because we've got a North Pole and a South Pole.

France moved out of Indochina and Algeria, reluctantly, after years of war, and countless millions of dollars of wasted money, and many scores of thousands of futile deaths, and now France enjoys unprecedented prosperity. Now, we are spend-

ing \$2 million a day in Vietnam. The cost is bound to go up in dollars and lives.

Ask yourself this awful question: If the Vietnamese were not brown-skinned people without voting power in the United States, would we bomb them?

Are we not racists on the world scene? Governor Wallace sent his State troopers to whip, cattle-prod, and beat Negroes and their white friends trying to march for freedom. On the world scene, how distinguish between Governor Wallace's actions and ours? Is not ours even worse because we use napalm bombs, gas, and we kill and kill to save face to try and bring about a negotiated peace.

Presumably, the frightened Vietcong will get down on their hands and knees and say: Big tall white men, lords and masters of democracy, stop your bombing and we'll agree to your peace terms.

Governor Wallace attempted to horsewhip freedom into the ground. We are attempting to bomb out Communist leadership from Vietnam. And the more we bomb them, the more Communist we make them. The more we bomb brown people in Asia the more we are hated in all of Asia, not only by the Vietnamese and the Chinese, but also by the Japanese, the Burmese, the Indonesians, the Hindus, and the Moslems. The wild men of Borneo could truthfully ask: What do the white savages want?

What do we want in Vietnam? John Foster Dulles put us in Vietnam with a few hundred advisers. Look how close we now walk to the brink of world war III because John Foster Dulles put 300 military advisers into Vietnam to save it from communism.

But, you ask, if we pull out of Vietnam, what about the rest of Asia? What about South Korea? What about Formosa or Taiwan? What about the rest of Asia?

We do have some historical interests in the Philippines. Curiously, since Spain settled so much of Latin America and also the Philippines, they have the same basic economic problems though separated by thousands of miles.

But, we did eventually grant the Philippines their independence, and some of their 30 million people understand and appreciate the United States and its democratic potential.

What about the rest of Asia? How about inviting the Philippines in as our 51st State? How about offering all-out aid to Japan, India, Pakistan, Australia, and New Zealand?

How about offering all-out aid to North and South Vietnam, North and South Korea, Formosa, and Red China, too?

Is it possible that we are about to blow the world to bits because our President has watched too many westerners on TV and considers himself the good man, and anybody who opposes him the bad man or men, and feels entitled to shoot them down if they disagree with him? Especially if they are short, dark, brown men, Buddhists, who will travel 7,000 miles across the Pacific to get us if we don't get them first?

But how does a great power like the United States extricate itself from Vietnam? Well, the French just picked up and left. The British picked up and left Ireland, Israel, the Middle East and India. Russia picked up and left the Congo. The only way to leave a country where you don't belong in the first place is just to pick up and leave. It's a very easy thing to do, much easier than fighting the Asian people in a prolonged war involving billions of dollars and perhaps millions of casualties.

But you say, "we can stop the Red Chinese now; 5 years, 10 years from now may be too late."

History repeats the follies of warriors who fought out of fear. Hitler speculated on a cheap and easy victory, too, but the British stuck it out, the Russians stuck it out, and in a few years, Hitler was defeated.

Is it not just possible that 650 million Chinese will stick it out? Isn't it possible that if we use atomic bombs in Asia, the brown and black men around the world will rise in revolt against us? Isn't it just possible that we could lose the world trying to save South Vietnam?

But what happens to Chiang Kai-shek and his hundreds of thousands of troops? What happens to the many millions of anti-Communist forces in Asia if we pull out of Vietnam and subsequently from Korea and don't defend Taiwan?

Look homeward, o angels of mercy. How about our unemployed in the United States? How about Latin America which could go Communist?

But, how about Chiang Kai-shek and the anti-Communist forces in Asia?

Must we play the part of the eternal counter-revolutionaries, holding back the thrust of history, whether it be progressive or reactionary, leaving Asia as a dangling participle in an infinitely unfinishable sentence?

I don't believe the Communists have as their primary desire the killing off of everybody in Asia who's against them. What would be the advantage of ruling over dead men, women and children? We could offer Chiang Kai-shek and some of the leaders of the anti-Communist forces sanctuary in our country even though there would be a danger inherent in this act.

I have no illusions about Ho Chi Minh and his government. Ho Chi Minh has been a long-time member of the Comintern—but, the joker is now whether he wants Chinese aid, which can gobble him up too in the process. He probably will not ask for Chinese aid unless we force him to.

We must wonder where all this will end. For, if we have the right to bomb North Vietnam, why does not Castro have the right to bomb a country he considers unfriendly? Why don't the Communists have the same right to bomb non-Communist countries? Where will all this end except in world war three?

Unfortunately, the classic definition of capitalist-imperialism as defined by Marx fits us in this Vietnam venture:

1. We have military weapons; we have a powerful military force that must be used to keep the wheels of industry going so that we can have wealth.

2. We attack a weak formerly subjected country.

3. We prevent a nation from self-determination.

You could put it another way: Bombs and profits as McNamara beats the band.

That is the heart of this issue: So long as such a preponderance of our production is geared for military might and spending, we are going to be engulfed in destructive wars not only to destroy people (and prevent the spread of communism) but to keep our military industrial machine humming at profitable speed.

If we do not convert 50 percent of our military spending at once to the construction of homes, hospitals, schools, roads, and conservation of our natural resources, we will have continued unemployment, growing crime, insanity, juvenile delinquency, and we will not have enough homes, schools, hospitals, roads and conservation of our natural resources.

We could win the friendship of the entire world with our wealth and our hand extended in friendship and peace. Instead we fritter away our wealth and the good will of the world with napalm bombs and incendiary bombs on the jungles of Vietnam to flush out a few hundred or a few thousand Vietcong.

In Alabama, it was racism that impelled Governor Wallace to send his armed forces against the Negro people and their white allies, who wanted to march peacefully for

April 21, 1965

the right to vote. How explain to the brown and black people of the world that it is not racism that impels our Government to use its military force against the brown people of Vietnam who want the right of self-determination of government? If the Vietnam people choose a Communist form of government how does that endanger our national security?

There are more Communists in Italy than in Vietnam but we don't bomb Italy. There are more Communists in France than in Vietnam but we don't bomb France. There are more Communists in Cuba than in Vietnam but we don't bomb Cuba. There are more Communists in India than in Vietnam but we don't bomb India. There are more Communists in Red China than in Vietnam but we don't bomb Red China. There are more Communists in the Soviet Union than in Vietnam but we don't bomb the Soviet Union. Then why does our national security demand that we bomb Vietnam?

It is evident that Vietnam, like Korea, is the wrong war in the wrong place at the wrong time. But the dangers now are even greater than during the Korean war. For that war came when Red China did not have the atomic bomb, when the Soviet Union and the United States had not begun to conquer outer space. Today, if total war comes, it can come from nuclear bombs rained down from up above with space ships zeroing in on their targets.

So this terrible question arises:

If there were no Vietnam, would we in the United States have to create one somewhere to use up our military weapons, to give purpose to our military, to keep the wheels of much industry going, to keep us affluent?

But France found out that it became richer once it pulled out of Indochina and Algeria, once it stopped spending useless lives and dollars fighting hopeless wars on foreign soil.

So now we come to the bitter fact that we have these choices in Vietnam:

1. The present use of American armed might in the avowed hope of obtaining a peaceful negotiation;

2. The planned withdrawal of American military might from Vietnam.

It is strange that we have to fight against our President on foreign policy since we are so much in agreement with him on domestic issues. It is strange that war, which kept the New Deal from moving further along with its domestic revolution, which also interrupted the progressive march of the Fair Deal, now challenges the Great Society, which has only begun to fight its war against poverty, crime, racial intolerance, unemployment, slums.

Some will counsel us to go along with our President in this strange adventure in Vietnam because he has all the facts, and has arrived at his position through knowledge. Some will continue to advocate this war action in Vietnam, which is bound to create the conditions for world war three on the holy grounds that it will prevent world war three.

But, many of us can not go along with our President on this brinkmanship diplomacy, not out of fear alone of world war three but because we are convinced that we, the United States, do not have any right at all to be in any part of Vietnam.

But how do we withdraw from Vietnam? What about South Korea? What about Taiwan? What about the rest of Asia and the world? We cannot rewrite the history of the world's geography to our liking. China has been, China is, China will be. China can no more conquer the world than the Russians can, than we can, for it is now evident after World War II that Eastern Europe, the Communist dominated, has certain desires of its own, too. And the era of Stalinism and Hitlerism is dead.

But I do not advocate withdrawing from Vietnam without offering a world plan of action. I repeat: We must invite the Philippines to become the 51st State of the United States; we must offer all-out aid to Japan, India, Pakistan, Australia, and New Zealand; We must recognize Red China, and offer all-out aid to both North and South Vietnam, North and South Korea, Taiwan, and Red China, too.

In addition, we must ask Puerto Rico in as our 52d State, and extend the invitation to all the Central American republics to become States of the United States.

We must offer more aid to Latin America. And we must convert 50 percent of our military spending to domestic spending for homes, hospitals, schools, roads, and conservation of our natural resources.

Believe it or not, the only way to win the war in Vietnam is to withdraw and make all-out effort to win the war against poverty and unemployment and race hate here in the United States, and in our sister republics to the south of us.

The only way to win the war in South Vietnam is to quit fighting a war in other people's lands, and then magnanimously offer the world a share in our limitless bounty for peace, for trade, for understanding.

For we have nothing to fear if our democracy is a working democracy, and if its fruits go down to our people and the people of the world. We shouldn't fear the bogeyman of communism so much that we are willing to forfeit our destiny as world leader fighting a senseless war in Vietnam. Let us pull out of Vietnam, militarily, but let us join the peaceful people of the world even more.

For the only way to win the war against communism is to win the people of the world to our way of life—and our way of life is not conducive, as now constituted, to winning the people of the world to a great belief in our democracy.

SAVANNAH, GA.

ABRAM EISENMAN.

SEATTLE, WASH.,
April 4, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Enclosed is a copy of a letter on Vietnam I recently sent my two Senators and Representative.

It was heartening to read Walter Lippmann's perceptive column of March 31 in which he concludes, "In southeast Asia we have entangled ourselves in one of the many upheavals against the old regime, and we shall not make things any better by thrashing around with ascending violence."

This tragic and immoral war must be stopped. I am encouraged whenever I read about your penetrating speeches on this subject on the floor of the Senate.

I would like to receive your newsletter. Please put my name on your mailing list.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely,

ROBERTA C. HAMMER.

SEATTLE, WASH.,
March 31, 1965.

Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: The U.S. Government is guilty of gross immorality in Vietnam. It is conducting a war of annihilation against the people of that country. It is bombing, burning, torturing and destroying without the slightest regard for human life. The bombing of North Vietnam is sheer madness.

The story that we are losing the war in South Vietnam because of North Vietnamese support and supplies is a myth. The guer-

rillas we are fighting are South Vietnamese and the greater part of their weapons are captured U.S.-made weapons.

It is a popular uprising we are trying to extinguish in South Vietnam, led by the National Liberation Front which has the support of at least 80 percent of the people. There are Communists within the NLF but they are in a minority. The objectives of the NLF are peace, independence, democracy and neutrality.

In trying to extinguish this revolution the United States-Siagon forces have resorted to napalm bombing of villages, inhuman torture, the bombing of hospitals and schools, the spraying of poisonous chemicals as defoliants and now have sunk to the use of poison gases against both guerrillas and civilians.

I am shocked and outraged by these actions. I demand that a cease-fire be called, our troops withdrawn and international negotiations begun to establish peace and neutralization in southeast Asia.

Sincerely,

ROBERTA C. HAMMER.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
April 2, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We ask for an immediate cease-fire in Vietnam and immediate use of U Thant's formula for negotiations.

Yours truly,

C. BLAKE.

COMPTON, CALIF.,
April 5, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have never written you before. I deeply apologize for such neglect because I have admired you over a long period of years. How I do commend you for your courage in being willing to stand up to your convictions. Too many people in all ages and today turn whichever way the wind blows. I commend you for the stand you take in Vietnam; namely, the necessity and urgency of getting out of Vietnam. To me your arguments are valid and should be so recognized by all persons with the responsibility of molding and formulating the decision—the President, Vice President, Department of State, Congress, cabinet officers, and the general public. When your ideas on Vietnam become popular enough to be crystallized into public opinion if it isn't too late with world war III with all of its nuclear destruction (God forbid), your speaking as a voice in the wilderness will be at an end. Then will your staunchness pay rich dividends. Keep on "keeping on" with your cries to awaken the slothful and the indolent, the know-it-all and sophisticated, the sincere and earnest seekers for truth so that we can make the slogan of freedom and justice for all the reality and manifestation it should be.

Thanking you for attention to my letter.
Cordially,

HELEN E. DOLLEY.

CHAPEL HILL, N.C.,
April 5, 1965.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Although I am not an Oregonian, I want to tell you what I think about Vietnam. I have just read parts of your speech to the Senate from last August and I agree with it 100 percent. I hope you are continuing to take the same stand. I think the Senate ought to call the administration to task for fighting a war of its own that the Senate never declared. I know

The Senate gave the President the right to rock around on behalf of SEATO countries, and I don't think it should have done it. And now, I think it should tell the President that he is going entirely too far. I think that President Johnson stands for so many good and excellent things, and I am sorry to see him fighting this war that is so dear that objective inquiry by the press is not permitted. If this is not irreverent, I wish that Mr. Kennedy were still with us, as I believe he would have been more straightforward with the press. I think the white paper is a bad job of rationalization and whitewash. The business of the Geneva records and the International Control Commission is used to make half-truths, which have the same effect as lies—worse, as they are more persuasive and harder to fight. As I graduated from the same college as Secretary Rusk—Davidson—and once shook his hand when he visited my fraternity house, and have heard him give really excellent lectures in the past (they are getting worse lately; his speech a few months ago at the University of North Carolina was all rhetoric), I am especially disappointed in him. I get the impression that State has been following the Pentagon very faithfully, and that the Bundy mythology of counterinsurgency is leading the Pentagon. It is all very strange. Please keep fighting against war.

Very sincerely,

TIMOTHY B. RAY.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.
April 5, 1965.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I heartily endorse your position for negotiations with Vietnam to stop this frightful war.

America has always been strong enough and humane enough to deal fairly not only with her friends but with her enemies too.

Respectfully,

IRENE SABEDL.

LOGAN, UTAH,
April 3, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I support your activities against the aggression against North Vietnam, and urge you to greater lengths. I think many others have doubts about this. We may be too far gone, but keep it up.

Yours truly,

BUD O. WATKINS.

STUART, FLA.,
April 5, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please use your influence in getting our boys out of Vietnam. Let's take care of our own country first. Our President has the wrong advisers in Taylor and McNamara, who are getting us into a big war. I agree with your point of view in every respect. Keep on telling us. Sincerely,

Mrs. THOMAS DARLING.

APRIL 7, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR: Enclosed is a copy of a letter I have sent to President Johnson.

Sincerely yours,

LORRAINE P. COHEN.

TEANECK, N.J.,
April 3, 1965.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Last fall my husband and I, along with millions of other Americans voted enthusiastically for you and what were led to believe were realistic and humane policies in foreign affairs. We feel as if we have been betrayed, that you are using or misinterpreting the mandate accorded to you. We are unequivocally against American action in Vietnam, discerning no

reason warranting the bombing of North Vietnam and fearing the very real possibility of escalation. Each day we hear that the United States is still open to negotiations, that we desire no wider war and yet every day there is some new aggressive aspect to our warfare. This morning it was the first bombing of nonmilitary targets. What will it be tomorrow?

Our adversaries seem to be showing unusual restraint. They are continuing the war exactly as they had been fighting it, but are not retaliating for reprisal sake. We seem to be goading them to see how long they will take it lying down. When we have angered and frightened and shamed them sufficiently and they lose their caution, we will loudly place the blame of the ensuing holocaust on them. I don't believe history will be so kind.

We have so many real problems to be faced. Your magnificent image of the Great Society has to be built. The civil rights struggle is still with us. And all over the world, wherever poverty and tyranny are being ignored, we can fight our ideological battle with the Communists without futility and rationalizations and loss of life, but with a real cause. Please lead us out of the barbarism of war before it is too late.

Sincerely yours,

LORRAINE P. COHEN.

ROCHESTER, N.Y.,
April 5, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Enclosed is a copy of a column by Robert M. Hutchins. The underlining is mine. Unless you have already read this column, I am sure it will interest you very much. I, myself, think it one of the very best on the subject that I have read—anywhere.

Yours truly,

H. R. CLARKE.

FOREIGN POLICY "FUTILE"—NEW START NEEDED
(By Robert M. Hutchins)

The bankruptcy of American foreign policy is now so clear that even the administration must be ready for a new start.

The essential element of the old, tired policy is the "containment" of communism. Everybody in the world is supposed to be interested primarily in "containing" communism. The people of Vietnam and the Congo are not permitted to say whether they would rather die than see communism rear its head in their country. It is assumed that every Asian or African peasant knows that communism is worse than death and that he should be delighted to have his country destroyed in the effort to repel it.

Of course, we do not really care about the Asians and Africans. If we did, we would ask them what they wanted. We have not let the South Vietnamese vote on joining North Vietnam or on any related subject, because we have suspected that the vote would not go our way. The foreign policy of the United States has not been built on justice; it has been built on the supposed self-interest of this country.

But "containment" is not in the interest of this country. It puts us into every situation anywhere in the world in which there are alleged to be any Communist elements. There is no situation in which this cannot be alleged.

And, in fact, there is no situation in which the allegation cannot eventually be proved. If the Communists are not there to start with, they will appear sooner or later in response to appeals from elements opposed to those we are supporting.

Hence we are committed to get into any fight going on anywhere, and usually on the wrong side.

The reason we are likely to be the wrong side is that we are allied with the status quo all over the world, and the status quo in the underdeveloped countries, at least, is usually wrong.

We are opposed to those who want to change it unless we can be sure they have the same ideas as the people they want to displace.

For example, we have no difficulty in adjusting ourselves to the game of musical chairs as played by military dictators in Latin America. But we find it almost impossible to accept a social revolution there or anywhere else.

Any regime, however corrupt or detested, that says it is against communism will have our instantaneous support. And if anybody asks why we should get into a vain, hopeless war to bolster up such a regime, the great domino theory, the handmaid and companion of "containment," is invoked. We are told we cannot withdraw because if we do other nations who have relied on us will fall like dominoes to the Communists.

The display we have put on in South Vietnam must have alienated the people of southeast Asia. By going into the Congo we alienate the people of Africa. How we strengthen our position with our friends or with neutrals by fighting losing wars in unpopular causes remains obscure.

The obvious substitute for "containment" is the United Nations. By working out the methods—and they must eventually be worked out—by which the United Nations may maintain order during revolutions we may obtain peace with justice. That should be the aim of the foreign policy of the United States.

MADISON, WIS.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I support your effort to change America's policy in South Vietnam. This war must be stopped before we get involved in an even greater conflict. If at all possible not only continue your present work, but step it up. It is wonderful to know that there are men of your stature in the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

ALAN T. OLMSTEAD.

LOS ANGELES ART THEATER,
Beverly Hills, Calif.,
March 31, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your repetitions of reality and law must not stop. Can't you get more press for your vital message?

With gratitude,

DONALD FREED.

HAZELHURST, WIS.,
April 5, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is just to inform you that many Wisconsin voters fully agree with your stand on the Vietnam war. You are serving this Nation well in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

PHIL KRONENWETTER.

BUFFALO CENTER, IOWA.

DEAR SIR: Every week brings us into a new phase of the escalation of the war in Vietnam with no honest hope for a backdown of North Vietnamese troops and their supporters.

World war III will take place unless we stop this escalation. We are always led to believe that all our efforts are retaliatory but the facts do not bear this out. We started it on July 31 when South Vietnam naval vessels shelled two islands off North Vietnam's shore. Those vessels we supplied. We armed them and we trained their crews. We also had ships in the vicinity that was a provoking element. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 1964, page 20291.

April 21, 1965

The North Vietnamese then sent out PT boats. At a distance of nearly 3 miles we opened fire first. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 21, 1964, page 20291. We then bombed four of their bases and destroyed many of their PT boats.

The escalation has continued. We must stop it. The lives of all of us are at stake and it is foolishness to continue the escalation. This is no Pearl Harbor. This is provocation on our part and our fears, that continue to motivate us, enable us to continue such injustices. May enlightened public opinion bring pressure to bear on you and others to change our present faulty foreign policy before it is too late.

A concerned citizen,

Pastor WAYNE WASTA,
Methodist Minister.

NATICK, MASS.,
April 5, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE, I strongly support your efforts toward solving the Vietnam crisis.

Sincerely,

Mrs. DAVID COOK.

DIVISION OF PEACE AND WORLD
ORDER, GENERAL BOARD OF CHRIS-
TIAN SOCIAL CONCERNS OF THE
METHODIST CHURCH,

Washington, D.C., April 6, 1965.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In view of the grave situation in Vietnam I believe you will be interested in the enclosed statement very recently adopted by the Executive Committee of the General Board of Christian Social Concerns of the Methodist Church.

Sincerely yours,

HERMAN WILL, JR.,
Associate General Secretary.

STATEMENT ON VIETNAM ADOPTED ON MARCH 24, 1965, BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD OF CHRISTIAN SOCIAL CONCERNS OF THE METHODIST CHURCH

We are gravely concerned over developments in the war in Vietnam. We acknowledge the complexity of the situation in southeast Asia, and we recognize the extremely difficult problems confronting the U.S. Government as it seeks to maintain as much as possible of that area free from Communist domination. Those responsible for policy determination deserve sympathetic understanding as they grapple with the unpleasant choices which they confront.

Nevertheless, we firmly believe that citizens of the United States and of other countries likely to be affected by the future course of events in southeast Asia have a right and a responsibility to study the issues and express a thoughtful judgment as to the wisdom of the national policies involved.

We, therefore, direct attention to the following considerations. The bombing of North Vietnam at an accelerating pace raises serious moral questions as to the appropriateness of the means chosen for the implementation of legitimate policy objectives. If the desired response from Hanoi and the Vietcong is not forthcoming, the present course of action could well lead to full-scale war with North Vietnam and possibly Communist China. Such an eventuality would be a disaster of world dimensions, and, in our judgment, out of proportion to the goal sought.

Accompanying this military course of action has been an apparent coolness toward offers of mediation and toward negotiation on any basis other than an unconditional acceptance of the terms laid down by the United States. We believe a proper regard for world opinion and the role of the United Nations calls for a clearer expression of read-

iness to negotiate and to accept the good offices of the United Nations Secretary-General in making arrangements for such negotiation to take place.

The Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches and the General Board of the National Council of Churches have made significant statements to which we direct the attention of Methodists. We agree with the World Council's Commission that the quest for a solution must be shifted from the battlefield to the conference table. We also support the National Council's General Board in its request to the U.S. Government: "To engage in persistent efforts to negotiate a cease fire and a settlement of the war which will attempt to achieve the independence, freedom and self-determination of the people of Vietnam;

"To utilize United Nations assistance in achieving a solution and in seeking to reduce the area of conflict by effective border control and internal policing; and

"To give bold and creative leadership to a broad international development program for the Mekong region and to continue full scale U.S. economic and technical assistance where necessary."

NOTE.—The Executive Committee of the Board of Christian Social Concerns of the Methodist Church speaks only for itself and not for the Methodist Church as a whole.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

We ask for an immediate ceasefire in Vietnam and immediate use of U Thant's formula for negotiations.

ESTHER EPSTEIN.

MINNETTO, N.Y.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to express my support of your statements on our policy in Vietnam and to urge you to continue in your stand.

Sincerely,

Mrs. MARY RUTH HANKS.

BRONX, N.Y.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you rather than to my own Senators because more than any Member of Congress, you have been a leader in the fight against our unjust aggression in South and North Vietnam, and our flagrant and increasing violations of the Geneva agreement. President Johnson is getting more and more brutal and bloodthirsty. He seems to recognize no moral or legal limits. Today I read of nonmilitary targets in North Vietnam being bombed, last week I read that poison gas attacks will continue, that balloons on the use of nuclear bombs and on attacks on China are being placed in the press.

With increasing justification, Johnson's policies in Vietnam are being compared to those of Adolf Hitler. Public opinion polls, letters and public officials, statements by clergy and intellectuals all oppose Johnson's course. But he has paid no heed to pleas for peace—neither to our own pleas nor to those of international figures like U Thant, De Gaulle, Shastri, Pearson, etc.

Pleas, in short, appear to be futile; more drastic protest action is required. I am writing this letter to urge you (the voice of conscience in the U.S. Congress), to call for impeachment proceedings against President Johnson. Although I am sure he will not at this time be successfully impeached, let it be written in history, that a Member and hopefully Members of the U.S. Congress attempted to take the course of impeachment if necessary to stop the wanton killing

ordered by the President of the United States. Let the impeachment proceedings symbolize the hopes and desires of all peace-loving international laws respecting America. Let us not be judged at Nuremberg.

Sincerely,

HAL LEVIN.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
April 8, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Warmly support immediate discussion of a peaceful settlement in Vietnam.

EMANUEL KLEIN.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
April 9, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I admire you and have followed closely all you have said in written about Vietnam. You have, I believe, the support of most Americans on this issue.

But do you have to confine yourself to showing that the present American policy is wrong? Can you not go further and take the lead in reestablishing Congress' right to decide when we shall go to war and when we shall not. Article I section 8 clearly gives Congress this power in the words "Congress shall have power—to declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water."

The mere fact that the present war is undeclared does not abrogate Congress' right in this field, it seems to me.

And our representatives in Congress have a responsibility to stop this un-American adventure on the other side of the world, and to prevent the nuclear holocaust which may follow.

Again, please accept my thanks for the many times you have fought against heavy odds for policies which were right.

Sincerely yours,

KATHERINE KENT.

SAN JOSE, CALIF.,
April 8, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We still support cease-fire and unconditional negotiations in Vietnam.

EDWARD AND JENIFER SCHOENBERGER.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
April 8, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge negotiations in Vietnam. History has proven war begets only more war. Bible says thou shalt not kill. No ifs in Bible. Plea stop killing at once.

Dr. and Mrs. I. OYLE.

HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.,
April 6, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Below is the text of message I have sent to the President April 6, 1965:

"We ask for an immediate cease-fire in Vietnam and an immediate use of U Thant formula for negotiations."

We wanted you to know of our support for you.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. LEWIS O. TEAGUE

CHICAGO, ILL.,
April 6, 1965

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am very glad that you coming to Chicago to take part in the commemoration of our Jewish martyrs, including my father, mother, and sister, who have been killed by the German murderers.

April 21, 1965

Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300150023-8

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

7879

Taking this opportunity I would like to add a few words that I had in mind to write to you for a long, long time.

I am one of your staunch followers, and I appreciate and admire very deeply your courage, honesty in your pursuing fight for justice, integrity for the whole of humanity. As a matter of fact I have a great collection of all your speeches and lectures in which you fearlessly speak out your mind and conscious.

I know there are many people like I, who are standing on your side, but they are afraid to speak out and express their views.

I have always voted Democratic and so I did in the last election, but I feel now terribly disappointed and misled. I cannot stand politicians who are breaking promises. I like honest, sincere people, men like you and your colleagues. I pray that God should give you health and long life that you should be able to continue your fight for justice, for the whole of mankind.

Please convey my best wishes to your colleagues, the Senators, ERNEST GRUENING, FRANK CHURCH, and the others.

I hope to see you, please God, next Sunday in Chicago, and hear you talk and shake your hand.

Yours faithfully,

Rabbi DOV B. WARSHAWSKI.

NORTHFIELD, MASS.,

April 6, 1965.

Mr. GEORGE BUNDY,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BUNDY: In your interview this past Sunday evening on "Meet the Press" program I had the distinct impression that you were playing down public reaction to the administration's Vietnam policy not in agreement with what is presently being done. I feel sure that you must know the increasing concern over the attacks on bases in North Vietnam, bringing with it the increasing danger of all-out war.

I am convinced that the administration is being strongly influenced by the Pentagon and that propaganda is now being put out to condition the American people to the dropping of bombs on targets in mainland China—which would be an open act of aggression.

Senator WAYNE MORSE in an address in Cambridge, Mass., on March 12 stated that "the Pentagon is deliberately pursuing a policy of escalation in Asia aimed at the destruction of Chinese nuclear installations within 90 to 120 days." He told his audience that "the failure of the new Vietnam policy is frankly recognized in private by administration officials, who are now determined to bring about mounting escalation of the war. If the American people do not make their voices heard in support of U Thant, Pope Paul, and the Council of Churches in their calls for negotiations." Morse warned, "We stand to awaken only when we are beingrenched in blood."

"The white paper," MORSE noted, "contains virtually nothing that was not known last summer and fall when the President was saying 'We are not going north.' And both Pentagon and State Department insisted that no useful purpose would be served in the South by attacking the North. To put the old stories in the white paper and call them justification for expanding the war now when they weren't before" MORSE charged, "is an insult to the intelligence of the entire world not to mention the Americans."

Since listening to the aforementioned Sunday broadcast I have learned that there are reports to the effect that the President is not fully aware of the extent of public disagreement with administration policies. Is this action being played down to him as seemed

¹ Quoted from "Mass. PAX News," official organ of Massachusetts Political Action for peace—April 1965.

to me to be the case when you spoke Sunday evening?

If this is true, Mr. Bundy, I am wondering if the advisers to the President are not doing him and the people of America a serious disservice in not acquainting him with the facts.

Very truly yours,

FRANCES A. COVEY.

DETROIT, MICH.,

April 7, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Tonight I listened to President Johnson explaining about our war in Vietnam, naturally I was disappointed.

I appreciate the difficulty he is in—his loyalty is to the international financiers, corporations, and monopolies, yet he must assure the people of this country to trust him and his cause in Vietnam. This indeed is very hard to do in face of the facts.

He as much as told the people that if all men cease their Socialist endeavors and surrender to the imperialists life will blossom anew as never before for all.

History refutes these possibilities—Africa was under their absolute power for centuries yet the imperialists never took advantage of their opportunities to show mercy, magnanimity, and fair play. Latin America is right now feeling the hard hand of the same gentleman. Asia too has had her share of the blessings of serving imperialism. Even if Johnson is sincere does he think for 1 minute that capitalists will change their ways just to please him—that's wishful thinking.

Anyway he assures us that the war will go on and we shall win—over the dead body of little Vietnam.

If President Johnson can kill Asians, Africans, and Latin Americans at will with impunity what will stop the racists, bigots, and fanatics from doing the same to those that they don't like? What an example for the world to watch?

How quick our Government responds to events in far away Asia and Africa, yet how painfully slow it is to react to injustices within our own borders.

I am glad that you are against our aggression in Vietnam, more power to you.

Sincerely,

JOHN Z. GILSAVAGE.

P.S.—Please, excuse the pencil I'm anxious to mail this to you.

MANCHESTER COLLEGE,

North Manchester, Ind., April 7, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am greatly disturbed by, and opposed to, escalation of the war in Vietnam. I believe that this policy is more likely to lead to an upward spiral of retaliation, destruction, and bitterness by both sides than it is to surrender by the North Vietnamese Government.

I appreciate your efforts to bring about a change in our Government's policy.

I urge that we take the initiative in bringing about a cease-fire in Vietnam through the United Nations or the powers of the Geneva Conference of 1954, and in negotiating an honorable settlement.

I am encouraged by the President's proposal that we should assist in a comprehensive program of economic development in Vietnam and elsewhere in southeast Asia, such as the Mekong River project. I believe that such a creative alternative should accompany our efforts to bring a cessation in hostilities. Thus we could help to meet some of the legitimate needs and demands of people in that area. I think that the problem is not basically a military one, and that our attempt at a military solution will greatly lessen our ability to reach a con-

structive resolution of the difficulty and avoid an all-out war.

I am aware of the dilemmas in this situation, and sympathetic to your efforts to meet the problems. May God give you wisdom.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM SCHUHLE,
Professor of Political Science.

TYNGSBORO, MASS.,

April 8, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is to say that as a Christian homemaker, I heartily support and agree with your position on the Vietnam situation.

I pray that you and those who hold to the hope that there must be an alternative to the escalation of the Vietnam war will soon be heard and headed.

Very truly yours,

CYNTHIA D. MARRINER.

BUFFALO, N.Y.,

April 7, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have sent the following telegram to the President:

"As a student and young voter, I was deeply disturbed by your speech on Vietnam. Our bombings, brutal atrocities and suppression of truth, are both immoral and indefensible. Only an honorable America can take the first step to end this insanity."

I have remained silent far too long on this issue. I merely wished to inform you of my feelings in this matter. Your concern and courage in this, as in so many other national matters, has been inspiring. Thank you.

Very truly yours,

JOHN D. MARCIANO,
University of Buffalo.

RAVENA, N.Y.,

April 5, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for being a courageous man. Thank you for speaking for the millions of Americans whose voices go unheard.

What is there left for the moral American to do? We have written our newspapers, written our Congressmen, marched in protest demonstrations—and yet we must go on living with our indignation and shame over our policy in Vietnam, because the voice of the people no longer counts.

I appreciate your willingness to speak at a time when other politicians seem to seek their political expediency through silence.

Sincerely,

JANET D. NEWMAN.

BERKELEY, CALIF.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to extend to you my heartfelt thanks for bringing to the attention of the American people the immoral war which we are fighting in South Vietnam.

That a great democratic nation such as ours can be waging a cruel and atrocious war in the name of freedom is hypocrisy epitomized. But there are many who share our sentiments and I therefore hope that you will not give up the fight.

Thank you again.

MARGARET SHEPARD.

SEBASTOPOL, CALIF.,

April 4, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR: Will you please tell the President of this United States how he can get us out of the world war that we are getting into as sure as God made little apples. Tell him to instead of putting more troops, etc., into Vietnam to pull them out, but tell them we are their friends and will back them up to the fullest extent with everything we possess for the purpose of defending

Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300150023-8

April 21, 1965

themselves. That way we can let them take the rap for war while we will defend them. And for God's sake, yours, his and mine, to get them out right now.

Furthermore tell him if by any means he wants to build some bad fences in Alabama to have Mrs. Johnson to start a Ladybird Special to Montgomery and Selma, to have her select a dozen or so governors' wives and take them along and call on Mrs. Wallace for a tea or perhaps she might invite them to a tea.

I believe that would fix some broken fences for him because I don't think, according to the results of the last election, they don't feel too kindly towards him. But they would to Lady Bird's Special and, according to the newspapers, she is a very intelligent and gifted speaker herself. I am thinking for this trip an old fashioned campaign train with speeches off the back end of the train like they used to do. What do you think of that?

Now, dear Senator, I have taken too much of your time already. Forgive, please.

Most sincerely yours,

FLOYD H. H. MEAD.

Ain't I a devil of a politician? Ninety-nine years young, voted Democratic my entire life. Had quite a few winners, eh. Was in Cuba with Teddy, but wouldn't vote for him.

DETROIT, MICH.,

April 7, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We just had to write you and thank you for the stand you have taken to stop the unnecessary war we are fighting in far off Vietnam. We are also happy that Senator GRUENING from Alaska is helping you to try and stop the war.

We had too many wars already. I have voted here in Detroit 50 years now. I have fought; my sons went to Japan to fight for freedom; my brother's boy was killed in Japan. So we had our share of wars.

I want to thank you again, Senator MORSE, and God bless you, Senator.

EDWARD C. MARKS.

And God bless you again, Senator.

SANTA CRUZ, CALIF.,

April 9, 1965.

DEAR SIR: For years I and my friends have followed your liberal and commonsense approach to world and domestic affairs. We think that you will agree with us that the U.S. attack against the Vietnamese people is indefensible on legal, moral, and tactical grounds. As one consequence among several, our country is isolating itself even from its friends. We urge that you advocate negotiation before there is left no country worth negotiating about. Why not a new foreign policy: Asia for the Asiatics?

Yours sincerely,

RANSOM RIDEOUT.

CLEVELAND, OHIO,

April 9, 1965.

To the Editor,

The Plain Dealer.

The language of the President's speech re Vietnam was eloquent, but unrelated to reality.

If a resolution were introduced in Congress to declare war against North Vietnam, the American people would oppose it overwhelmingly.

The President is responsible for the death of every American boy killed in Vietnam in this illegal, undeclared war. Furthermore, the Congress has no right to place either the authority or responsibility upon the President through resolutions which give the President the Congress warmaking power.

By and large the Vietnamese people want the Americans to get out of Vietnam. They should have gotten out long ago. France won't support the U.S. position in Vietnam.

Other NATO allies have given token support at most.

It is not our sole responsibility to try and resolve the situation in Vietnam. We are not a world police force. If we continue going it alone. We shall be embroiled in wars all over the world, to the private delight of all of our allies, who chuckle at our stupidity in sacrificing our men in distant parts of the world.

We have no foreign policy except force, which will never bring lasting peace.

We should certainly give our surplus food and more to the hungry peoples of the world. We should not force our presence where we are not wanted, we with our high standard of living, while they struggle to keep body and soul together with their rice plantings.

The President knows that we certainly do want something in Vietnam—we want to dominate and control. So, we had better get out of Vietnam at once, where the lives of our boys are being sacrificed needlessly.

Very truly yours,

HARRY A. BLACHMAN,
Attorney at Law.

PASADENA, CALIF.,

April 6, 1965.

READERS' FORUM,

Star-News,

Pasadena, Calif.

DEAR SIR: Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY and other administration lackeys are showing signs of frustration over their failure to sell the war in Vietnam. He is quoted in Los Angeles: "Some people get a little more concerned about our deeds than Communist terrorism." "I haven't heard of any demonstration about their blowing up our Embassy."

There was a time when the United States was only advising their friends, the South Vietnamese, on how to deal with restless elements. This farce was at its peak during the regime of that great democrat who never got elected, Ngo Dinh Diem. Remember him? Many saw Mr. Diem as a corrupt and arrogant despot but he was the best that Mr. Dulles could find to serve as the agent who could invite the United States to participate in South Vietnamese affairs—for a price, of course.

Mr. Diem duly invited the United States in but it turned out that more than advisers were needed because the Diem policies were somehow alienating his own subjects. Some left wingers have even suggested that, had the elections of 1956 been held (as required by the 1954 Geneva Agreement), Ho Chi Minh of the North would have won handily. President Eisenhower had this to say: "I have never talked or corresponded with a person knowledgeable in Indochinese affairs who did not agree that had elections been held as of the time of the fighting, possibly 80 percent of the population would have voted for the Communist Ho Chi Minh as their leader rather than Chief of State Bao Dai." This comment about Bao Dai (long since retired to the rigors of the French Riviera) has been applied by spiteful souls to include Diem.

Naturally, Diem, although a great democrat (haven't we been assured endless times on this count) could not tolerate a democratic election of Ho Chi Minh. The result has been that Diem is gone and was for a time supplanted by a number of generals, very democratic ones to be sure. Finally, the generals were effaced and the United States has stepped in and is running the show. Everyone knows that nothing could be more democratic than that. The greatest irony is that the restless elements in South Vietnam have come to regard the United States as fair game for ambushes, blowing up of embassies, and other devilry—all this while their arms bear the signature

"Made in U.S.A." There simply is no gratitude left in this world.

Yours,

DAVID B. NIELSEN.

(Copies to HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Senator WAYNE MORSE, and Senator THOMAS KUCHEL.)

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,

April 6, 1965.

SIR: It is a relief to hear some sane voices in the Senate about the Vietnam situation. We do believe peace is possible. We also believe that an end should be brought to the Vietnam war. This is too much of a threat to international peace to be playing war and using torture, napalm, etc.

Peace is possible. It only needs men of good will to bring it about. Thank you for being one of them.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. CLARK DAVIS.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,

April 6, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is just to tell you that I—and many others like me—support fully your opposition to our militant military policy in Vietnam. For the first time in my life (60 years), I am ashamed of my country's actions. I have long admired you and never more than now—please keep up the good work, which I realize is most difficult in the face of the ignorance and apathy of most people.

Sincerely,

Mrs. MARIAN S. PHILLIPS.

Don't bother to answer—you have more important things to do.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,

April 11, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: My wife and I are two Americans who approve of the stand you are taking on the Vietnam war. We are deeply concerned about the warlike gestures of the present administration. We believe that millions of American citizens disapprove, but we fear that not enough of them are concerned enough to do anything about it. Like you we are strongly convinced that we have no legal nor moral right to be down there, and we are not impressed by the President's excuses for his actions.

We call ourselves a nation under God, but God seems to be completely left out in the decisions of our leaders. We are acting like savages with guns. We are incurring the disapproval and hatred of the world. We cannot stand against the whole world. We are courting war with China and probably with Russia, which would be disastrous. Nobody would win. We are bombing helpless people destroying their land; burning them with napalm and poisoning them with gas.

We should negotiate now, and withdraw with dignity, not necessarily as victors but with prudence and the love of God.

Our military seem to be drunk with power and the President must be ill advised. His story teaches us that the decline and fall of empires always ensue when that empire seek to conquer the world. The peaceful nation that seek no conquests are the ones that survive.

We hope you will become our President some day so that we may have peace without fear.

Very truly yours,

HERBERT and BEAULAH MORRISON.

BALTIMORE, MD.,

April 9, 1965.

DEAR SIR: I am a college student who has the great privilege to hear you speak on Vie

April 21, 1965

nam at Johns Hopkins. It is reassuring to find a person like you in politics.

If only some sort of peace party could be formed with you as Presidential candidate. You would have my vote. My esteem for you is unbounded.

Sincerely,

ERICA BUCHMAN.

LEESBURG, FLA.,

April 8, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Perhaps this is a fan letter but I cannot resist the impulse to tell you how much I admire your stand and your courage to speak out on the issues of our times. I find myself wishing you represented my State in Washington.

Let us hope that your voice will be heeded and not just a cry in the wilderness.

Sincerely,

HELENE ST. JOHN.

HISTORICAL AND RESEARCH COM-
MITTEE, MENNONITE GENERAL
CONFERENCE,

Goshen, Ind., April 8, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to congratulate you for the courageous statements you have made concerning the U.S. involvement in southeast Asia. It seems to me that what we have done there has been simply to solidify the forces against America and to turn world public opinion against us. As one who has lived in the Orient several years and has traveled in the interior of Vietnam, I feel convinced that the United States cannot win a war there any more than France was able to do it there or in Algeria. The forces of nationalism are too strong to allow a U.S. military victory. Let us not do the things that we were afraid Goldwater would have done had he been elected President.

Sincerely yours,

MELVIN GINGERICH,
Executive Secretary.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,

April 1, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Knowing your sensitivity to this important issue, we have enclosed a photocopy of our letter to the President on U.S. policy in Vietnam. We hope that you will continue to use your considerable influence in the pursuit of a reasonable solution to the Vietnam crisis.

Respectfully yours,

GRADUATE STUDENTS IN ASIAN STUDIES.

MARCH 24, 1965.

HON. LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON,
President, the United States,
Executive Mansion,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Sir, we, the undersigned graduate students of Asian affairs at the University of California, have with mounting concern watched the development of U.S. policy in Vietnam. Lacking the detailed information on the current situation here that is available to the Government, we do not presume to offer any specific solutions. From our knowledge of the general development of modern Asian history, however, it is apparent that the recent trend in U.S. policy can only lead to ultimate disaster.

Until recently our own Government spokesmen have repeatedly stressed that any solution to the civil war in South Vietnam must be 90 percent political and only 10 percent military. If "political" is taken to include basic socioeconomic reform, we en-

tirely agree with this analysis. Therefore, it is incomprehensible how the recent drastic intensification of direct military participation can attain our professed goals of a stable and independent Government in a peaceful South Vietnam.

The increasingly overt U.S. involvement and direction of the war can only undermine whatever remaining support the Saigon government has in South Vietnam by completely identifying it with a foreign power. Since Vietcong strategy, following the classical lines of wars of national liberation, is to mobilize mass support on a nationalist appeal of resistance to foreign intervention, the American military presence removes any possibility of the local government gaining the popular support necessary to defeat the Vietcong.

Similarly, the bombing of North Vietnam cannot win a guerrilla war in South Vietnam. It can, however, expand the war into a major conflagration in the Far East whose ultimate consequences would be unforeseeable.

That such risks should be taken in a military policy that is self-defeating to our purposes in South Vietnam we find appalling. Furthermore, the increasing suppression of information from Vietnam further undermines our faith in the wisdom and efficacy of this policy. We therefore strongly urge you to reconsider this futile attempt at a military solution to what is essentially not a military problem. Since suppression of the Vietcong now seems impossible, other means of securing a peaceful settlement in Vietnam must be explored.

Respectfully,

(Signatures illegible.)

APPLE VALLEY, CALIF.,

April 7, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We would like to commend you for your stand on the Vietnam situation. We, the public, need to hear more words from you so that we have some feeling of hope. The escalation of the war in Vietnam is indeed discouraging. Military involvement cannot settle political and economic problems.

We have written to our own Senators KUCHEL and MURPHY calling for their leadership in urging the United States to negotiate now.

President Johnson gave us a flame of encouragement by his call for economic programs for Vietnam. Please send us more information about the Mekong River project and the proposal that we send surplus farm goods to Vietnam. What other proposals have you heard of which we can study and perhaps urge our Senators and Representatives and President Johnson to support?

Very truly yours,

EDWARD P. FLOWERS.
PHYLLIS JEAN FLOWERS.

EL CERRITO, CALIF.,

April 7, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing once again to thank you for your unstinting efforts on behalf of humanity—your opposition to the U.S. policy in Vietnam. I have written letters, talked for hours, helped to pay for ads, and am helping a little to plan events for April 17, the march on Washington day. But I felt horribly depressed this evening to hear the President say the same things based on the same false picture of Vietnam—interlarded with images of the Great Society which hasn't the chance of a snowball in hell while we get nearer and nearer to war with China.

I know you are too busy to answer mail yourself—I can't even find copies of your speeches, though, of course, some of them are in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—but I have

wondered if you perhaps know whether Mr. Johnson reads any dissenting mail, and whether he reads anything but State Department handouts about Vietnam. The other day on CBS television news in the morning, Johnson was complaining about the press conjecturing about a disagreement over Vietnam policy. He said he had said to his wife, "O Lord, forgive them, for they know not what they do." Now I believe that traditionally people who have delusions of being God or Christ are considered mentally ill. At any rate, this remark suggests a frightening arrogance in that "folksy" man—and none of the humility that marks a scholar of human affairs. Is there any way to approach the man? Would letters to Vice President HUMPHREY be more useful? I haven't written to McGeorge Bundy—I started to but his resemblance in role and manner to Goebbels put me off.

What I would like to know, however, is whether there are any particular things that ordinary citizens like me can do that you would consider especially useful. If there are, I would like to know about them.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. M. J. BILLINGS.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I write this letter in support of your position on the Vietnam situation. Your reasonable and ethical stand on this question is most heartening in the midst of so much saber rattling and stupidity.

Sincerely yours,

LAURENCE M. OLIVO.

MIDLAND EMPIRE INSURANCE
& REAL ESTATE,

Klamath Falls, Oreg., April 8, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The United States has no business in Vietnam. When the U.S. Government has to pay an enemy to stop fighting, after we already have them whipped to a standstill, which cost us billions of dollars in the first place to do; I, as many other citizens feel that our representatives are trying to bankrupt our Nation.

If I should try to run my business on borrowed money that I couldn't pay for, my complete organization would collapse.

We, as citizens have no complaint when our tax moneys are spent on the improvement of our own country; but when we have to support foreign dictators, large and small, with our tax dollars, I feel that we have gone too far.

Please, do everything in your power to curtail this gross sabotage of the American tax dollar. We, the people, depend on you, as one of our representatives. You are a custodian of our American heritage. Let's relieve the tax burden at home now, by curtailing all giveaways of any kind to all foreign nations.

Let's be Americans, let's think American, and let's take care of America.

Thank you and best wishes.

Very truly yours,

CLEM LESUEUR.

NORTH HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.,

April 7, 1965.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have just heard your speech on the Vietnam problem. I am very glad you have offered to negotiate with Russia, China, and North Vietnam. However, refusing to talk with the Vietcong, I believe, is wrong, as they are a part of both North and South Vietnam. I further believe that the United Nations should handle this

problem, even if Russia has not paid all its dues. If we do not support the United Nations, our chance for real and lasting peace will end.

I believe our intensification of the war in Vietnam and the bombing of cities in North Vietnam has only solidified the peoples of Asia against us. If we spread even further to the bombing of China, more of Asia will join against us.

I believe we should be sure that what we are really doing is right, and, if it is right, it would be the will of God. So with this in mind, let us look at all the reasons we are in Vietnam. If we are wrong in any way, which is very possible, let us admit it and ask the United Nations to settle this problem now.

In your speech tonight you said you asked yourself each night if you had done all you could for peace, etc. You suggested that each of us ask ourselves the same question. I asked myself tonight, as I have many times before, and the answer is "No." That is why I am writing you. If I did not write you of my concern, I would not be doing my part today. However, if I wrote only to you it still would be insufficient; so I am sending copies to some Members of Congress.

May God be with us all.

Sincerely,

STANLEY K. WEITKAMP.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
 April 1, 1965.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
 U.S. Senate,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I endorse your position for negotiations on the Vietnam situation.

Sincerely,

D. SAMUELS, D.D.S.

ROCHESTER, N.Y.,
 April 10, 1965.

DEAR SIR: I commend your opposition to the Vietnam mess and to foreign aid.

In paying taxes on April 15 I have urged taxpayers to write Congress and the President to stop wasting our tax dollars abroad. If pushed this could be the "ground swell" needed to stop wasteful "foreign aid."

Yours truly,

HOMER G. WHITMORE.

LA HABRA, CALIF.,
 April 7, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
 Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to thank you for your most courageous stand in urging a peaceful settlement of the Vietnam situation.

To me, this is the only rational solution, for further escalation could easily lead to a nuclear holocaust.

Please continue to urge this peaceful means of ending the Vietnam crisis.

Thank you for your great courage and high principles.

With greatest gratitude and deepest admiration,

ESTHER H. ADLER.

NEW YORK CITY, N.Y.,
 April 9, 1965.

Hon. W. MORSE:

I certainly do agree with Your Honor that any amount of U.S. money in the way of promised aid will not buy peace. There must and should be, Your Honor, other easier ways of finding peace. So I close to Your Honor and yours and those near and dear to your heart with my highest respect.

Sincerely,

GEORGE McCULLOUGH.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,

April 10, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I heard the speech of our President and I have read it with care. I am horrified that it is being accepted as a peace speech. It is the most well-thought-out effort to further confuse the American people and surely anyone who is knowledgeable about what is going on knows this well. Our people can all be fooled—sometimes—but, as history shows, not for all time and they are increasingly aware these days that we have no legitimate business in Vietnam, that the killing, the burning, the destruction of food as well as people, has no justification in the eyes of any but a small, wealthy, powerful (because U.S. supported) group who will be overthrown when the National Liberation Front achieves victory.

How can we mouth words about loving people, grieving over the hungry, etc., at the very moment when we send more soldiers and planes and arms to this land?

I hope that people who, like yourself, do have some vision of a future for the world other than nuclear destruction, will make clear that—while the Mekong Delta idea is fine—not new, already underway with many countries—it is impossible because the United States keeps the civil war going and expands it. First—cease-fire—then begin to find ways to talk instead of kill. And I hope too that there will be voices to point out that it is as futile and deceitful to talk of negotiations without the so-called Vietcong (National Liberation Front) as it would have been for the British to announce their desire for peace—but negotiations to be only with the French.

We need every voice of sanity. Help bring some to the Halls of the Senate—join Senator GRUENING who speaks with such a clear and brave and true voice.

Respectfully yours,

ELIZABETH MOOS.

MALIBU, CALIF.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thanks for your words for peace. Keep it up.

RICHARD M. POWELL.

APRIL 8, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I just read your "Senator Morse Reports" and wish to congratulate you for your valiant, forthright stand against the brutal and futile war in Vietnam which has damaged U.S. reputation and has evoked the just criticism and indignation of heads of states, churchmen, and decent people here and the many countries overseas.

I also fully support your bill aiming at restricting military aid and replacing it with economic aid to countries developing their free institutions.

Respectfully,

K. WEIGL.

APRIL 8, 1965.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to praise you for you stand on the southeast Asia situation. Are we going to have a truce, like in Korea, and keep U.S. troops there indefinitely?

Harry Truman called the Korean war a police action, but if Margaret Truman had been 2d Lt. Harry Truman, Jr., and in the Army in Korea in 1950, I'll bet it would have been declared a war.

I had command of an ammunition ship in 1950-51 delivering bombs to the aircraft carriers at sea and we worked long and hard, but after October 24, 1950, and we saw that Harry Truman would not let us win the war, I could no longer tell my crew that we should be there.

Will we ever get our troops out of Korea or do we keep supporting a corrupt, un-

stable government there forever at over a million dollars a day?

And now the President proposes to give a billion dollars to southeast Asia. For what? To support more corrupt politicians there.

We should not allow any more American lives to be lost in Vietnam or in southeast Asia. Maybe it would stop if we gave each widow of an American who lost his life there a million dollars—better than for foreign aid. We cannot buy respect or loyalty—ask Sukarno.

Yours sincerely,

M. W. GRAYBILL,
 U.S. Navy (retired).

[From Time magazine, Mar. 19, 1965]

COLUMNISTS—IF GOLDWATER HAD WON

How would the United States have fared if Barry Goldwater had been elected President? "The mind boggles to think of it," mused Columnist Art Buchwald last week in the New York Herald Tribune. Nonetheless, Buchwald did his deadpan best to guess how things really would have turned out under Goldwater. To begin with, he wrote, "the Vietcong would have blown up an American barracks. Goldwater would immediately call for a strike on military bases in North Vietnam and announce a 'new tit-for-tat policy.' Democrats would make speeches that Goldwater was 'trigger happy' and was trying to get us into a war with Red China.

"But Goldwater would ignore the criticism and continue the raids, using not only Air Force bombers, but also jets from the U.S. Fleet. As time went on, he would explain that, instead of a 'tit-for-tat' policy, we now intended to bomb North Vietnam in order to let Hanoi know that they could not support the Vietcong without expecting retaliation.

"Senators would call for some sort of negotiations. But Goldwater, with his lack of restraint, would retort that there is nothing to negotiate and we would only be selling out southeast Asia if we sat down at a table with the North Vietnamese and Red China. Instead, he would recklessly announce that he was sending in a battalion of Marines with Hawk missiles to protect our airfields. His critics would claim he was escalating the war, but Goldwater would deny it. Instead he would bomb supply routes in Laos and Cambodia.

"To explain these desperate actions, Goldwater would have the Defense and State Departments produce a 'white paper' justifying the attacks and proving that Hanoi was responsible for the revolution in South Vietnam."

Of course, wrote Buchwald, Democrats would hotly insist they had known all along that Goldwater would plunge the United States into a war. Republicans would argue that Goldwater had no choice, that anyway he had merely inherited the Vietnam mess from the Democrats. "It all seems far fetched," allowed Buchwald, "and I may have let my imagination run away with itself, because even Barry Goldwater wouldn't have gone so far. But fortunately, with President Johnson at the helm, we don't even have to think about it."

[From the Saturday Review, Feb. 27, 1965

VIETNAM AND THE AMERICAN CONSCIENCE

Vietnam is profoundly complex, but it is not so complex as to defeat the American intelligence or disable the American conscience. Some facts and implications are clear, no matter how murky the general situation.

The first fact is that the United States today does not have the backing of the Vietnamese people in whose name it went into Vietnam in the first place and whom it is seeking to save today. The U.S. military forces have had to cope not just with secre

April 21, 1965

7883

gents from North Vietnam but with the growing opposition of the populace as a whole. In briefings of new U.S. military personnel, the point is stressed that most Vietnamese are either sympathizers with or secret members of the Vietcong. The retaliatory bombings by the United States of North Vietnam targets do not meet the problem presented by internal opposition within North Vietnam itself.

The second fact is that most of the military equipment used against American and North Vietnam military forces has come either from Communist China or North Vietnam but from the United States. It is ludicrous to talk about bombing supply lines from North Vietnam as a means of shutting off the flow. According to some estimates, up to 80 percent of the military equipment used by the Vietcong originates in the United States. In largest part, it is either captured by the Vietcong or turned over by supposedly loyal South Vietnamese. No one knows how much of the equipment finds its way to Communist China. A Chinese official interviewed in Peiping several months ago said he was almost reluctant to see the Americans leave; they had contributed so heavily to the Chinese arsenal.

The third fact is that the legal justification invoked by the United States for its involvement in Vietnam has long since been nullified. Under the terms of the 1954 Geneva agreement, all foreign forces and military equipment were to stay out of Indochina. The United States came with military force into Indochina, most notably in Laos, South Vietnam, and Thailand, declaring it had done so at the request of the Governments involved, which was not a violation of the treaty. But nothing in the treaty gave the United States the right to finance revolutionary movements or to participate in undercover subversion. (In Laos in 1960 and 1961, the United States financed and equipped the effort of General Phoumi Nosavan to overthrow the only elected government in the history of Laos. At the same time, the United States continued to pay the salaries of loyalist forces and to furnish their supplies. Thus the United States was in the astonishing position of underwriting both sides of a civil war. Eventually, the situation was restored to its prerevolutionary status, but only after many thousands of civilians were killed or became homeless.)

In South Vietnam, the inability of the Diem government to maintain the support of its own people constituted a severe drag in the war effort. Eventually, the Diem government was overthrown and the Premier assassinated. Later, Frederick E. Nolting, Jr., former Ambassador to South Vietnam, said the United States has been directly involved in the antigovernment plot. Whether Premier Diem was or was not authoritarian and backward it beside the point; the American people have never given their Government a warrant to engage in subversion or murder. Diem, regimes in South Vietnam have come and gone; which of them has enjoyed no legitimate legitimacy it is difficult to say. In any case, what is the legal basis for our presence now? Our presence was requested by a government no longer in existence, and that our own ex-Ambassador said we should overthrow.

The fourth fact is that our policy in Vietnam in particular and Asia in general has not been of a piece. Basically, an important objective of our foreign policy is to keep the Soviet Union and Communist China from coming together in a unified and massive ideological and military coalition. But our policy in Vietnam is producing exactly the effect we seek to avoid. Nothing that has happened since the original rupture between the two major Communist powers has done more to bring the Soviet Union and Communist China together again than recent American actions in Vietnam. The Commu-

nist Chinese have long argued that the Russian idea of coexistence was an anti-Marxist and antihistorical notion that could only be advanced by naive sentimentalists. They claim war is inevitable because of the nature of capitalism. As evidence, they assert that the United States, despite its claim that it sought only to promote the internal stability of Indochina, was actually pursuing a war against Asian peoples as an extension of the very imperialism Asians had fought so hard to expel. The Soviet Union, which is no less concerned than the United States about Chinese expansion throughout Asia, also has to be concerned about its standing in the world Communist community. It cannot allow itself to appear indifferent to military action involving a member of that community. Any expansion of the war by the United States into North Vietnam would force the Soviet Union to identify itself with North Vietnam and thus with China.

REDLANDS, CALIF.,
April 5, 1965.

To the Right Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish the enclosed clippings might be read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Your remarks on our foreign policy are always a great satisfaction to me.

Respectfully yours,
MRS. ARTHUR M. SARGENT.

BERKELEY, CALIF.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: For what my support is worth, I give it to you with great gratitude and encourage your courageous campaign for an intelligent approach to our involvement in Vietnam.

You and Senator GRUENING are worth the other 98 Senators combined.

Please continue and I cannot thank you enough.

F. JOHNSON.

RUTLAND, VT.,
April 9, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to bring to your attention that the Constitution of the United States provides that Congress shall have power to declare war. This means that the President has not got the power to declare war.

Therefore, in South Vietnam the United States is carrying on an unconstitutional war.

I suggest that Congress refuse to appropriate any money for this undeclared war or for the aid of South Vietnam. And, I suggest that Congress refuse to confirm presidential appointments to men who will not do everything in their power to stop this undeclared war.

Moreover, neither the people of the United States nor the people of South Vietnam want the U.S. forces in South Vietnam.

Furthermore, the cost of this undeclared war and aid to South Vietnam deprive the people of the United States of their tax money which they would either like to keep themselves or have spent for local improvement and public benefit. The city of Rutland needs better schools, better roads, more sewers, and new sidewalks.

Yours truly,
IRVING H. REYNOLDS.

UPLAND, CALIF.,
April 5, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I would like to express my whole-hearted support of your stand on the

issues involved in our current Vietnam policy. I feel that a sane appraisal of our moral obligations is very much in order before we are pushed into a situation where our national destiny is imperiled by reactions of fear and irrational anger. Please keep us out Red China and North Vietnam.

Yours truly,
GREGORY H. REISNER.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 6, 1965]
WRONG VIETNAM POLICY

To the Editor:

In seeking to establish peace in southeast Asia, President Johnson has placed himself under a severe handicap by taking the advice of the same men who persuaded President Kennedy to continue the Eisenhower-Dulles policy of unilateral military intervention in Vietnam, instead of—as in Laos—seeking to implement the Geneva accords of 1954.

The more this interventionist policy has failed, the more its sponsors insist upon trying to redeem failure by ever deeper, more dangerous and more reckless commitment of United States prestige and power.

It is now evident that the policy urged upon Presidents Kennedy and Johnson has failed and will continue to fail if carried further. When a policy has shown itself incapable of achieving its ends, there is only one thing to do and that is to adopt a different policy. And when Presidential advisers who have sponsored a bankrupt policy refuse to recognize the need for changing course, it is time for the President to seek other advice.

ECONOMIC COOPERATION

To the outside observer it appears that President Johnson is about the only "dove" among the present policymakers. He alone has spoken, vaguely to be sure, of the kind of economic cooperation with all of southeast Asia which might bring the warring factions to the conference table.

Surely there are in Washington men able and willing to help the President formulate a clear-cut policy for peace; Walter Lippman's recent articles are an outstanding example, and there are plenty of leaders in the world who stand ready to help end an ill-advised adventure that more and more threatens world peace and, with it, the President's noble hope of establishing in the Great American Society an example of what all men everywhere may hope eventually to achieve.

JAMES P. WARBURG,
Greenwich, Conn.

WCRB,
BOSTON, MASS.,
April 8, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR: Please try to seek a peaceful settlement in Vietnam and not spread the war.

Sincerely,
THEODORE JONES, President.

DEAR SIR: I share your misgivings about the Johns Hopkins speech. Indeed it seems to me that this might as easily be an attempt to quiet student opposition on campuses, liberal and church opposition and to lull the consciences of those abroad and at home, while the aggressive war is continued or expanded. L.B.J.'s "sons" are not dying—his daughters are safe and I dare say if McNamara and Bundy have them, they are safe, too. The people of South Vietnam are not allowed to decide—and it is an evil thing we do to forbid people the right to be free of foreign troops and intervention, and to take sides in a civil war, too, when it is intervention. The "aid" may be a way of purchasing the right to dissent from our policies from other people by propping up more puppets. I do not want to feather the beds of Diems on the Riviera, with our tax dol-

April 21, 1965

7884

lars. To help the people, yes—but not to corrupt a people.

You are a brave and wise man.

Thank you.

H. MARTIN.

SILVER SPRING, Md.,
 April 12, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
 U.S. Senate,
 Washington, D.C.

Sir: President Johnson is waging a war against North Vietnam beyond any power given him by the Constitution or any Federal law. Would you help me to commence an action of mandamus through the U.S. Supreme Court to stay his hand in North Vietnam?

Very truly yours,

ARTHUR A. LEVINE.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,
 April 11, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
 U.S. Senate,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: A short note of support for your stand on the present U.S. policy in Vietnam, and encouragement for your continued vigorous protests of the administration's policies there.

I shan't bore you with the reasons I find present U.S. policies in Vietnam most shocking, and quite frightening; they do coincide in general with your own views as elaborated last month at Harvard University, however.

What disturbs me most, though, is the almost unanimous acquiescence of your colleagues in Congress with the President's rather bellicose policy in Vietnam. I have and shall continue to hammer away at my own Representatives on the subject. Poor fellows, they are not blessed with such short letters.

Best wishes.

Most sincerely,

GERALD PACHOLKE.

PITTSBURGH, PA.,
 April 10, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
 Senator of the United States,
 U.S. Senate,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to you in reference to your recent statements regarding our so-called advisory war in Vietnam.

I think our action in Vietnam is a deplorable situation and can only result in involving us in a major war in Asia. I believe Gen. Douglas MacArthur warned our leaders about involving our country in a land war in Asia shortly before his death. Who are we to intrude in the internal affairs of any country? The enclosed newspaper clippings pretty well sum it up. All of the smart talk by President Johnson, Mr. Rusk, Mr. McNamara, and General Taylor won't brush these facts away.

Herewith are some of the things I believe has led this country into our present situation.

1. The CIA and their meddling in the affairs of other countries. Why is this agency not responsible to our Senate and Congress? They have assumed an all-powerful position wherein they could involve us in a catastrophic war.

2. Has the country been taken over by the military and is our civil government powerless to exercise control over this group?

3. Has the Federal Government, along with the Supreme Court, overstepped their powers in respect to States' rights? What is being done about the enforcement of laws for all groups in our society? Or do we only enforce the law of the land for some pressure group and turn our back when others break the law?

As I am one of the 25 million disappointed voters in the recent presidential election, I

decided to write you as you seem to be one of the few responsible leaders left in our great land. Since both of our Senators from Pennsylvania support the administration in the Vietnam war, it would be a waste of time to write them. Who is trigger happy now?

Being the parent of a son who was shipped off to Korea in 1950, at the age of 19 years, with little or no training, to spend almost 2 years in that hole, for what? I do not want to see this country go down the drain again in such a war.

Thanking you for any consideration you may give to my views.

Yours truly,

E. T. MCGUIRE.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press, Mar. 26, 1965]

REASON GASSED OUT
 (By Richard Starnes)

WASHINGTON.—The Bamboo Curtain behind which the United States is waging undeclared war against North Vietnam has parted ever so slightly and revealed some desperately ugly circumstances.

The vital point has been lost in the controversy that has raged since disclosure that nonlethal disabling gas had been used against Communist guerrilla forces.

Apart from professional Communist propagandists no one contends the gas is analogous to chemical-biological-radiological weapons banned by the Washington Disarmament Treaty of 1921-22 or the Geneva Treaty of 1925.

But that, of course, is not the point, the point is that world reaction to the use of any sort of chemical warfare agent—but particularly gas—could have been expected by any but the most desperate bitter-end professional soldiers trying to stave off defeat.

Failure of the U.S. military technology to defeat the Vietcong is a doleful fact that in the military mind transcends any ideological consideration.

The most cogent argument on behalf of continuing the fight in Vietnam is that defeat there would lead only to repetition in Thailand, Malaysia, and the Philippines.

Thus the ultimate conclusion is the same: Defeat in southeast Asia is inadmissible; at whatever cost, the war must be "won."

This has led to desperate adventurism such as the use of gas more poisonous to American repute than to the foe, and to a news blackout as rigid as any of World War II. The American people are being denied the information they need to reach mature democratic decision or upon which to base outspoken protest.

The United States has been using horror weapons in Vietnam almost since the beginning. Napalm is a far more savage instrument of war than nonlethal toxic gas, but strangely enough it has excited little protest. Worse even than napalm is white phosphorous—and proxy-American use of that dreadful chemical passed almost unnoticed early this month.

Projectiles or bombs filled with white phosphorous would win most professional soldiers' votes as the most barbarous weapon of modern war—not excepting lethal gas. White phosphorous shells explode in a hell-fire that clings to whatever it strikes, and which cannot be extinguished.

Use of these devices is a true measure of how far we have gone in Vietnam. Even the use of nonlethal gas lets down bars that have been painfully erected over centuries of human travail.

Napalm and white phosphorous are ghastly; so, indeed, are hand-held weapons of such tremendous muzzle velocity that men are no longer wounded by them, they are dismembered.

Madness has replaced reason in Vietnam, and desperation has become the rationale for all manner of savagery. That is the real

lesson that the use of gas has brought with it.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press Mar. 2 1965]

MOST POWERFUL ROCKET

WASHINGTON, March 27.—World's newest most powerful rocket will be flight tested June by the Air Force.

It's the Titan 3-C. It will generate 2,970,000 pounds of thrust—more than five and a half times as much as Titan-2, which launched Grissom and Young Tuesday.

June test will be first of 12 designed perfect Titan 3-C for operational use. k July 1, 1966.

Air Force will use it to orbit an experimental manned space station late in 1966 or 1968; will rehearse with a dummy in 1966.

Titan 3-C will take the space heavyweight title from NASA's Saturn 1 rocket which generates 1,590,000 pounds of thrust. Biggest rocket launcher Russians have displayed is estimated to have 1,433,000 pounds.

Core of Titan 3-C will be a Titan 2 rocket. It will have two giant solid-fueled stage strapped to its sides, and on top will be a twin engine which can be fired three times in space for orbit-switching maneuvers.

It will be used as a space truck by the Air Force for future military missions. In one of its tests—next February—Air Force will try orbiting eight specially geared military communications satellites in one shot.

Titan 3-C probably will remain world's biggest "thruster" until NASA develops Saturn 5. That one will generate 8,700,000 pounds of push—enough to propel a 45-ton, three-man spaceship to the moon.

Housing and Home Finance Agency has compiled list of banks, insurance firms, and savings and loans associations that are Negro controlled; will encourage them to invest in urban renewal or other federally sponsored construction.

Combined assets of firms on the list is \$77 million, with \$298 million in Southern State firms—that already have \$86 million in Government-insured mortgages. Now under consideration are a 17-story office building for Negro-controlled Atlanta Life Insurance Co., and an 8-acre shopping center in Mobile to be built by Negro investor for Negro shops.

White Citizens Council in Selma is using radio time to urge white persons to stay there instead of going to Montgomery. It is an effort to counteract the Negro boycott of Selma stores.

Voice on the air is not identified, but residents say it's one of Sheriff Clark's posse men.

NOTE.—When President Johnson briefed governors this week he indicated his concern that Red China may send 350,000 troops to Vietnam; said negotiations are out of question since there's no one to negotiate with.

Ambassador Maxwell Taylor will recommend increased pressure on Hanoi when reports to President Johnson next week.

He will urge more air strikes with military planes carrying heavier bomb loads, aimed at industrial targets.

And he may urge that we hit targets north of Hanoi, including bridges leading to Chi if Chinese Communist troops mass near border.

Taylor will report that South Vietnam morale is up and U.S. position there improved but that Hanoi is stepping up infiltration of small regular army units and Vietcong is making a major effort to cut South Vietnam in two. (He doesn't think they can do it with present forces.)

Partial blockade of Tonkin Gulf is under study. Carrier jets will continue to be used for raids and ships will bomb North Viet coastal installations.

More U.S. troops are not needed now, Taylor will say.

April 21, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

7885

Education notes: Wyoming, holdout against taking Federal school funds, has finally passed a law enabling it to participate in National Defense Education Act. New survey of Missouri shows it has at least 10 school districts operating racially segregated schools. Connecticut Supreme Court has ruled that if State law designates teacher retirement age, local school boards can't change it. Second-term college enrollment at 16 large State schools shows 9.6 percent increase over last spring, 5.3 percent decrease from last fall (due to midyear graduations, dropouts, and flunkouts.)

President Johnson will not recommend reduction in 10 percent auto excise tax. Treasury estimates tax brings in \$2 billion in revenues. And Mr. Johnson, in his budget message, set \$1,750 million limit on excise cuts he will propose.

But Treasury is beginning to fear Congress will cut the auto tax anyway. Pressure is building up, despite record auto sales. Some congressional leaders talk about cutting auto tax in half—which would add billion to overall excise reduction.

Auto manufacturers say they'll pass on any cut to buyers. Reduction to 5 percent tax would save buyers an average of \$100.

Also, Treasury has agreed that if a cut is passed by Congress, it may be retroactive to date the bill goes to Capitol Hill. Aim is to prevent any slump in auto sales while customers wait for taxes to drop.

Administration proposals are expected in about a month. They're likely to ask repeal of excise on furs, jewelry, toilet articles, leather goods, and other luxuries.

There's a chance Alabama may share its Governor Wallace with the Nation after 1966.

State constitution keeps him from running again for Governor; also has a ban on running for any other office, including U.S. Senate, until he has been in private life a year.

If he wants to run for Governor again, he may try to have State constitution amended, but is likely to run into a filibuster in his legislature. But he may not have to go this route if he decides to run for the Senate—Alabama attorney general thinks the Alabama restriction is unconstitutional.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press, Apr. 11, 1965]

My TURN

(By John O'Hara)

It was a frightening picture that has stayed with me, and I am not one to use that word, frightening, every day.

The taxi drivers of New York City for years had refused to be organized into a union. Back in 1934, for instance, the drivers had to fight the goons who overturned their cabs and beat them up, but the hackies remained unorganized. So it has remained until this year, and the professional unionists did not like that.

There are only 11,000 cabs in the city, but they are public conveyances and the public had a constant reminder of the fact that in all these years, the organizers had been unable to compel the hackies to join up. From the professional unionists' point of view, that was a disgrace, and it could not continue.

So this year the unionists went all out. Although there had just been a fare increase, that made no difference. They began working on the hackies early in the winter, finally calling a meeting in Madison Square Garden, which was attended by several thousand hackies.

To make sure the meeting would be attended, the unionists announced that the hacks were not to roll that day. Some did, and their tires were spiked, windshields smashed, some members of the public and

some hackies got hurt. At meeting time the hacks were not rolling.

The head of the electrical workers' union said it did not matter if some people got hurt. What mattered was that the hackies had to come into the union.

POLITICIANS NEED BIG LABOR

The head of the garment workers screamed and waved his arms and said his union had 180,000 members who would support the hackies, and he emphasized the word financially. The mayor of New York, who will run for reelection this year, sat there with the head of the electrical workers and the head of the garment workers, and thereby gave quasi-official support to the takeover.

The mayor is not personally popular with the hackies, but the garment workers and the electricians are big unions and he needs them.

You looked down at the first few rows in the audience, and you saw the new breed of professional unionists, who obviously had never driven hacks for a living. And interspersed among them were the union tumblers.

A tumbler is a cheerleader, a master of ceremonies. It is a Yiddish word that used to be applied to the entertainment directors at the summer hotels in the Catskills. Danny Kaye, for instance, started out as a tumbler. But Wilkie had his tumblers at the Republican convention in 1940; Goldwater had them.

The meeting ended, and the unionists won. After all those embarrassing years of shame, all they had to do was smash a few cab windows, injure a few citizens, spike a few tires, and get some big union leaders and Wagner of city hall on a platform, and the hackies succumbed.

You can buy beer at Madison Square Garden, but this was not even a beer-hall putsch.

Well, not quite. But it's the way you get your message across if you want to organize the recalcitrant. Some violence, a large quantity of inconvenience to the public, the promise of financial support by big labor, and the active cooperation of compliant politicians.

THE NEW FACE OF FASCISM

A few days later Martin Luther King demanded a total economic boycott of Alabama industry, and did he not state that he would enlist the support of the unionists? Had he not already been photographed with another Detroit boy, Walter Reuther? Had not various Governors sent their representatives to Selma?

The naive, the outraged, the victimized, the men and women who loathe the Ku Klux Klan seem to join with the exhibitionists, the subverters, the sinister, and decent indignation reinforces the new fascism.

We are looking in the wrong direction for the new fascism, which will not be called fascism and will not be identifiable by swastika armbands. The Hitler-Mussolini kind began in beer halls and in marches, among the middle class people who were more or less committed to some form of socialism.

We saw what happened to them, and to the rest of the world in the process. The word "socialist" remains in the official title of the U.S.S.R., where fascism seems to flourish. The socialism which Eisenhower saw creeping into our system of government is now inherent to it (with some help from Eisenhower himself).

The latent evil in goodness is not always apparent. Cancer is the life force gone wild.

APRIL 10, 1965.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We hereby express our wholehearted endorsement of your

enlightened stand on Vietnam. It takes political courage to consistently express views that most Americans unfortunately, are not yet prepared to accept. You have gained however, the eternal gratitude of many among us who wish to see restored, the image of America as a nation dedicated to the free expression and self-determination of peoples, anywhere in the world.

Gratefully yours,

JOSEPH SPARACINO.
DIANE SPARACINO.
EDITH GITTO.
PETE GITTO.

SWARTHMORE COLLEGE.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have just seen your film (made at Yale) at a teach-in at Swarthmore, and to make a long letter short: Keep it up. It must seem kind of lonely at times to be one voice, but you are not alone, and we hear you. I, and many others, will be in Washington to protest our position in Vietnam, but what we really need is your voice.

Thank you.

LARRY ORNSTEIN.

FIRST METHODIST CHURCH,

North Andover, Mass., April 12, 1966.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I strongly endorse your initiative for peace made to your address on April 7th at Johns Hopkins University.

Both your offer of "unconditional discussion" and the proposal of massive aid to Southeast Asia were most helpful and commendable.

I know that you are faced with many grave decisions concerning Vietnam and sense many conflicting pressures, but I respectfully urge you to make every possible step to lessen the likelihood of a direct confrontation between mainland China and the United States.

I hope that you will give serious consideration to the suggestion that the air strikes be called off since they appear only to strengthen the resolve of the North Vietnamese and are likely to drive them further toward their Chinese and Russian allies.

I heartily support every effort toward peace and reconciliation in Vietnam.

Sincerely,

NEAL F. FISHER.

Copies:

The Honorable EDWARD M. KENNEDY.
The Honorable LEVERETT SALTONSTALL.
The Honorable WAYNE MORSE.
The Honorable ERNEST GRUENTING.
The Honorable GEORGE MCGOVERN.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,
April 11, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to commend you for your stand on our withdrawal from Vietnam. You seem to be "the voice of one crying out in the wilderness and I for one hope you will continue to "cry out".

Most sincerely,

GERTRUDE GOBEL.

NEW CASTLE, DEL.,
April 10, 1965.

U.S. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Office of Senator,
Washington, D.C.

HON. SENATOR MORSE: Knowing that you are interested in seeking negotiations to quickly end the conflict in Vietnam, we are asking you to do all you can by vigorous efforts for negotiated peace, to end this war. This conflict threatens the peace of the world and all our security and, if continued, the de-

7886

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

April 21, 1965

struction of all we hold dear, and our little ones.

There should be a pause in the air attacks of our country on the North Vietnamese, and not to invade the territory involving China. This is a grave mistake. Our President voices hope and words for peace efforts, but the next day, papers have great headlines of additional troops landing, planes, and heavy equipment for battle.

This is confusing to many and especially to an oriental mind who would think we do not mean what we say. They are slower to move and do not think the same as we do. It is the time not to be too quick. There must be a pause or cease fire, so to speak, so that the efforts seeking settlement may have a chance. Sometimes we must be still, so God can have the chance to answer the prayers of many and help.

We feel that the United Nations must play a vital role in bringing about a settlement. The pause would help there also.

Through the help of the United Nations, many think that we should have a contingent of troops together with those from other U.N. nations—a peace force to see that fighting stops and to police the area of conflict.

This, with an internationally supported economic and social program of reconstruction and development many think desirable to have peace established, then we should leave the mainland of Asia. It is the land of oriental peoples.

Protestant clergymen and all their people ask that "vigorous efforts be made now to negotiate an end to the war." May God help us and give you wisdom to help. Kind regards and wishes, I am

Sincerely,

Mrs. E. CALHOUN FARMER.

EAST BOSTON, MASS.,

April 6, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your speech against our policy in Vietnam might have been made not in Athens, Ohio, but over 2,000 years ago in Athens, Greece, before Greece ruined itself in the treacherous and uncalled-for expedition in Syracuse.

The people are again misled by warmongers and profiteers. Their good sense of self-sacrifice and patriotism is again being perverted to the ruin of all of us.

Thank God for WAYNE MORSE and a handful of others. I hope for yourself that you have the highest reward of every honest man—that you could look back through your life of honesty and integrity.

Your sincere admirer,

MILTON HEIMLICH.

SEATTLE, WASH.,

April 8, 1965.

WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Will you please do what you can to get us out of this international mess and then run for President in 1968?

RONALD JOHNSON.

INTER-OFFICE TELETYPE,

April 9, 1965.

DEAR SIR: Thank God for brave men like you. Please continue your valiant efforts in regards to the Vietnam situation in the face of all this "sheep-like" opposition.

Respectfully,

My Brothers' Keeper

Mrs. WILLIAM GALLIE.

SANTA CLARA, CALIF.,

April 9, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR: Just a note to tell you that my wife, my friends, and I think you are a great statesman. Your stand against our Government's policy in Vietnam takes a great deal of courage and we applaud you for it.

Sincerely,

D. LIEBERMAN, M.D.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.,

March 31, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: From 8 p.m., March 24 to 8 a.m., March 25 an all-night teach-in to protest American policy in Vietnam was held at the University of Michigan. Two hundred and fifteen members of the faculty and staff of the university sponsored the 12-hour program of lectures and seminars designed to inform the academic and local communities on Vietnam and the nature of the war which is taking place there, and to search for viable peaceful alternatives to our Government's present aggressive course. Enclosed is a copy of a petition sent to President Johnson which was signed by 768 of those who participated in the program.

At the conclusion of the sessions a resolution was passed to broaden our local action into a national faculty-student movement which would engage the active participation of academic communities throughout the country in a continuing program of protest and constructive criticism. Telegrams of support have already been received from almost 50 colleges and universities across the Nation with assurances that several have already scheduled or are scheduling teach-ins of their own. Plans also are now being made for a national teach-in.

We wish to thank you for your continuing efforts against our foolhardy attempts at a military solution to the problems of southeast Asia. We will continue to keep you informed of our activities, and hope, that if you have any suggestions to make as to how our group can be most effective, that you will send them on to us.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM GAMSON,

JOEL ISAACSON,

(For the Faculty-Student Committee
To End the War in Vietnam).

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN ALL-NIGHT PROTEST
TEACH-IN ON THE WAR IN VIETNAM, 8 P.M.
MARCH 24 TO 8 A.M. MARCH 25, 1965

Mr. PRESIDENT: We, members of the faculty, staff, and student body of the University of Michigan, and citizens of the local community, have joined together for an all-night protest at the university against the policy of the United States Government in Vietnam. Our protest has taken the form of a series of lectures and discussions through the night, in search of nonmilitary solutions to the problems of southeast Asia.

We are profoundly concerned about your present course of military expansion, and do not believe that it can bring about a permanent and satisfactory resolution of the conflict. We call upon you to initiate a policy, not of intensified war in southeast Asia, but of an offensive for peace. The conferences and negotiations for such solutions are long and hard, but we urge that they begin now. Let us begin with constructive initiatives toward a cease-fire. These must include the cessation of our unilateral military actions, including the bombing missions into North Vietnam, and our introduction of grotesque weaponry, such as the nonlethal gas recently tested. It must also include a greater respect for the safety of civilian populations in both parts of Vietnam. Nothing short of such a total effort to effect a negotiated settlement in Vietnam will lead our Nation back upon the path of reason and morality from which we have so dangerously strayed.

ENDICOTT, N.Y.,

April 1, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This letter is long overdue: Thank you for myself and for dozens of my acquaintances for the very courageous stand you've taken on the Viet-

nam mess. Please don't ever falter in your most patriotic fight against what we are doing there. I recall enough of the 1954 Geneva Conference (when Dulles walked out in a huff) to know that our policy there is very wrong. The only people around here that are for our policy in Vietnam, strangely enough, are those who supported Goldwater.

When I read this morning's paper about the mass defoliation and burning out of a forest there, all I could think of is that Goldwater is smiling with satisfaction. I am shocked, sickened, and horrified at the napalm, gassing, and the wholesale slaughter going on there. It defies all morals, ethics, and decency, for I sincerely believe those people in South Vietnam are fighting a civil war in which we have no business, except to help bring it to an end.

I've written President Johnson my views and also enclosed a clipping quoting Pope Paul's pleas for a ceasefire before the thing gets out of hand.

Thank you again and keep up the good fight.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. HELEN SPIEGEL.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,

April 1, 1965.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I endorse 100 percent your position in seeking a negotiated settlement for the Vietnam war.

Yours truly,

ARTHUR PARRILLA.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,

April 1, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR: I am grateful that we have you and a few more Senators who see that the only way out of this horrible war is negotiation. So many people here and abroad feel that this is a senseless war. Why does the President shut his ears? Please keep talking peace. Thank you.

Yours truly,

P. KLINGLEOFFER.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,

April 1, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR: Please accept my heartfelt congratulations on your courageous speaking out on Vietnam. We in the peace movement take much encouragement from your sensible stand that we have no business being there at all. We run the risk of becoming involved in a major war.

ALICE HAMBURG.

BRONX, N.Y.,

March 31, 1965.

YOUR HONOR: I write to express my support for your opposition to our present policy in Vietnam. The instigators of this policy are probably more behind the scene than out in the open. Your colleagues must be made aware of this and induced to speak up. Are they more concerned about their political future than the potential loss of millions of lives?

Sincerely,

EMANUEL ROSENBLUTH.

PLAINFIELD, N.J.,

April 1, 1965.

HON. WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am one of, I hope, millions of ungrateful citizens who have for many years admired you and enjoyed the benefit of your selfless service to our country without ever having taken a few minutes to thank you for it.

I want to extend these long overdue thanks to you now and to encourage you to continue even though we are not writing to thank you and must seem uninterested and completely apathetic.

April 21, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

7887

Particularly today I want to urge you to continue your strong stand against our military action in Vietnam. I enclose a copy of a letter I have written to the President about this.

My sincere thanks, admiration, and all good wishes to you.

Sincerely yours,

Miss RITA CAMPBELL.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,

April 1, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We ask for an immediate cease fire in Vietnam and immediate use of U Thant's formula for negotiations.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. T. SCHULMAN.

PLAINFIELD, N.J.,

April 1, 1965.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I read the New York Times every day. I read "The Reporter." I listen to radio and television discussions and try to inform myself as well as possible on the reasons for our war in Vietnam. Much of the information heard and read is contradictory and I realize that you have more information than the general public, but for some time now I have had to conclude that we are grievously wrong in taking part in the involved politics of that unhappy country.

I therefore urge you to turn from this course immediately and negotiate. I fear we are wasting men, supplies, and money and gaining nothing but resentment and ill will toward ourselves. I do not care to win a war, even a justified one, which this one is not, by destroying a people's food supply and shade trees, by using gas, even a little bit of harmless gas and by making little children squeal on parents. How low can we sink? Shame on us.

Mr. President, let us discontinue retaliatory attacks and cease fire immediately and begin negotiations now in spite of present unfavorable conditions.

Respectfully yours,

Miss RITA CAMPBELL.

(Copies to Senator CLIFFORD CASE, Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Senator WAYNE L. MORSE.)

WHITE PLAINS, N.Y.,

March 31, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We wholeheartedly agree with you and support your position regarding immediate negotiations in the Vietnam war.

Sincerely,

MONROE and JESSE BLUMERFELD.

MIDDLE VILLAGE, N.Y.,

April 1, 1965.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The deaths that resulted from the bombing of the American Embassy in Vietnam underscore that "We shouldn't be there in the first place."

Neither this administration, nor any other, has given we American people a justification for the loss of American life in this area. Our leaders are ignoring the peoples' opinion. They are responsible for our men being killed and for risking the lives of all of us in a nuclear war.

This is a matter for the U.N. or other responsible international body.

Very truly yours,

RENE A. REEVES.

(Copies to Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY, Senators J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, JACOB JAVITS, ROBERT KENNEDY, and WAYNE MORSE.)

LITTLE SILVER, N.J.,

March 30, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My own representatives in the Congress have been silent on Vietnam. I write to thank you for your criticism of the present policy.

To me, it looks like another Korea—or worse. All of Indochina would not be worth it, even if we could win with the present strategy—which seems doubtful. Even the Pope has asked for peace, and nobody is more concerned about communism than he is.

But you know all of this. I appreciate greatly the fact that some few courageous men have questioned. The great mystery to me is why so many are silent at such a critical time.

I hope you can persuade others of your peers to represent the interests of this Nation as you have.

Sincerely,

DAVID A. NICHOLS.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,

April 1, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Earlier letters from me have told you how thankful my wife and I are that you are in the Senate, working for the reign of reason in Vietnam. I am sending with this note a copy of the Churchman, on page 3 of which there is a letter quoting a Vietnam petition which we circulated recently in the Philadelphia Ethical Society. Over 150 people signed it.

I also enclose a copy of an open letter to Billy Graham which we are preparing. How we shall manage to get it published I do not yet know. If Billy Graham got converted by it he could really help in preserving the world. Let us hope for the best—and keep the peace powder dry—if it is proper to talk in such terms in this connection.

I don't know why, but I find myself feeling optimistic today about the future of the world.

Yours with the greatest admiration.

HENRY S. HUNTINGTON.

APRIL 1, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As an American mother I want you to know I appreciate your logic concerning the Vietnam situation. I most strongly urge you to advise our President against any further commitment of American young men to the civil war in Vietnam.

I shall raise my voice, along with millions of other American mothers, in objecting to our sons' participation in an undeclared war for an undefined cause.

Sincerely,

Mrs. JOHN J. DWYER,
Resident of California.

SAN JOSE, COSTA RICA,

March 31, 1965.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I once again implore you to stop the employment of armed violence in Vietnam. I urge you to rethink and redirect the U.S. foreign policy so as to practice world government under law for all nations and a peaceful settlement of all disputes. Such a policy practiced by the United States would be to live up to our best traditions and to help fulfill the hopes of a world yearning for peace. It would prove that strength of character and moral strength are mightier than any strength of arms, which I fervently believe. We must mature enough as a nation to come to understanding this.

I want to point out to you the contradiction between your domestic policy of deploping unilateral violence (as in Selma, Ala.) and of your foreign policy of violence and armed might unilaterally used, as in Vietnam. No wonder confusion and growing delinquency burgeon among the young in the United States when Uncle Sam exhorts youth, "Don't do what I do, but only what I say." Individual violence, whether in a big city, or by the Ku Klux Klan or by whom ever is rightly deplored. But the U.S. Government, like God, exempts itself from all rules controlling arms and the use of them.

Let us turn urgently to the use of law, both at home and on the world scene.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. CHESTER M. PATTERSON, JR.

MARCH 31, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I admire your courage in saying on TV that our present policy in Vietnam is leading us into a large-scale war in Asia, and I thoroughly agree with you. You are not second-guessing the President, either, because you said months ago on TV that we should work this out through the United Nations rather than to intervene as we have done, and you were absolutely right.

Johnson has been acting like a Russian czar rather than the head executive of a democracy every since he was elected, but he has done exactly what the voters rejected Goldwater for advocating, by escalating the war in Vietnam. Furthermore, he ought to be impeached for the administration coverup of the Bobby Baker graft ring, because it is obvious that to expose Baker would have been very embarrassing to some much higher up.

It is unfortunate that you are not in Johnson's job, and if the voters really picked their elected leaders, you would have been a much more likely choice than Johnson. Mr. Johnson and Mr. Goldwater both were the choices of the people who have been enriching themselves at the taxpayers expense for years with the money from supplying military materiel and equipment for the cold war.

The late President Kennedy had thawed the cold war to the point where China and Russia had turned on each other, and the people who are exploiting the cold war didn't want that. They want the cold war to go on, but it is turning into a very hot war fast under Johnson's leadership. We will be lucky if we have an economic collapse before we have atomic war.

HARRY BONFIELD.

PITTSFIELD, MASS.,

March 31, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your fine speech on Vietnam in Cambridge on March 12. It's almost enough to give one some hope for the future, hearing such honest and courageous talk. You're influencing many people to ask for debate on this issue. You make such good sense, and you bring out so many facts to support your position.

Thank you for your efforts on behalf of all of us.

Most sincerely,

Mrs. ALBERT ROWE.

WEST TYLER, TEX.,

April 1, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
The Senator from Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am 69 years old. Served 20 months overseas on the western front in World War I. I am the father of two sons both of whom served their country in World War II. The elder in the Pacific, the younger, 2 months under 20 years of age, first lieutenant of infantry killed in action in Germany in March 1945.

We, the United States, are aiding, abetting, and committing murder in Vietnam without (just) cause, and without the sanction of the people of the United States as provided in the U.S. Constitution. We are killing and a party to the killing of an innocent people against whom we have no just grievance. Our own innocent sons are making the supreme sacrifice in an Asian war not of our making, not of our cause and not of our business to commit our sons to the jungle sacrifice.

President Johnson was elected on a promise of peace ticket in the sense that the Republican nominee could only promise a more vigorous action in the Asian war, which obviously God loving, God fearing, and merciful people did not want.

The Congress of the United States is the only constitutional agency, short of an invasion, that has power to make war. My God, why does it not exert its constitutional power to call a halt to our invasion of Vietnam? Our cities and our people should be spared the deadly destruction now being poured upon others. Our best security lies not in making war upon others, and that I think Senator MORSE, of Oregon, and Senator GRUENING, of Alaska, have made known to the American people.

Sincerely,

CYRUS MCCASKILL.

ELM GROVE, WIS.,

April 1, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As a citizen of Wisconsin, I have written my congressmen to strongly protest the use of gas and the fire bombing of a forest area in Vietnam.

There is a most urgent need for moral justice in today's world. Should not Congress, as the representative of a nation that believes in the dignity and equality of man, speak out against this brutality? There are many of us who admire your courage and dedication toward peace.

Yours truly,

DORA KNEEN,
Mrs. Eric Kneen.

ST. LOUIS, MO.,

March 31, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I could not agree with you more in your statements about our position in Vietnam.

We could expend 100,000 men and \$50 billion and then not win the war.

Sincerely,

HARRY L. BRANIGIN.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,

March 31, 1965.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to urge you to continue to support a policy of negotiation in Vietnam, and to praise you for the stand you have already taken.

Yours respectfully,

MARGARET W. BROOKS,
Mrs. Peter Brooks

GUYMON, OKLA.,

April 1, 1965.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Chamber,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I have been listening to your opinions on the Vietnam matter over television and reading about them occasionally in my newspaper.

I agree with you completely. As Sidney Lens said in the January Progressive:

"We have made of communism a cause of our worldwide difficulties, whereas in reality it has been an effect of them. Communism

has spread only because the 'respectable' powers refused to do something about the burning problems of poverty and oppression."

To hear over our news media that our leaders think the American people "would never consent to negotiation on the Vietnam matter," and that such leaders are afraid to have Red Chinese delegates come to the U.N. to discuss our mutual problems because our people might become screaming meemies and toss such delegates into the ocean, makes us ill.

Why not air the causes of our failure to deal sensibly with the Red China problem since 1949 and let us see how our McCarthyism and extremist followups have made us the laughingstock of the world, as well as a danger to world peace?

Why doesn't this Democratic Administration enlist the aid of the 1936 GOP presidential candidate, Alf M. Landon, of Kansas, who makes such good sense now in his plea for U.S. recognition of Red China and for our support in getting her into the U.N.; as well as approaching "Mao's formal proposal to all the countries of the world (for a summit conference on nuclear weapons) with cordiality and caution rather than with coldness and negativity"? That would be a bipartisan effort and help to blunt the opposition of the far right, it seems to me.

As an American citizen, I am glad that the world is hearing your continuing pleas against escalating the war in Vietnam. Keep it up at every possible occasion. You come right into our living rooms now, you know, through television, and your pleas are most effective. We wish there were more Senators like yourself, FRANK CHURCH, GAYLORD NELSON, GEORGE MCGOVERN, and WAYNE MORSE.

Above all, don't falter now in your campaign. People almost everywhere now know science has outlawed war as a means of settling disputes between nations. Thanks a million for your good efforts on behalf of peace.

Respectfully,

Mrs. H. L. CURTIS.

BRONX, N.Y., April 1, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You with your energy and ability can bring this to the Senate floor and end this mess. Since when can Presidents order killing without consulting the Senate or the American people?

LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President, the White House,
Washington, D.C.

My DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Some time ago you had taken the position that our Armed Forces in Vietnam were only advisers, yet they were there killing and being killed. It was only through a leak via television that the American people really learned the truth. Since then our newspaper reports indicate very clearly that we are at war.

In November 1964 you received a mandate from the American citizens, which actually drowned out the warmongering Barry Goldwater, only because we all felt that you were a man of keen judgment and would bring this Vietnam situation around the conference table for settlement.

Instead of conferences for peace, this horrible war is being escalated daily so that the danger of a nuclear holocaust is possible with the resultant loss of 150 million within an hour of such hostilities.

Mr. President, your children as well as mine, and my grandchildren are not being given a chance to make friends and patch up the differences that exist and that you have inherited. Instead of making friends, we are making more and more enemies all over the world.

We blundered when we sent our boys to Korea, and we blundered more when we sent our so-called advisers to Vietnam. It takes a big man to say that we erred, and I still

believe that you are this man. But how long is it going to take? The Asiatics, Europeans, Latin and South American peoples are not being fooled by us. They know the score and it is up to you, Mr. President, to negotiate now before it is too late.

We have no business trying to settle the business of real revolutionaries 10,000 miles from our shores no more than we would tolerate interference from other countries when we so desperately fought the English in our Revolution. Further, if it is not a crime for us to bomb incessantly the poor North Vietcong, then it is not a crime to have our embassies bombed in retaliation.

Mr. President, I beg of you, let's stop interfering with the affairs of other people. Let's show them that democracy can really work. Let's give a brave people the right to overthrow corrupt 24-hour governments and let's save our children from being devoured by insects that will flourish and be the only gainers.

A line from you is invited.

Respectfully yours,

HENRY H. OELBAUM.

People with feelings for human lives all over our land support you fully in your honorable and determined effort to oppose our cruel and aggressive actions in Vietnam.

Lewis Mumford speaks for me.

ELIZABETH WALDRAN.

BERKELEY, CALIF.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle,
Mar. 3, 1965]

PLAYING RUSSIAN ROULETTE IN VIETNAM

(By Lewis Mumford)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following letter on America's role in Vietnam was written to President Johnson by critic Lewis Mumford.)

Mr. President: The time has come for someone to speak out on behalf of the great body of your countrymen who regard with abhorrence the course to which you are committing the United States in Vietnam. As a holder of the Presidential Medal of Freedom, I have a duty to say plainly, and in public, what millions of patriotic fellow citizens are saying in the privacy of their homes; namely, that the course you are now following affronts both our practical judgment and our moral sense.

Neither your manners nor your methods give us any assurance that your policy will lead to a good end; on the contrary, your attempt to cure by military force a situation that has been brought about by our own arrogant, one-sided political assumptions cannot have any final destination short of an irremediable nuclear catastrophe. That would constitute the terminal illness of our whole civilization, and your own people, no less than the Vietnamese and the Communists would be the helpless victims.

In embarking on this program, you are gambling with your country's future, because you have not the courage to discard a losing hand and start a new deal, though this was the magnificent opportunity that your election presented to you. Your games theorists have persuaded you to play Russian roulette. But you cannot save the Government's face by blowing out our country's brains.

From the beginning, the presence of American forces in Vietnam, without the authority of the United Nations, was in defiance of our own solemn commitment when we helped to form that body. Our steady involvement with the military dictators who are waging civil war in South Vietnam, with our extravagant financial support and underhanded military cooperation, is as indefensible as our Government's original refusal to permit popular election to be held in Vietnam, let alone communism should be installed by popular vote. Your attempt now to pin the blame on the government of North Vietnam deceives no one except those whose wish

April 21, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

7889

aking originally committed us to our h-handed intervention: the same set of notions and intelligences that inveigled us to the Bay of Pigs disaster.

Instead of using your well-known political witness to rescue our country from the literary miscalculations and political blunders that created our impossible position in Vietnam, you now, casting all caution to the winds, propose to increase the area of senseless destruction and extermination, without aving any other visible ends in view than to conceal our political impotence. In taking this unreasonable course, you not merely show a lack of "decent respect for the opinions of mankind," but you likewise mock and betray all our country's humane traditions.

This betrayal is all the more sinister because you are now, it is plain, obstinately committing us to the very military policy that your countrymen rejected when they so overwhelmingly defeated the Republican candidate.

Before you go further, let us tell you clearly: your professed aims are emptied of meaning by your totalitarian tactics and your nihilistic strategy. We are shamed by your actions, and revolted by your dishonest excuses and pretexts. What is worse, we are horrified by the immediate prospect of having our country's fate in the hands of leaders who, time and again, have shown their inability to think straight, to correct their errors, or to get out of a bad situation without creating a worse one.

The Government has forfeited our confidence; and we will oppose, with every means available within the law, the execution of this impractical, and above all, morally indefensible policy. There is only one way in which you can remove our opposition or regain our confidence; and that is to turn back from the course you have taken and to seek a human way out.

Thank you for your effort to stop the war in Vietnam. Please read Hans Morganthau's piece in the current New Republic. This should be read to the Senate.

May commonsense prevail.

ROBERT M. FINNELL.

MUNCIE, IND.,
April 1, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Indubitably your name will and in history along with that of Bertrand Russell, of England, Jerome D. Frank, Linus Pauling, and others who have devoted so much effort toward avoiding a nuclear holocaust.

A sequel to your incisive remarks in the late is Bertrand Russell's article, "The War of Atrocity in Vietnam." Lord Russell meticulously documented his case and pleaded for President Johnson to listen to reason rather than get us swept up into a nuclear war. The absurdity of escalation is apt to culminate in an Armageddon. Why, why, why will not our President listen to those who plead for peace rather than those who are all too anxious to beat out the all too familiar sounds of the war drums? Lord Russell's article appeared in the December 1964 issue of "The Minority of One." This is the one publication which has the courage to print material on Vietnam that urges withdrawal. Senator Morse, in order that more Americans might read your views on Vietnam, please write an article and mail it to the following address: M. S. Arnoni, editor, The Minority of One, Inc.; 155 Pennington Avenue, Post Office Box 544, Passaic, N.J. The writer is confident that Mr. Arnoni would be honored to publish an article by you. You see, sir, most of the population does not have the faintest idea that you and Senator GRUENING vehemently denounce our

current policy in Vietnam. Thus, if you were to write an article for the publication, even more people might join in your plea for peace.

Personally, sir, it appears that Leonid Brezhnev is to be commended for being as patient with us as he has been. No doubt if Russia tried something in South America similar to what we are trying in Vietnam, we would already have been through a nuclear war by now.

Sir, please keep up your fight against the inanities of war. Muncie's population is well represented in the Birch Society, and nearly every day one reads letters to the editor of the Press that apparently are trying to foment another Red scare and which demand escalation, escalation, and more escalation. If you were to write a letter, even a long one, to the Muncie Evening Press, Muncie, Ind., giving your views on Vietnam, the writer is certain that it would be published in full. Sir, if you would be so kind as to do that, then people around here who seemingly have not even heard of the word "negotiation" would be able to at least see, though perhaps not agree with, another point of view.

Congratulations, sir, for having the courage to take an unpopular stand on this crucial issue. Thousands will remember you as a man who did all in his power to avert World War III. The remaining millions, perhaps, while the earth is burning around them, will be consoled to know in their hearts that they were furthering 100 percent true-blue pure Americanism.

Sincerely yours,

NILE SHIELDS.

CHICAGO,
April 2, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Since 1942 we are in wars and police actions all the time. In my opinion we are now involved in the most stupid war of all. 7,000 to 8,000 miles away from our own shores. Something must be wrong with our foreign policy.

Dear Senator, please keep up your good work for our country.

Respectfully,

G. GRIEBEL.

WESTON, MASS.,
March 31, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We strongly disapprove of the widening of the war in Vietnam. Bombing the north will not alter the situation in the south and only earns us bitter hatred around the world.

The use of nauseous gas, napalm, the new shattering bullet, and other military inventions are self-defeating in a war with racial overtones. The Pentagon's advice is dangerously out of touch with reality in our judgment.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN C. GRAY,
HELEN L. GRAY.

P.S.—We greatly admire your courageous stand.

OXFORD, OHIO,
April 1, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We congratulate you on your support of negotiations to bring about an end to the war in Vietnam and we urge that you do everything possible to bring about open hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the grave situation in southeast Asia.

Sincerely,

MELVIN BLOOM,
ROSABELLE BLOOM.

LAKEWOOD, OHIO, April 4, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: So glad for your courageous stand re the Vietnam situation. How can we continue use of napalm, that hideous, devilish weapon, and not be shamed before the world, and before any God of justice and mercy?

God's grace and power be with you as you gather more to the banner of true Americanism with its concern for humanity—en masse or as individuals.

With whole-souled appreciation.

HILDA A. FOSTER.

SENATOR MORSE: Just a few words of encouragement on your stand on Vietnam. How easy or much easier it would be for you to change your stand but thank God for your not doing so. God loved his people and I am so thankful there are men around who will do the same.

God bless you.

Mrs. D. LOWER.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

We ask for an immediate cease-fire in Vietnam and immediate use of U Thant's formula for negotiations.

RUTH BOCCOUR AND FAMILY.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
March 31, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: We are in complete agreement with your patriotic and farsighted stand on Vietnam.

We hope many other members of the Senate would join you in your courageous efforts.

Sincerely,

ANATOL KOVARSKY,
LUCILLE KOVARSKY.

P.S.—We are enclosing the copy of a letter we've sent to President Johnson.

NEW YORK CITY, N.Y.,
March 29, 1965.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing to you to express my shock, indignation, and surprise at the U.S. Government's actions in Vietnam.

Not only is the policy we are following immoral in nature, but worse yet, it appears to be reckless and self-defeating politically. If, as you stated on March 25, we "seek no more than a return to the 1954 Geneva agreements," then why have we been consistently rebuffing General De Gaulle who for the past 2 years has been urging us to seek a negotiated solution on this very basis?

Why is our Government still listening to those who in 1965 are evoking the specter of "Munich," which took place in 1938 at the time of England's extreme weakness and has no relevance to the relationship of forces as it exists today?

Why do we discard without explanation Mr. U Thant's advice? He spoke to us not only as the Secretary General of the U.N., but as a Burmese citizen whose country has been experiencing serious problems of civil strife? Yet, despite her very long border with China and lack of U.S. military aid, Burma remains non-Communist and maintains good relations with her neighbors. Are the opinions of Burma, Cambodia, Afghanistan, Ceylon, Nepal, India, and even of allied nations like Pakistan and Japan to be dismissed without as much as an explanation? Aren't these the very countries we are trying to protect?

Why, inasmuch as the Hanoi government is desperately trying not to become China's satellite, do we feel it incumbent upon us to push it further into China's arms by threatening it with extinction?

Perhaps the central cause of the danger in Vietnam is not so much the aggression by Communists, but our refusal to see the

April 21, 1966

events there in any other way and the inability to change our own habits of thinking, when it comes to our relations with China? The purpose of our policy was to isolate China; instead we are isolating ourselves as the proceedings at the U.N. and our lonely role in Vietnam prove.

How can we reconcile our claims to moral leadership and your own pledges of "seeking a reduction of tensions" with General Taylor's alarming comment that "there are no limits to escalation; the pressure stops when the enemy gives in."

We are no doubt sincere in our belief that we are fighting communism, not realizing of course that what we are really fighting is our own policy of trying to improve relations between all nations and of trying to promote some sort of stability in this dangerous world.

How can a religiously moral people ignore repeated appeals by the Pope and Protestant leaders and continue to rationalize our destructive policy?

It has been said that the Communists show no interest in negotiations. However, inasmuch as there were indications to the contrary, prior to our attacks on North Vietnam, should not the cessation of these attacks be the logical prerequisite to any meaningful exploration of diplomatic alternatives?

We have to realize that not only the Communist side but both sides have a great deal to lose from the extension of this conflict and act accordingly.

Yours truly,

ANATOL KOVARSKY.

P.S.—One is amazed to read that people like General Taylor and Mr. H. Cabot Lodge are still advising our Government. Whatever their competence in their respective fields, their advice on Vietnam has led from one disaster to another.

A.K.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY,
New York, N.Y., March 31, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please work for a cease-fire in Vietnam. I know from hearing you speak on television that you have no sympathy with those who would extend the war. There are many who support you.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. HILDA JOHNSTON.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
April 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In recent months I have written three letters to President Johnson protesting against U.S. military intervention in Vietnam. Ironically, it seems that every time I write the war tempo is increased as if in utter scorn of my opinion.

Although you have been courageously attacking the administration for its dangerous policy, please continue to use your influence to end our folly.

Yours respectfully,

LOUIS J. KANE, M.D.

SEEKONK, MASS.,
April 1, 1966.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: First, we bombed a schoolhouse with children in it, causing the deaths of 40 youngsters. Then we attacked civilians with poison gas. Now, as if we had not done enough to "preserve democracy" in Vietnam, we are resorting to burning the jungles with fire bombs and fuel oil, killing people, animals, and vegetation.

The bombing of our Embassy in Saigon was tragic. It is, however, exactly what we must expect when we help military dictator-

ship suppress its own population. How much longer must Americans, Asians, and wildlife perish to support tyranny?

Are we staying in Vietnam to save face? My God, man, who cares about prestige when hundreds of innocent people are dying every day. Who cares what the world thinks when Vietnam is being torn apart by fire bombs, tanks, rockets, and littered with broken bodies and charred ruins of villages and cities?

Mr. Johnson, our Vietnam policy is totally without justification, commonsense, or reason. It is criminal and hateful for the United States to be engaged in such crimes against humanity. The Nazis resorted to any means to prevail over their victims; the United States is doing the same thing when it murders children, gasses civilians, burns jungle, wildlife, and men, and supports tyranny.

What more can I say? I am opposed to your policy (not ours, since most New Englanders with whom I have spoken deplore your policy). I doubt that it will change until you have succeeded in drawing China into the conflict, and have seen millions of people die. What, Mr. Johnson, will be left? And, why?

Very truly yours,

W. BRUCE DEAN.

Cc: Senators SALTONSTALL, E. KENNEDY, GRUENING, and MORSE.

BRONX, N.Y.,
April 1, 1965.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In order to show you that we fully appreciate your efforts to bring about negotiations to restore peace in Vietnam, we are sending you, enclosed, a copy of our letter to the President.

Our heartfelt wishes for success in this endeavor to the benefit of our country and the world are with you.

Respectfully yours,

HENRY and LISI MARX.

BRONX, N.Y.,
April 1, 1965.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MR. PRESIDENT: We share your anxiety about the dangerous situation in Vietnam and are fully aware of the tremendous difficulties confronting you in deciding on a policy which will bring peace and security to the entire area of southeast Asia. As citizens of this country we cannot help being obsessed by grave doubts regarding the role of our country in the Vietnamese war. We sincerely believe that force and destruction will only strengthen the forces we are trying to destroy, a fact vividly illustrated by the experiences of the French in the same area.

Mr. President, we believe that immediate steps should be taken to stop shooting and to start talking. The offers of negotiations made by Mr. U Thant should be accepted, even those of De Gaulle and of our other friends should be sincerely considered. The civilian leaders of all factions of Vietnam should be given a chance to meet with our civilian representatives and, with our fullest cooperation, to meet with each other in order to form a provisional government representing the people of Vietnam at the conference table.

If only a small percentage of the money spent for war in Vietnam would be diverted to efforts for peace, the honor of our country and the freedom of Vietnam could be advanced immeasurably.

Mr. President, the thoughtful citizens who elected you are confident of your leadership, not to more bombings, but to immediate efforts toward peace in Vietnam.

Respectfully yours,

PRAYER-FOR-PEACE PROGRAM,
Farmingdale, N.Y., March 31, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
The U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

YOUR HONOR: I have written to the President of the United States this afternoon expressing my views of his great acts of iniquity in the policy used by his administration regarding the daft Vietnam situation.

I wrote to him on many other occasion about this.

I wholeheartedly endorse your position for negotiation over the Vietnam crisis. I pray you may have the strength to make others realize the same.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS WAYNE PIEPER.

NEW YORK CITY,
March 31, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I heartily endorse your position for negotiations in Vietnam and for immediate ceasefire.

Mrs. R. A. MINSTER.

April 1, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like you to know that I am in whole hearted agreement with your position on Vietnam.

Please continue to fight for negotiations. Respectfully yours,

CAROL HIRSCH,
SYDELL HIRSCH,
DAVID HIRSCH.

Cc: Senators GRUENING, CHURCH, and MCGOVERN.

ROCKVILLE CENTRE, N.Y.,
April 1, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We urge you to exert your considerable power to check the escalating war in Vietnam.

We believe that this peace cannot be won on the battlefield, but must come about through negotiation, and preferably under the auspices of the U.N.

We fail to see the rhyme or reason to our policy on Vietnam, and on the contrary are struck by inconsistencies, vague assumptions, and unfortunately inhumanities that we attribute to the Vietcong.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT M. PERR, M.D.
MERIDEN PERR.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
March 31, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: The following telegram which summarized a lengthy letter was sent at this date to President Johnson:

"Alarmed by Goldwater's military attitudes, we campaigned for your election. Now the Republicans claim that the Democratic Party is the war party is refuted only by men such as CHURCH and MORSE. Please stop the killing in Vietnam."

Dr. and Mrs. EDMUND LEVIN.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
April 1, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We ask for an immediate cease-fire in Vietnam and immediate use of U Thant's formula for negotiation.

Mrs. J. BELLFORT.

ROSLYN HEIGHTS, N.Y.,
April 1, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: As all decent people must be, I am aghast at the wanton disregard for human life evidenced by our country's actions in Vietnam, which are leading to world war.

The only ray of hope for the salvation of mankind is the courageous fight you are conducting in opposition to the madness of the administration.

April 21, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

7891

I implore you, please continue and increase your endeavors to bring about negotiations.

Respectfully,

GLADYS BLUM.

MEDIA, PA.,
April 1, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator, Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Your continuing fight against the all-pervasive influence of the Pentagon and big business in the Senate, your forthright stand against our involvement in the civil war in Vietnam—these take courage and understanding of what is true representation of the people's interests. We all hope you will continue your good work in the Senate in the months and years ahead.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL KESSLER.

SPARTA, N.J.,
April 1, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: Your stand on the Vietnam situation always impressed me.

I take the liberty enclosing copy of my today's letter to the President, which may interest you.

Respectfully,

PETER PRINS.

SPARTA, N.J.,
April 1, 1965.

TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I doubt whether you will be able to read this letter yourself, because you must be extremely busy.

Nevertheless I take the liberty to give my views on the Vietnam situation.

I strongly feel that our policy in Vietnam is completely wrong and utterly deplorable.

In this respect I admire people like Senator WAYNE MORSE, Senator RIBICOFF, the Senator from Alaska (I think it was Senator GRUENING), Walter Lippmann, and others, who have the courage to express their views freely; warning of the dangers confronting us, and the moral angle of the case.

I have the feeling that people in the United States are not fully informed about developments in Vietnam and about the real feelings of the majority of the people over there, who want us to leave them alone.

On the other hand it seems that the American press is more or less influenced by Washington.

We have always abhorred this policy in the Communist bloc, and it should certainly not be allowed in a great democracy like ours.

In this respect I applaud programs like yesterday's "Changing World" on TV channel 13.

We all know that the popularity of the United States has gone downhill pretty fast in the world during the last years, which is regrettable and not always justified.

Our policy in Vietnam, however, is adding fuel to this consumptive fire, and will be felt for years to come.

Even a great nation like ours, can never stand alone in this world, especially economically.

Sure, there are countries who are friendly toward us, but we may never lose sight of the fact that their attitude is often influenced by financial support we give them.

If we really want to be a leader of the Western world, we should give moral leadership.

What we are doing in Vietnam is not a shining example of moral leadership. It only satisfies the "hawks" in Washington and elsewhere, and I am sure that the majority of our people do not agree with this policy, regardless of the outcome of so-called reliable opinion polls.

Of course we are opposed to communism, but what we are doing in Vietnam is not the right way to fight it.

On the contrary, I strongly feel that in this way we are only playing into the hands of communism.

We feel reassured that the Russians did not interfere up until now, but could it be that in the back of their mind they are thinking "give them enough rope, etc.?"

As I see it, we will never be able to stop communism on the ruins of a devastated and underdeveloped Asian country, especially where these ruins are for a great deal caused by our own intervention.

Having lived in Asia myself for 25 years I feel strongly on the subject.

Let us not fool ourselves by saying "we cannot pull out now without losing face," because as the Senator from Alaska said these days: "more setbacks are still to come."

Please, do not consider this a negative attitude.

We have to face the naked fact that, apart from the moral angle, the struggle in the swamps of Vietnam is not our type of war, and will downgrade the image of the American eagle still further.

Respectfully,

PETER PRINS.

SPARTA, N.J.

BRATTLEBORO, VT.,
April 1, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I heartily approve your efforts to stop the war in Vietnam. I believe firmly in a negotiated peace and I have written to President Johnson and other Senators.

Sincerely yours,

CORA M. LEVER.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
March 31, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to register my support for the positions you have stated in public concerning the present policy of the U.S. Government with respect to the Vietnam situation. There seems to me no doubt that the present unilateral action of the United States poses a threat to world peace. Any thought that military action is going to change what is a political issue appears simplistic to say the least. As a physician and psychiatrist I am much more concerned with the possibility of saving human lives—Americans and Vietnamese—than with proving points of dubious principle. The issues presented by the administration as justifying their intervention in Vietnamese affairs do not appear warranted by the facts. The American people are being asked to defend an allegedly anti-Communist regime against an alleged threat of Communist domination. There is little evidence that any of the governments of South Vietnam enjoy any measure of public support—there is inadequate evidence that the Vietcong is actually controlled from Hanoi. There is, on the other hand, considerable evidence that South Vietnam is in the throes of a civil war being waged by dissidents within the country. It would appear that we have little justification for being involved in this.

When I voted for President Johnson in November it was largely because he appeared less likely to involve us in ill-considered war. It is indeed disheartening to see us drifting in this direction at the present time—particularly when clear reasoning reveals no necessity for this. I hope that you will have the strength to persist in bringing to the American people the facts of this situation so that they may be able to impress the administration officials with their repugnance for the present policies being followed in South Vietnam.

Sincerely yours,

LEONTI H. THOMPSON.

SUNNYVALE, CALIF., April 1, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Just a note to let you know that we strongly support your stand in behalf of a negotiated peace in Vietnam. We go further, we are for pulling out of Vietnam. I commend you on your good activity in that regard.

I am sure that the great majority of silent Americans feel the same way. For reasons of job and other pressures they hesitate to say so. I sincerely hope that you keep up the good work.

Respectfully yours,

PETERSEN ENGINEERING CO., INC.,
GERALD A. PETERSEN, President.

P.S.—It was only last November that President Johnson won by a landslide and was a very popular man in the United States. He is losing his popularity rapidly and unless he changes his tactics he is likely to become the most despised President we ever had, that is, if his actions lead us to the point of no return so that we don't live to arrive at that or any other decision.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
April 1, 1965.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are writing to support your views on Vietnam. We think it is urgent to stop the North Vietnam bombings, withdraw U.S. troops and begin negotiating for peace there immediately.

We urge you to continue your efforts to convince your fellow Senators and President Johnson of the futility of the present U.S. policy in Vietnam.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. LENNY ALMELEH.

BERKELEY,
April 1, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your right and eloquent attack on the current U.S. policy in Vietnam.

There is widespread support for those—unfortunately—few Senators who are talking sense about the blundering, illegal, destructive, criminal, and atrocious U.S. military intervention in Vietnam.

Eventually, you and GRUENING and the others will be proved right. Something must be done soon, before we permanently alienate all of Asia.

I am informing President Johnson of my concern. In continuing and extending the American war in Vietnam, he must be relying on evil counsel. I trust the President has not lost his mind.

I want my country to do the right thing—also the sensible thing.

We must get out of Vietnam now.

Keep up the attack.

Sincerely,

M. H. WIXMAN.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
April 1, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing this letter (the first of its kind in my 24 years) out of emotion; a feeling of frustration and helplessness over what our country is doing in Vietnam, and a feeling of thankfulness that there is at least one voice, one conscience, in a place where its utterances mean something, that speaks out against our behavior in this situation.

My wife and I would jump at the chance to speak out in favor of the U.S. actions someplace in the world. After all, it is our country. But we cannot. When I read even the slanted and softened news releases that we are given I cannot help but feel anger,

7892

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

April 21, 1965

sorrow, resentment, and alienation from this country. I am angry that we pursue such a course of action. I am sad that the Government should be deluded with a sense of righteousness and self-protection that it justifies any means to any end it so declares. I resent being forced to pay taxes from my labor, a portion of which supports our immoral actions. But most tragically, I feel alienated from this country, alienated to an extent that I would sit in jail rather than fight for the United States in any such action anywhere, at any time during my life.

Please sir, continue speaking against these outrages of morality and justice. There are precious few left with the principles, guts, and position to do anything about it.

At this time of national hypocrisy, I am grateful to be able to look at my Government and say "at least there is one who can see and does speak."

Sincerely,

JOEL P. BAUMWOLL.

OAKLAND, CALIF.,

April 2, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been a teacher and occupational therapist for the past 15 years having worked with the disabled including the disabled veteran and I am disturbed about the situation in Vietnam as one issue that must be arrested, if at all possible, for better solution for world peace.

I am strictly opposed to the decisions and actions to allow the U.S. troops to engage in combat in this country of Vietnam to say nothing of the use of gas warfare. This is a definite act of aggression by the United States and should immediately cease.

As a member of the Women for Peace of Oakland and the First Unitarian Church of Berkeley, Calif., I will continue to give my wholehearted support to proselytize for cease-fire and withdrawal of the U.S. troops promptly.

Sincerely yours,

DOROTHY L. BOHLMAN.

Citizen.

BELLINGHAM, WASH.,

March 31, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: Keep up the fight to stop the war in Vietnam. I'm with you all the way, and so are some others in this town. They had a peace march, 40 people, and all were arrested for parading without a permit, but today, because of the pressure, the judge threw the case out of court. I am wondering what can be done by me, or just the little people. Writing letters to our Congressmen and the President don't phase them, they don't even have the courtesy to answer.

My hat is off to the pastor who is refusing to pay his income tax because the money is being used to fight a war. He can do this and I know that if enough of us did this the war would stop overnight. It is impossible for some whose employer has to withhold ours. For us we have no choice.

Maybe we can figure out some way to help you in your uphill fight. Our town paper gives us no coverage of what is being said against the war.

Sincerely and hopefully,

FRED CARY.

WALNUT CREEK, CALIF.,

March 26, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I do want to thank you for alerting people to the war propaganda, but I think that I am probably writing this letter to you in part so that I can write one letter to Washington without getting back a deluge of that propaganda—never

just one sheet, but two or three saying the same things in a different arrangement. If we read it often enough are we supposed to believe it?

This solid front propaganda is deeply disturbing to me, apart from the fact of half-truths and lies: It is handed out like the party line for all good comrades to read, swallow, and repeat. I think that Washington should be aware that the elections last November clearly went against this way of doing things (it's the Birch way), and against the belligerence in Vietnam advocated by Barry Goldwater. Do we have a two-party system or don't we? If we are a free country, why can't we get what we voted for, not what we voted against?

The Office of Public Disservice of the Bureau of Public Affairs, Department of State, tells me that "at this time, no issue commands more of the time, energy, and attention of the President and his senior advisors (than Vietnam)." Perhaps they should be spending more time, energy, and attention on what we the people voted for. Then they might find that Vietnam solved itself quite easily.

Peace is "face" enough.

Sincerely,

Mrs. BARRY STEVENS.

APRIL 1, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Excuse the impulse to economy that behooves me to use up old campaign stationery but it's the L.B.J. tradition of turning off the lights in the White House.

Only he shouldn't turn off the lights all over the world.

For your genuinely effective efforts to stay his hand as it reaches to flip off mankind in order to appease the light company of the Macs, thanks so great no words approach the extent of my appreciation, respect, reverence.

Devoutly,

MARK KNOX NICHOLS.

BEVERLY HILLS.

THE TOBACCO SUPPLY CO., INC.,

Springfield, Tenn., April 3, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,

U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am quite disturbed about the war situation in Vietnam. I believe we should pull out of there one way or another.

If we should get in a war with China, I am told they could march a line six men wide and unarmed from now on and still if we killed them as fast as they walk in, that their population would not decrease. I think that they would welcome anything that would destroy about 50 to 100 million Chinese.

In my opinion, we have no chance whatever of winning a war that close to China unless we should go in immediately with atomic bombs and I think that would be too risky, for Russia would no doubt bomb us out as soon as we have weakened.

At the rate we are going, this country will soon go bankrupt and all the fine things we have fought for, produced, and developed will go to naught.

Please use your great influence to get this trouble settled.

Thanking you in advance, I remain,

Yours very truly,

MARVIN L. SMITH,

Chairman of the Board.

NEW SMYRNA BEACH, FLA.,

April 1, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I congratulate you on all the energy you are expending in an endeavor to arouse the American public from their stunned apathy to better under-

stand the tragedy of our war policy in Vietnam?

I hope you are no longer a lone voice crying in the wilderness in the Senate. We need more courageous leaders like you and Senator FULBRIGHT.

My cousin, who lives outside of Boston, wrote me that she had just heard you speak and that you said you had been told in briefings that the United States hopes to bomb Chinese nuclear bases in 90 to 120 days. Is this true? If it is, how terrifying. Are we inviting a nuclear war? Where is our compassion? Where is our integrity? And we claim to be a Christian nation.

Is there anything we can do to help change our unimaginative foreign policy other than writing to our Representatives?

The irony of our present foreign policy in Vietnam is that it is so staunchly backed by the Dirksens and Goldwaters.

I hope every Senator has read Norman Cousins's editorial in the March 27 Saturday Review.

We seem to be going through an international McCarthyism today with our fear of communism making us perform with totalitarian tactics. Haven't we learned that war doesn't stop the spreading of a ideology?

But this is more dangerous because we are playing with the lives of the entire world.

Thank you for all you are doing.

Sincerely,

ESTELLE B. CLAPP.

MISHAWAKA, IND.,

March 30, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Technically you do not represent me in the Senate but you do represent my thoughts on foreign affairs and bless you for that.

Referring to the bombing of North Vietnam of course. If it wasn't for you and Walter Lippmann I would be sure that either the entire United States had gone mad or that I had slipped off the deep end myself.

With the notable exception of yourself and Mr. Lippmann I have looked and listened in vain for any responsible person, in or out of Washington, to even question these unprecedented attacks on another country much less condemn them.

Please keep speaking up as you have been and perhaps some of your colleagues will be inspired to stand up on their hind legs. I pray so, for the sake of the greatness of our country.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN D. MARSHALL.

(Copies to Senators HARTKE, BAYH, and Representative BRADEMANS.)

STEPHEN WISE FREE SYNAGOGUE,

New York, N.Y., April 2, 1965.

HON. WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I send this letter to express my concern and dismay over the war that is presently being fought in South Vietnam. There is no question that we are presently engaged in a war in Vietnam which is being escalated at a frightening pace. It is a war without purpose or meaning. The Vietnamese people do not wish us to be there. South Vietnam has no strategic military importance to us and there is every possibility that a compromise government can be established in Vietnam which in time will act independently of the Chinese Government.

I personally know of no one who wants this war. Therefore, it seems to me, that responsible representatives of the people and leaders in Government must put a halt to this senseless slaughter.

¹I delete CHURCH and MCGOVERN because they condoned the raids in their Senate speeches.

April 21, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

7893

Urging your best efforts in this matter,
I remain

Sincerely,
Rabbi GERALD A. GOLDMAN.

ITHACA, N.Y.,
April 2, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR WAYNE MORSE: You will recall I sent you, and you very kindly had published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, some proposals for negotiation in Vietnam. I also sent a somewhat shortened version in the form of a copy of a letter to the Secretary of Defense. Enclosed is the correspondence with the Defense Department which may indicate how little they care for informed public opinion. Make such use of this as you deem wise.

Cordially,
HARROP A. FREEMAN,
Professor of Law, Cornell Law School.

ITHACA, N.Y.,
April 2, 1965.

JOSEPH A. CALIFANO, Jr.,
Special Assistant to Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CALIFANO: Again, I have your letter of March 27 in reply to mine of March 5. I do not see how the Defense Department can be so unconcerned with the public and particularly the informed and concerned public.

Your letter refers to mine as a "comment" on your letter of March 2. It was not primarily a comment, but a request for answer of specific questions, for documentation and information. This, you chose wholly to ignore.

Your total reply is in the form: "If you have not yet done so, I recommend that you carefully read all the public statements of the State and Defense Departments * * * (etc.)" How could you make that suggestion, when the letter to which you are replying specifically says: "I have ready at hand and have carefully read all the releases of the State and Defense Departments; the speeches of Johnson, Kennedy, McNamara, Rusk, and others; the various white papers, including the recent one."

I am about tired of this correspondence and about ready to release it to some press service as an example of the way in which the Defense Establishment treats an informed American who is deeply interested in a central problem of policy—a matter of life and death to Americans.

Very truly yours,
HARROP A. FREEMAN.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
March 27, 1965.

HARROP A. FREEMAN,
Professor of Law, Cornell Law School,
Ithaca, N.Y.

DEAR PROFESSOR FREEMAN: Thank you for your letter of March 5, 1965, commenting on my letter to you of March 2, 1965, concerning the situation in Vietnam.

If you have not yet done so, I recommend that you carefully read all the public statements of the State and Defense Departments; the speeches of Presidents Johnson and Kennedy, and Secretaries McNamara and Rusk; the 1961 Department of State report entitled "A Threat to the Peace," as well as the recent State Department pamphlet entitled "Aggression From the North." My letter of March 2, 1965, was merely a summary of these documents, which represent the carefully considered views of the Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson administrations on the subject.

Sincerely,
JOSEPH A. CALIFANO, Jr.,
The Special Assistant to the Secretary
and Deputy Secretary of Defense.

No. 70—10

MARCH 5, 1965.

JOSEPH A. CALIFANO,
Secretary ROBERT McNAMARA,
Office of Secretary of Defense, Washington,
D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CALIFANO: I have your letter of March 2 in reply to my thoughts on settlement of Vietnam.

I assume you are a bright and coming young man, but please don't try to just make assertions as though you know all the facts and no one else does, to an old scholar.

Now, you say, "The Vietcong insurgency was never, from its inception, an internal revolt", as a correction of one of my points. Will you please document: (1) the earliest date for which you have proof of other than American or local weapons being used in South Vietnam, (2) the earliest date for which you have proof of North Vietnamese participating as combatants in South Vietnam, (3) the earliest date for which you have proof of any training of South Vietnamese by North Vietnamese or other outside countries (other than the United States), (4) what that proof is. Now, I have ready at hand and have carefully read all the releases of the State and Defense Departments; the speeches of Johnson, Kennedy, McNamara, Rush, and others; the various white papers, including the recent one. I am particularly interested in the period from 1955 to 1959.

I would also like you to elaborate a little more what your proof is on the subject of Catholics and our changes in Vietnam. As myself a person who fairly regularly attends Catholic retreats, who participated in pacem in terris, I doubt that I could be thought of as unfavorable to Catholics. But I happen to know the whole story as to Cardinal Spellman and Diem. And I happen to have been all through south Asia and know the Buddhist situation and what is involved.

Be assured, that as a scholar I do not take any unalterable position. I am always open to proof. But I never have, and I shall not now, take the mere assertion of someone who knows less about the facts than I do, as an adequate explanation.

Sincerely yours,

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
March 22, 1965.

HARROP A. FREEMAN,
Professor of Law,
Cornell Law School,
Ithaca, N.Y.

DEAR PROFESSOR FREEMAN: Secretary McNamara was grateful for your kind letter and for the copy of your letter to the Vice President. He asked that I thank you for sharing your comments with him.

If I may, I would like to take exception to several points raised in your analysis. The Vietcong insurgency was never, from its inception, an internal revolt. It is and has been an effort closely coordinated, directed and supported from Hanoi and further supported by Peiping. Therefore, we did not enter wrongly into an internal struggle, but entered legitimately, because the government of South Vietnam asked for our help in burning back a threat to the freedom and sovereignty of the Republic of Vietnam. The Communists have described the Vietcong effort as "a holy war of national liberation that will be a test case for other underdeveloped areas." To allow such an effort to go unchecked would be to open up the entire area of Southeast Asia to similar aggression and, eventually, other areas in Africa and Latin America. Our dedication to the principles of freedom and our concern for the fate of the free world demanded our presence.

Nor have we been concerned with "Catho-

lics rather than people." While assisting the Republic of Vietnam to build an armed force capable of deterring Communist aggression, we have been equally interested in helping the people develop a government truly responsive to the needs of all the people and the dictates of the revolution of rising expectations.

On the basis of the evidence now piling up, it will be very difficult for the Communist bloc to continue their claims of not aiding external aggression, but only internal liberation. For Vietnam is a very definite case of Communist assistance to external aggression.

As Secretary McNamara said in his recent testimony before the House Armed Services Committee:

"The road ahead will be difficult and continuing sacrifices will be required of our people, both in money and in lives. But the challenge must surely be met. If we fail to meet it here and now, we will inevitably have to confront it later under even more disadvantageous conditions. This is the clear lesson of history which we can ignore only at our peril.

"We may be certain that as soon as they had established their control over South Vietnam, the Communists would press their subversive operations in Laos and then in Thailand and we would have to face this same problem all over again in another place or permit them to have all of southeast Asia by default. Thus, the choice is not simply whether to continue our efforts to keep South Vietnam free and independent but, rather, whether to continue our struggle to halt Communist expansion in Asia. If the choice is the latter, as I believe it should be, we will be far better off facing the issue in South Vietnam."

Let me assure you again that we were pleased to have the benefit of your thinking.

Sincerely,
JOSEPH A. CALIFANO, Jr.,
The Special Assistant to the Secretary
and Deputy Secretary of Defense.

KEY WEST, FLA., April 2, 1965.

HON. SPESARD L. HOLLAND,
Senator From Florida,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HOLLAND: I hope that you will support Senator MORSE and his associates in their effort to stop the current Pentagon hoodlumism in Vietnam and to help President Johnson find an honorable solution to the problem inherited from his predecessors by giving Vietnam back to the Vietnamese.

I should add that almost 40 years (since 1927) of professional concern with Asia gives me the right to an opinion, and that everybody I talk to about the matter agrees with me.

Sincerely yours,

MORTIMER GRAVES,
Same to Senator SMATHERS and Representative DANTE FASCELL.

ROBERT L. WOLF & ASSOCIATES,
Granite City, Ill., April 2, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I hope you can stand firm in your opposition to the sadly unworthy course of our Government in South Vietnam. I know you will not share my use of the word "murder" as describing the actions of President Johnson but having searched my conscience I can find no other word. Surely if some friend of the Vietcong would today bomb Scott Field near here there would rise up a great cry. I cannot so close my mind as to fail to see the exact parallel.

I find it difficult to be so at odds with the man I just helped to elect but I cannot

join with Goldwater and Nixon and approve that which I thought the nation had rejected. We have reached the point where my nation has so abandoned itself that it has left me behind. Now I can only say that humanity requires that the United States be brought to its senses or to its knees. I suppose I am guilty of treason but not treason to the country I loved but only to what she has become. McCarthy, McCarran, all you rightwing —, what have you done to my country.

Please do what you can. Even now I cannot really understand how we have been brought to the position where the world must unite to bring an end to U.S. aggression against humanity wherever it seeks to change the shameful status quo. How have we come to embrace every shameful dictator and slave owning tyrant and military cabal? At least could we not call them our — opposing the enemy — instead of describing the wretches as "Freedom Loving."

I suppose it is a case of "Those the gods would destroy they first make mad." What have our people done to deserve the horrors that must surely be heaped on an even to our little children. Yes Mr. Lippmann the war hawks are now rejoicing the people shall soon cry.

Yours in tears,

ROBERT L. WOLF.

P.S.—The St. Louis Globe Democrat, a leading antihuman newspaper approves the acts of Barry Johnson or is it Lyndon Goldwater. I personally voted for Lyndon Johnson, advocate of human decency.

BARRY—L.B.J.'S MILITARY MENTOR

During the presidential campaign of last fall, the Republican candidate for President, Senator Barry Goldwater, was roundly castigated by his political enemies as an irresponsible warmonger—largely because of the views the Senator expressed on the Vietnam struggle.

It might be well now to review a few of the more extreme positions held by the Senator during that campaign.

We recall Mr. Goldwater suggested that perhaps the staging areas for North Vietnamese troops in neutral Laos might be bombed. Subsequent to November, President Johnson has bombed them repeatedly.

Senator Goldwater further suggested that perhaps carrying the war to North Vietnam might serve to induce Hanoi to end its aid and direction of the fighting in the South. Since November, President Johnson has initiated the bombing of North Vietnam, not just as retaliatory raids for Vietcong blows against American installations, but as a set policy, the purpose of which is to induce Hanoi to desist its support of the war.

Senator Goldwater suggested that it might be beneficial from a military standpoint if America undertook to defoliate areas where trees and shrubbery protected the guerrillas from air assault.

Now comes word from South Vietnam that a large forest northwest of Saigon, which provides a canopy of cover for the Vietcong, has been the target of chemical defoliation, to leave the forest dry and dead. Yesterday that forest was set ablaze by Air Force planes. The purpose: Nothing if not defoliation.

To find out what the administration plans to do next in Vietnam we suggest rummaging through Senator Goldwater's old speeches.

How 1962 CIA SUGAR SABOTAGE WAS NULLIFIED—PRESIDENT KENNEDY ACTED TO DESTROY SOVIET-BOUND CARGO

(By Max Frankel)

WASHINGTON, March 26.—Discussions here about the use of nausea gas in Vietnam have brought to light the story of an ingenious scheme by which the White House once nullified the use of a different kind of chemical agent on some Soviet-bound sugar.

It is the story of how former President John F. Kennedy outraged the Soviet Government by conspiring in the detention of a British ship with cargo from Cuba in order to undo a successful sabotage operation of the Central Intelligence Agency.

The Caribbean melodrama involved mysterious shipboard fires and hijacked sacks of sugar, court battles, and angry diplomatic messages, all against the background of the Cuba missile crisis.

The story, 30 months old, is not ended. At least one attorney in Puerto Rico still is being sued by Moscow for damages.

The story has no direct relationship to gas and Vietnam, but sources have been recalling it as they talk about the various unorthodox weapons that occasionally pose special problems for Washington.

It began on August 22, 1962, when the British freighter *Streatham Hill*, under lease to a Soviet agency, limped into San Juan harbor, Puerto Rico, for emergency repairs after it had damaged its propeller on a reef. The 7130-ton vessel was carrying 80,000 sacks of Cuban sugar to the Soviet Union on one of the then regular commercial runs by Western ships that were infuriating the Kennedy administration.

Of the sugar aboard, 14,135 bags came ashore, allegedly unloaded to permit the making of repairs. The bags of sugar were placed in bond in a customs house, because Cuban products could not be imported into the United States.

As the freighter lay in port for several weeks, either before or after some of its cargo was taken ashore, one or more agents of the United States managed to get to some of the sugar to apply a substance that would spoil its taste and usefulness. It is said to have been an essentially harmless substance, not likely to inflict injury, but certain to arouse serious dissatisfaction among Soviet consumers.

How many sacks were tampered with is not known, but subsequent developments indicate that most if not all of the adulterated sugar was among the sacks in the warehouse.

The purpose of this chemical sabotage is said to have been manifold: to damage an expensive cargo; to rouse Soviet suspicions about the quality of Cuban sugar; to create discord between Soviet and Cuban authorities and, possibly, to discourage shippers from providing services that were likely to lead to disputes, recriminations, and perhaps even suspicions of sabotage.

KENNEDY ANGERED BY PLOT

The operation appeared to have been a success and the *Streatham Hill* was preparing to reclaim the doctored sugar and resume its journey on September 19 when President Kennedy learned of the sabotage. He is said to have been angered by the plot and fearful not only of injury to Soviet consumers but also of setting a dreadful precedent in chemical sabotage.

In early September, therefore, the order went out from Washington: The contaminated sugar must not leave U.S. territory. Intelligence agents, harbor authorities, customs officials, and Government attorneys were put on the job and thus began the intrigue to undo intrigue.

How it was done is clear from the recollection of sources here, in San Juan, and Miami and news reports at the time. Exactly who played what role could not be learned.

On September 18, Terry Kane and some associates from Miami appeared in the Superior Court of Puerto Rico to contend that the sugar in the warehouse belonged to Cuba and ought to be seized as compensation for the Cuban Government's debt to them.

A year earlier, they had obtained a judgment in a Dade County court in Florida that Premier Fidel Castro's regime owed them

\$833,978 for the seizure of a farm machinery business in Havana.

WRIT OF ATTACHMENT

Kane said it was his own idea to go after the sugar in San Juan. What encouragement he had from Washington is not clear but on September 19, just as the *Streatham Hill* was about to reload its cargo and depart, court records show, the Puerto Rican court issued a writ of attachment against the sugar in the warehouse.

The next day, with the freighter still in drydock, the remaining sugar on board was ordered impounded and held for a possible settlement of the debts due Kane and associates.

Apparently President Kennedy's orders had then been carried out. A long series of diplomatic and court bouts followed.

CANOGA PARK, CALIF.,

March 30, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I believe it is time for all countries to consider the needs of individuals within other countries before imposing a foreign will upon them. Only country whose citizens are well fed and well educated, morally and economically strong can approach international crises with such humanitarianism. No country measures up to those standards as well as our United States of America.

For that reason, I must protest our country's intervention in Vietnam. It is time for the Vietnamese people to be united and to learn self-government without outside interference. This can only be done if all foreign elements leave Vietnam immediately. Our presence in that country is a detriment to the health, welfare and future growth of all concerned, and can only result in hatred and international chaos.

I appreciate your efforts on behalf of the people of this country to seek an expedient and peaceful solution to the Vietnam crises and I hope that you and other Members of the Senate will continue to move in that direction as long as it is necessary.

Sincerely,

Mrs. JO ANNE MCCOLLOCH.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,

March 31, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Enclosed is a carbon of a letter I sent to Senator FULBRIGHT. I thought that because of your own forthright stand in the Vietnam matter you might be interested in the activities of the group discussed in the letter—a group which has made one of its main purposes the pushing of a hard line in cold war policy. Especially alarming, of course, is the fact that important public figures, including our Secretary of State, appear to be lending their prestige to this group.

P.S. I am sending a copy of this note to your colleague, Senator GRUENING.

Yours truly,

JAMES T. BURNETT.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,

March 31, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: Several years ago, in your excellent study of the influence of the extreme right in our Armed Forces you noted the role of the Institute for American Strategy. Shortly thereafter, I was engaged in research for a pamphlet on the far right published by Norman Thomas' Socialist Party; (The American Ultras, New York: 1962). In the course of my research I came across additional evidence of the ties of the IAS—and its director, Frank Rockwell Barnett—with organizations on the ultraright fringe. Therefore, I was surprised to receive in the mail the other day an advertisement for a book to be published by Doubleday Anchor:

April 21, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

7895

"Peace and War in the Modern Age." The book is announced as being published by Anchor for National Strategy Information Center, Inc. In case there was any doubt about the identity of the group, Frank R. Barnett's name appears among the contributors to the volume. What is dismaying, however, is that the names of Dean Acheson, Allen Dulles, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and Dean Rusk also appear. I am not, of course, questioning the right of Mr. Barnett or his group to express their views. But I am wondering whether the public figures mentioned are aware of the extremist connections of the group to which they are lending their prestige.

I should mention that I am a graduate student in political science at the University of California, so I assume that the mailing of the American Political Science Association may be being used for the distribution of an advertisement in question.

Yours truly,

JAMES T. BURNETT.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
April 1, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: The stand that you have taken against the war in Vietnam is the most courageous thing for a man to do. You will never know how I appreciate it. And I'm alone. There must be millions who wish that war stopped. Seems we are being the aggressors.

I never miss your talks when you come here. They are so inspiring. Is there anything we can do as American citizens to stop that war? If it keeps on we will be destroyed.

I wish to thank you again for your courage.

Sincerely,

Mrs. LUCILLE MARTIN.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

HON. SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: Thank you for the forthright position you are taking in our protestations against our participation in the Vietnam civil war. I hope our leaders will "see the light" as you do.

Respectfully,

REBECCA G. EPSTEIN.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
April 3, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I write to thank you with all my heart for your position on the involvement of the United States in South and North Vietnam. I fully support your position. You know of course that thousands of knowledgeable Americans agree with you and are horrified at the measures being taken by this Government. I feel that those surrounding the President are wrongly advising him. Please continue to fight. Can you think of ways that the hundreds of Americans who want our involvement to cease can make their objections count? Already the United States has lost the respect of Asians and many European countries as well as Latin America and Africa.

I think Senators McGOVERN and COOPER may agree with you to some extent. Also we must keep Walter Lippmann and James Easton at work on behalf of this effort to find a new and better Vietnam policy.

Gratefully,

WINNIFRED WYGAL.

LARCHMONT, N.Y.,
April 2, 1965.

S. Senator W. L. MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I, too, voted for President Johnson last November; and I, too, oppose the American use of gas, napalm, and bombings in South Vietnam. We have nei-

ther the duty or right to tell the people of southeast Asia how to live, what government to have, or to force freedom upon them. I agree with the enclosed ad from the New York Times.

Very truly yours,

MOSES CAMMER.

A LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Last November we cast our vote for you because we were alarmed by the war policies of Barry Goldwater.

Today we find your administration is in Vietnam, following the very policies we voted to reject.

All this in the name of "freedom." Freedom for whom? There has never been a free election in South Vietnam. The Vietnamese people do not support the "24-hour" governments imposed on them by military coups. They want an end to this fratricidal war.

The bombings of North Vietnam and the landing of the Marines in South Vietnam constitute an open invitation to world war.

We join with Pope Paul VI and U.N. Secretary General U Thant in urging an immediate cease-fire in Vietnam, a conference of all nations to negotiate peace.

CALIFORNIA

Benjamin Bufano, Alden B. Campen, Mrs. Sally Cooper, Charmion Cotton, Mr. and Mrs. B. Druckman, Beverly J. Farquharson, Rev. Stephen Fritchman, Mr. and Mrs. Ben Gindlen, Dr. Frances Herring, Dr. Bud R. Hutchinson, Irmgard Lenel, Samuel Levine, Don de Mistral, Mary Louise de Mistral, Mrs. Ruth Orloff, Emmy Lou Packard, Ava Helen Pauling, Dr. Linus Pauling, Dryden Linsley Phelps, Byron Randall, Robert E. Randolph, Valeda Randolph, Alice Richards, Holland Roberts, Helen Sheats, Clara Silverstein, Margaret T. Simkin, Mr. and Mrs. William F. Stanton, E. L. Swallow, Frances Tandy, Frank Wilkinson, James May Zorbas, Anna Dant, Lenore Peters Job, Helen Miller.

CONNECTICUT

Rabbi Robert E. Goldberg, Anton Selkowitz, Louise Pettibone Smith, Dorothy Stein, Dr. Willard Uphaus, Anita Willcox, Henry Willcox, Lloyd F. Worley.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Janet M. Neuman, Leva B. Pillser, Margaret Russell, Joanna Vogelsang.

FLORIDA

Isabel Smith, Monroe Smith.

ILLINOIS

William T. Baird, Ernest DeMaio, Alberto Donnellis, Gene Johnson, Mr. and Mrs. Leslie G. Milligan, Mary Phillips, Dorothea Sherlock.

IOWA

Prof. Howard L. Pawns.

KANSAS

L. J. Pritchard.

KENTUCKY

Anne and Carl Braden, James Gant, Sam and Liz Shira, Anita M. Smith.

LOUISIANA

George T. Pappas.

MAINE

Elizabeth E. Hoyt.

MARYLAND

Sylvia Bailey, Jean H. Feinberg, Louise Greenwood, Miriam Levin, Marjorie Soco, Bernice Steele.

MASSACHUSETTS

Albert Allen, Carl Anthonson, Cynthia B. Anthonson, Charlotte Berg, Edmund C. Berkeley, Kay Boyle, May Brande, Edith Carlson, Marion Coden, Melvin R. Cohen, Pauline Dana, Vera Fisher, Charles Gibadlo,

Bernard Edwin Galitz, Mary E. Giffin, Helen H. Gillette, Florence M. Goodell, Sara R. Gordon.

Samuel H. Grimspon, Mrs. Hector M. Holmes, Samuel W. Hurowitz, Ben Kublin, Gertrude T. Lurie, Mrs. Margaret Lynch, Mrs. P. Mayer, Mrs. Phyllis T. MacEwan, Irving Millstein, Joseph H. Nelson, S. Roy Remar, Bertha C. Reynolds, Winifred F. Root, Frederick Schuman, Edith Soboff, Pitirim A. Sorokin, Mr. and Mrs. Philip Stockwell, Robert C. Taylor, Jr., Elizabeth T. Vincent, Rev. Eliot White, Dorothy T. Wilder.

MICHIGAN

Hymie Cutler, Mary Gentry, Carl Haessler, Mrs. Alice Herz, Morton Leitson, Axel Nielsen, Wanda Pusey, Mrs. Clara M. Vincent, Leroy Waterman.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Verne Thomas.

MISSOURI

Sol Londe, M.D., Prof. and Mrs. Theodor Rosebury.

NEW JERSEY

Jane Aronowitz, Gerald A. Bertin, C. DeGregory, Alta Jacobson, Guy Lisa, James Lisa, Jesse Moskowitz, Leon M. Mosner, Rabbi Benjamin Plotkin, Ruth M. Jackson, Harold E. Lippman, M.D.

NEW YORK

Alvin Abelack, Joan Abelack, Sandra Abelson, Henry Abrams, Virginia and Stephen Abrams, Rev. George A. Ackerly, Taylor Adams, Don Amter, Vicky Amter, Clara Antin, Eunice B. Armstrong, Gertrude Asher, George Ballin, Elizabeth Baker, David Balfour, Rev. Lee H. Ball, Cleo Banks, Martha V. Bartos, Elsie Baudman, Minna Bayer, Abraham I. Beacher, M.D., Nettie Becker, Paul Becker, Mel Beinart, Ruth Beinart, Dr. and Mrs. Marvin Belsky, Adele Berk, Jeannette R. Berne, Dorothy Bishop, Sylvia Bjornson.

Milt Bloch, Ruth Bloch, Jules Bloom, Edith Bluestone, Carl Blumenthal, Ethel Blumenthal, Ruth D. Blumenthal, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Boehm, Vanzotto M. Bowie, Francine B. Bradley, Ph. D., Florence Breuer, Edwin Berry Burgum, Esther Carroll, Clara R. Case, Doris Cattell, Dorothy Chertak, Alice Citron, Clara Coffey, Adele Cohen, Saul Cohen, Mr. and Mrs. Sidney Cohn, Ephraim Cross, Sara Cunningham, Henry DiMare, Ailx Dobkin, Elizabeth Duimovich, Miriam Dworkin, Kurt Easton, Dr. F. J. Einstein, Stella Ellashow, Alan Emanuel, M.D., Richard Erle, Ph. D., Harry Epstein, M.D., George Evans, Ali Fatemi, Stanley Faulkner, Dr. Leon Feinstein, Irving Felsher, Stanley Finger, Sidney Finckelstein, Lorraine Foner, Leon Forer, Ruth Friedman, Saul Friedman, Ruth Gage-Colby, Annie Gaston, John C. Gebhardt, Lester A. Gelb, M.D.

Miriam Gill, Helen Ginsburg, David Glaser, Irving Glusak, Larry Goldberg, Paul Goldberg, Morris Goldin, J. Goldstein, Nina Goldstein, Sam and Joan Goldstein, Herman Gordon, Ceil Gross, George M. Hall, Eileen Halpin, Louis Harap, Margaret L. D. Hatch, Jane Benedict Hawley, Peter Hawley, Dr. Mary Alice Hilton, Jane E. Hodes, Dr. Robert Hodes, Bernice Holland, Samuel J. Holland, Frank Ichuk, Grace Cohen Ichuk, Clara Isquith, Corinne Jackson, Eugene Jackson, Robert E. Jackson, Irma Jaffe, Jack Jaffe, Mrs. M. L. Jaffe, Terre Johnson, Steve Jonas, M.D., Mr. and Mrs. Jules Kabat, Martha Kahn, Tillie Kahn, Samuel Kamen, Peter Kaminski, Rabbi Mordecai M. Kaplan, Maude W. Katz, W. C. Kelly, Walter Kendra, Florence R. Kennedy, Rockwell Kent, Dr. and Mrs. David Kimmelman, Bernard L. Klein.

Fred Koury, Eileen Krieger, Dr. Louis Kroll, Burton Lane, Corliss Lamont, Helen Lamont, Virginia M. Lerner, Robert Lehrer, Regina Lerner, Jo Ann Levinson, Dr. and Mrs. Frank Levy, Sylvia C. Levy, Meryl Lewis, Rudolph Lindenfeld, Vera List, Adele Lithauer, Donah B. Lithauer, Sara Anne Naddell, Lucy Orenstein, Dr. I. J. Panken, Barbara Parker, MSW,

7896

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

April 21, 1965

Georgia V. Parker, Richard Pastor, Roberta Penzner, Dr. and Mrs. Irving Peress, Sam Pevzner, Cyril Philip, David Platt, Sarah Plotkin, Ceceila Pollack, Mildred Price, Sidney Price, Dr. and Mrs. Samuel J. Prigal, Esther T. Rand, John Randolph, Anita Ratener, Leo Ratener, Ella Ratner, Luna Reich, Ph. D., Dr. Irving W. Reid, Sylvia Reiderman, Al Resnick, Fannie Resnick, Frances Reswick, Philip Reisman, Jerome Robbins, Mr. and Mrs. Paul Robeson, Jr., Peter Rosano, Pauline R. Rosen, Irwin Rosenhouse, Dorothy Monet Rosenwald, Joel Rothman, David L. Rubinfine, M.D., Mary Russak, Maud Russell, Lillian Ryckoff.

Joan Saltzman, Morris Salz, Esther Sanders, Rose Savage, Morris Schappes, Robert N. Schneider, Mildred W. Schoenberger, Rose Schuyler, Caroline Scollen, John Scudder, Claire Serchuk, D. A. J. Shapiro, Gerald I. Shapiro, Leo Shapiro, Ralph Shapiro, Dr. and Mrs. M. B. Sherman, Jean Shulman, Florence Siegel, Mike Siegel, Dr. Samuel Siegel, Harold Silverstein, Mr. and Mrs. Abbott Simon, Dr. and Mrs. Sidney Socolar, Ruth Spain, Joseph Spencer, Rudolph Steiner, Stan Steiner, Dr. Clifford N. Stern, Mr. and Mrs. H. Stolley, Dr. Arthur Stulbaum, Ise Suckerman, Nat Suckerman, Isabelle Suhl, Jack Sutton, Jerome Tanklow, Harry Tarr, Wilbert A. Tatum, Dr. H. J. Tennen, Fran Tepper, Dr. and Mrs. N. Thaler, Erling Tholfsen, George Tichenor, Janet M. Tilney, Elizabeth Timberman, Naomi Unger, Semah Unterman, Francine Valiario, Lee Waldstein, Samuel Wallach, Florence Wallerstein, Herbert Wasserman, H. M. Wasserman, Bernard Wein, Janet B. Weinblatt, Frieda Weisberg.

Abe Weisburd, Nat Werner, Margaret Werthman, Joel White, T. E. Wilson, Arthur Wyrob, Mr. and Mrs. Jack Yellin, David Young, MSW, Ellen and Leonard Zablow, Susan Littlefield, Doris Loewl, Sylvia Lopez, Dr. Helen Merrell Lynd, Mrs. George Mack, E. Louis Mally, Doris Mann, David Mann, William I. Margolies, Herta Mayer, Ellen McCatty, Georgio McMurray, M.S.S. William Howard Melish, Rev. John Howard Melish, Mr. and Mrs. H. Meyerson, Betty Millard, Abe Miller, Cecile Miller, Mildred Miller, John P. Mills, Aileen H. Morford, Elizabeth Moos, Anna E. Morganstern, Aurelia Morris, Alex and Marion Munsell, Marjorie Murphy, MSW, Miriam Zelnick, Allen Zivgarell, Abraham Zitron, Celia Zitron, Lea Zigdor, Joan Barnard, Mr. and Mrs. J. Bauman, Robin W. Briebl, M.D., Dr. and Mrs. Desmond Callan, Henry Clayton, Rose Gershon, Thelma Kaga, Shirley Kregler, Henry L. Klein, Lena Levine, Anton Refregier, Simon Ross, Don Schoolman, Morris Seltzer, Dr. and Mrs. Mark Silvan, Gladys Skideil, Sarah Smith, Miriam Urdang, Helene S. Zahler.

OHIO

Prof. Elizabeth Kresky, Francis Loud, Richard Meisler.

PENNSYLVANIA

Derk Bodde, Galla S. Bodde, Mrs. William Dobkin, John R. Keisler, Mr. and Mrs. Jack Lesnik, Mildred Scott Olmsted, Ida Pruitt, Judith Shouse.

RHODE ISLAND

Harvey O'Connor.

TENNESSEE

Dr. and Mrs. F. A. Blossom, Roxie Wood.

VERMONT

Irving and Ruth Adler, Elsa Golben.

VIRGINIA

Thelma C. Dulinage, Belle W. Schulz.

WISCONSIN

B. D. Bushee, Mrs. Esther Bushee, Frances H. Bushee, Walter B. Rideout.

WYOMING

Grace Anderson.

What you can do to stop the war in Vietnam:

Reproduce this advertisement in your local newspaper.

Write to President Johnson and send copies to your U.S. Senators.

Write to U.S. Senators WAYNE L. MORSE, ERNEST GRUENING, FRANK CHURCH and GEORGE S. MCGOVERN endorsing their position for negotiations.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,

April 1, 1965.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I fervently endorse your position for negotiations for ending the war in Vietnam. I think that the time has come for us to stop talking about saving face and to start talking about saving lives. Men cannot resolve differing ideologies by plunder or mass murder—that can only lead to heavy loss of life, property, and esteem on both sides. And in the end, nothing permanent, i.e., this homogeneous ideology, can be effected. In addition, we are losing face among our allies and other free nations of the world for our current "walk softly, carrying a big stick" policies.

It would seem self-evident that people would realize that nuclear war—and the threat increases every hour, every day—would be disastrous. Indeed, it would be annihilating, for as there is no such thing as one drink for an alcoholic, there is no such thing as a localized war. The way things are developing now, it is almost a matter of time before this universal dread becomes a reality.

I repeat, I heartily endorse your policies and hope that as a strong voice in our Government, you can somehow further make clear the need for negotiations. Are we, in the final analysis, a nation of mice or men? Is our hoped for Great Society all for naught? Must we throw sticks and stones like children at play (albeit, alas, we are not at play) or can we sit down at the conference table and discuss our fundamental differences?

I have just turned 21, and am looking forward to legally adding my voice to governmental policies, I shall vote, not for the war for destruction, but for peace.

Sincerely yours,

ELLEN GARDINER.

SCARSDALE, N.Y.,

March 31, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As a former west coast resident, perhaps I can get your ear.

Please do not cease in asking that the United States heed world opinion, U Thant, and Pope Paul and stop bypassing the U.N. in Vietnam.

Thank you for being a voice of moral integrity over the years.

What "democracy" are American boys fighting for in Vietnam. I'm ashamed that we are tearing up that country with bombings. We should use the U.N to develop the Mekong Valley; thus help them achieve a stable government. This isn't giving them a stable government. I feel my country is betraying its humanitarian ideals. 1984 is indeed here, if all contrary opinion is silenced by Johnson, as it indeed seems to be.

He has been so fine on Alabama, I'm distraught that his international advisers have been so military in the old-fashioned pre-nuclear sense.

I voted against Goldwater because of his warlike stance; but now Johnson is doing precisely what the electorate repudiated.

BEVERLY NYGREEN.

SCIENTIST OPPOSES WAR

WOODS HOLE, MASS.,

March 24, 1965.

To the Editor:

In the last election we scientists stood as one man behind President Johnson, being afraid of what Mr. Goldwater, as President,

might do. Now President Johnson does in Vietnam what we feared. He made no promises to us scientists. Nevertheless, I feel disappointed, alienated, if not betrayed. I am sure many of my fellow scientists feel as I do. We are deeply concerned because it was our work which opened the way both to a better future for mankind or its final catastrophe. We are going the wrong way, and it is time for scientists to get together once more, this time to sound a warning.

As an American I am deeply concerned also because this is more than a war. It is a moral issue from which we can only emerge with our name badly tarnished. Even victory must mean a defeat. The administration's policy is contrary to the principles for which this country has always stood. If a war can be conducted, our treasures spent on it, our boys taken to far-off countries to kill and be killed, all without asking the people or their representative then democracy becomes a hollow word.

The great majority of the American people is opposed to this war that also scuttles the U.N., on which mankind pinned its hopes and which we promised to support.

ALBERT SZENT-GYORGYI, M.D.
(NOTE.—The writer was awarded the Nobel Prize for Medicine in 1937.)

ORLANDO, FLA.,

April 2, 1965.

HON. WAYNE L. MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I endorse your position relative to the hostilities in Vietnam.

I do not believe the issues involved such as to require U.S. participation in actual fighting. I hope you will continue to work for immediate withdrawal of U.S. forces.

Sincerely yours,

ABE SCHESTOPOL

A LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Last November I cast our vote for you because we were alarmed by the war policies of Barry Goldwater.

Today we find your administration in Vietnam, following the very policies we voted to reject.

All this in the name of "freedom."

Freedom for whom? There has never been a free election in South Vietnam. The Vietnamese people do not support the "24 hour governments imposed on them by military coups. They want an end to this fratricidal war.

The bombings of North Vietnam and the landing of the Marines in South Vietnam constitute an open invitation to world war.

We join with Pope Paul VI and U.N. Secretary General U Thant in urging:

An immediate cease fire in Vietnam.

A conference of all nations to negotiate peace.

What you can do to stop the war in Vietnam:

Reproduce this advertisement in your local newspaper.

Write to President Johnson and send copies to your U.S. Senators.

Write to U.S. Senators WAYNE L. MORSE, ERNEST GRUENING, FRANK CHURCH, and GEORGE S. MCGOVERN endorsing their position for negotiations.

VIRGIL CONNER INSURANCE, INC.,

Apopka, Fla., April 1, 1965

Senator GEORGE S. MCGOVERN,
Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK,
Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senator WAYNE MORSE,

DISTINGUISHED GENTLEMEN: Am enclosing copy of my letter of February 24 to President Johnson to which I did not receive a re-

April 21, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

7897

Am taking the liberty to send copies of this letter to you. My reason for doing so is because from reading the papers I get the idea that the thinking of you four distinguished gentlemen is not completely conditioned by the interests of the economic-military complex warned against by retiring President Eisenhower. Am not sending the letter to the Senators from my own State. With them the ideas here expressed would likely fall on stony ground.

My information is from the same source as that of the late and lamented Will Rogers. To me the situation in Vietnam is madness. If we were to hire really smart men to study the problem with the purpose of coming up with the worst plan for its solution—for the one most inhuman, most nearly completely against the public interest, the one most expensive and most dangerous—could these said smart men find a worse way than that the United States has drifted into, and into which it seems bent on drifting further?

For one like me who feels helpless against this dangerous trend, do any of you gentlemen have any suggestions? Any information will be received with thanks.

Yours truly,

VIRGIL CONNER.

LAWRENCE, KANS.,

April 1, 1965.

Mr. WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon.

DEAR SIR: I believe this trouble in Vietnam should be settled by conferences.

Do what you can to get this done. Please. Thank you.

ELIZABETH HENDERSON.

FEBRUARY 24, 1965.

HON. L. B. JOHNSON,
President of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I think you are doing a good job.

I realize that the State Department, the military, the CIA, and even the White House itself are colored more or less with the Dulles policy of overcommitment throughout the world. Even an able and conscientious man like you, and a really good politician besides, will have to have some time to clean the mess out.

Of course, being a small businessman in a country community, and having interests that coincide with the interests of nearly all the American people, I am for pulling the United States out of southeast Asia and using the money to start a new schoolhouse or student dormitory every day for the next year. I suggest this in defense of freedom.

Incidentally, I do not believe that the leaders of the Republican Party, nor any of the groups mentioned above are capable of making decisions in the public interest. I believe any decision that they influence would by that much be slanted contrary to the public interest.

In a previous letter I told you I was born a Southern Democrat. The precinct in which I live and the one in which I have my office went for Johnson in a county that gave Goldwater 76 percent of the votes cast. Of this I am proud.

Yours very truly,

VIRGIL H. CONNER.

SYRACUSE, N.Y.,

April 1, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to express my support for your stand on Vietnam. I urge a cease-fire and conference to negotiate peace.

Sincerely yours,

RUTH FLEISS.

DEAR SENATOR: Maybe it would be a good idea for you and fellow Senators who are against what the United States is doing in Vietnam to call on the wife of the President and explain the situation to her. Perhaps

she will see the folly of the President's advisers and use her influence. She looks to me as a woman with a lot of good common-sense.

Sincerely,

ED.

NEW YORK CITY, N.Y.

ROBERT KEFFKE.

APRIL 1965.

DEAR SENATOR: I am grateful for the effort you have made to get us out of this crazy, cruel war in Vietnam. I read that 80 percent of American citizens are against it, too.

Could you get a bill passed so that we people who foot the bills and bear the moral shame could have a plebiscite on war?

More power to you.

WILHELMINA TAGGART.

OAKLAND, CALIF.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
The Capitol,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Allow me to add my name to your growing number of admirers. It is heartening to see that honor and dignity still exist (especially in the face of such overwhelming odds) in our Government. Sir, I am speaking, of course, on your refusal to fall in line with the administration on the Vietnam question. Whether our policymakers have been seized with madness is hard to tell, but, more important, it remains within the power of persons such as yourself to make every effort to bring such shameful hypocrasies into public view. I am not too certain, that if the American people knew what was really going on in Vietnam, they would be willing to support our suicidal policies with such docility.

Senator, I am almost sick with horror at the thought of such wholesale public irresponsibility. The world saw the gathering clouds of two World Wars and, during all the months that preceded both, nothing was done by any of the nations which could have done something. The same situation exists today. Britain complains with a weak voice. France does nothing, no one puts any pressure on our Government—which seems to be perfectly oblivious to any opinion outside of the borders of the continental United States. When our own State Assemblyman John L. Burton took an initiative (he sent a letter of appeal to the heads of state in Great Britain), he was shouted down in the San Francisco Chronicle—the most widely read daily in the bay area. At the same time, this worthy journal of public information relegates news releases from Vietnam to mere one-column blurbs, while it titillates a sensation-hungry public with front-page scandal. Mr. Senator, what are we to do? It is impossible to surrender myself over to such stupidity and injustice. Perhaps you know of some way in which I can direct my energies so that I may do what I can to avert another senseless slaughter. Certainly, letter writing is some help, but it is not enough. With the full realization that you are a very busy man, and that you may not be able to reply to me personally, I eagerly await your reply and possible suggestions. Keep up the good work and count me on your side.

Sincerely,

PHILIP HOCKING.

APRIL 2, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Oregon.

DEAR SIR: I write you to encourage and support your position on Vietnam. I think it's quite clear that the day we bomb Hanoi, the United States will be involved in a total war. I cannot understand how our roads of suppression and exploitation of underdeveloped areas can continue without an expression of concern from the Congress. And how can we be at war without the consent of the Congress?

All these questions and more continue to go unanswered, yet Hanoi approaches us

quite rapidly. Americanism begins to be a very dirty word around the world, and we know all too well, that our only allies are the fascist dictatorships and racist countries.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT KEFFKE.

NEW YORK CITY, N.Y.

MORRISVILLE, PA.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

DEAR SIR: I heartily approve of your stand on Vietnam.

Have courage and stick by what you know is right.

FRED GOLDMAN, DDS.

WARRINGTON, PA.,

April 12, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We want to let you know that we are grateful for your honesty and integrity as shown by your position in the Senate in opposing our Government's policy in Vietnam.

It is our concern that we will continue to have outstanding statesmen such as you speak forth on issues that affect the welfare of our country and the rest of the world.

Let us know what we can do to help you.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. J. REED SUPLEE.

BENSON, ARIZ.,

March 31, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR: I beg you to rise and make a major address denouncing our whole indecent adventure in Vietnam. It is your duty since only you and Senator GRUENING seem to have the knowledge and the courage to say what the majority of Americans are thinking and saying.

Goldwater lost the election but Goldwaterism goes clomping on in military boots. It's the old story—first you build up a military force for defense then you use it for aggression.

You are one of my few long enduring heroes since I have for years followed your career. Congress is always hopelessly "dated" but I nearly always find you correct and stimulating.

Please talk long and often and please denounce this war from the Senate floor. I have written Johnson and HUMPHREY crying "shame."

Sincerely,

PETER R. KELLY.

APRIL 2, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Enclosed please find a copy of a letter I have written to the President. I hope it has not been an exercise in futility.

I heard your speech at Johns Hopkins University on March 15. Thank you for your courage and effort to educate the public. I only hope that you will continue to speak out against this Vietnam policy.

Sincerely,

BALTIMORE, MD.

Mrs. CATHERINE L. MINK.

APRIL 1, 1965.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue,
Washington, D.C.

MR. PRESIDENT: I write to register my disapproval of our actions and policy in Vietnam. I have read and heard your statements on the subject. I am familiar with the last white paper released by the State Department. I am saturated with all the justifications put forward by our Defense Department, Members of Congress, and various and sundry advocates of this course. But I also have researched the history of that area and our involvement there.

April 21, 1965

What a tragic story it is: From the unenlightened French colonial exploitation, to the rise of the nationalist movement under Ho Chi Minh, to the Japanese occupation, to the duplicity of the British General Gracey after World War II, to the vain efforts of the French and their duplicity in trying to replace the yoke of colonialism on Vietnam by means of puppet regimes—yes, right down to our fanatical anticommunism as espoused and promulgated by John Foster Dulles. His was the warped view of the world which put us into a struggle on the wrong side with the French and their puppets and it has been the political cowardice of three Presidents which has kept us there.

I wonder if you, Mr. President, and the policymakers ever bothered to read the history of the Vietnamese struggle to rid themselves of the exploitation of Western man. If we had more historians and fewer CIA people and State Department "hard nosers" making policy we might not find ourselves the "last French colonialist in Indochina."

I heard your press conference on Saturday March 20, and your reiteration of policy on Vietnam and I can only say that whether it was started 10 years ago or 110 years ago, whether it was the policy of 3 Presidents or 33 Presidents, and whether you repeat it 47 times or 147 times—it still doesn't make it right.

The people of this country do not support this hideous little war of napalm and massive bombardments and U.S. official propaganda, but they have become so intellectually lethargic with affluence that they cannot bestir themselves to give loud voice to their disapproval. They assuage their consciences with the balm of anticommunism.

Have we come to the point where anything is justifiable in the name of anticommunism? When I consider that after World War II and just prior to its ending, Vietnam was a unified and independent nation from northernmost to southernmost boundaries—when I consider that Bao Dai had relinquished his throne in support of Ho Chi Minh and the Vietminh government and wrote De Gaulle asking that the French not persist in reclaiming these colonies; then I go on to find that the United States came into this struggle on the side of the French, then the Diem regime, and that it was officially stated policy during Dulles' secretaryship to back Diem's refusal to hold elections in accord with the 1954 Geneva agreements—that we built up Diem's army again in violation of the 1954 Geneva agreement—and now we have to listen to our officials saying that North Vietnam must show its willingness to live up to those 1954 agreements—I can only say, what hypocrisy. Why should the Vietnamese respect the artificial 17th parallel imposed on them by others, yes, even Russia and China along with the Western Powers.

In closing let me say I am ashamed of my Government. I do not support the President. I believe we shall fall in this effort because we do not have right on our side.

With regret,

Mrs. CATHERINE L. MINK.

BALTIMORE, MD.

BRIARCLIFF MANOR, N.Y.,

April 2, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to tell you I endorse your position on Vietnam and have written to the President urging negotiation or failure in this to withdraw our troops.

With deep concern and best wishes,
Sincerely,

HOLLIE D. STADTFELT,
Mrs. Nicholas T.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,

April 4, 1965.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Tonight I have written to President Johnson urging that he help bring

about a cease-fire in Vietnam and get all nations to sit down at the conference table to negotiate a peace.

I endorse your position for negotiations and will do all in my power to continue supporting you.

Very truly yours,

EDWIN GREENBLATT.

APRIL 5, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like you to know that I endorse your position for negotiations (after cease-fire) in Vietnam crisis.

I have just written the President asking that he take a strong step forward and call for cease-fire and negotiations.

Sincerely and respectfully,

Mrs. F. BERMAN.

APRIL 2, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We ask for an immediate cease-fire in Vietnam and immediate use of U Thant's formula for negotiations.

Yours truly,

MURIEL BLAKE.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.

TORRANCE, CALIF.,

April 1, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you and urge you to continue your positive stand insofar as Vietnam is concerned.

Although those of us who want a disengagement in Vietnam are in the minority we are growing each and every day.

It is my personal thinking that we will be able to stop the war in Vietnam only if we act quickly, hard-headedly (in the sense that we seek peace) and together.

The world is looking at southeast Asia today and so are many Americans. We must show them that the present U.S. position in Vietnam can lead to nothing else but war unless and only if it is stopped now.

You are to be commended for your stand and you have my continued support and admiration.

Sincerely,

G. D. WIEBE.

N.B.—I am wondering if we could have a copy of the RECORD where you, according to the Saturday Evening Post, I believe, called the Vietnam fiasco McNamara's war?

G.W.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,

April 4, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The news of the last few days are most alarming. What can a lone citizen do to express his fear and anger at the ever increasing war which our Government is waging in South Vietnam? It is wrong, terribly wrong.

We are so fortunate to have you in the Senate and we beg you to continue your utmost efforts to arouse the American people to an understanding of what is really happening. Our Government is playing with high stakes. The worst thing is that we may lose—if not already—control of our maneuverings and find ourselves in an inextricable position escalating into a large terrible war.

We support you—we beg you to continue your strong efforts and keep speaking out.

Our gratitude to you.

Sincerely yours,

FAMILY OF LOUIS J. LIFSHEY.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,

April 4, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We wanted to tell you how immensely grateful we are to you for your fight against our involvement in Vietnam.

We only hope that it leads to an early cease fire and negotiations.

Even if it is very little, we will do our utmost to uphold your position among our friends and acquaintances.

Respectfully yours,

PAUL RONALD,
MIRIAM RONALD.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,

April 3, 1965.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I fully endorse your position on Vietnam—an immediate cease-fire in Vietnam and negotiation to begin at once.

Yours sincerely,

MARTIN TILLER.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,

April 2, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We ask for an immediate cease-fire in Vietnam and immediate use of U Thant's formula for negotiations.

Yours truly,

CARMELITA BLAKE.

MIDDLETOWN, PA.,

March 25, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I'm a busy housewife with five children, but I must take time out to let you know how much I appreciate and respect you for speaking out against the terrible situation in Vietnam.

It's wonderful to know that there are today in 1965 courageous men such as you, who are comparable to the few who spoke out 200 years ago, and 100 years ago.

I sincerely hope that you are receiving much mail supporting your position and viewpoint on the Vietnam issue.

As you know, very little appears in print concerning those of us who don't support the administration on their Vietnam policy, so if you have any printed material available (speeches, et cetera), I would very much appreciate your sending me anything at all that I could use on radio programs such as "Voice of the People," "Open Mike," et cetera.

Thank you very much for taking time to listen to me; and above all thank you for "speaking out," so that I could and can listen to you.

Gratefully and sincerely,

LILA H. BRETZ,
Mrs. Harry W. Bretz, Jr.

PONTIAC, MICH.,

March 25, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR: I am deeply troubled about many things that are going on in our country which seems to me that you able men in Congress seem to have no say into whatever.

What has happened to our trusted Congressmen? Why is it the Congress has nothing to say about Vietnam? Why is it that Dean Rusk, McNamara, McGeorge Bundy, seem to be the only ones calling the shots in Vietnam?

Why is it our allies are sitting on their hands and having nothing to do with us as far as Vietnam is concerned?

What has happened to the United Nations? No help.

Why must we send the cream of the crop over into the jungles to be shot down in cold blood far away from home to fight against godless, heartless, people?

Senator, down deep in your heart do you think we will ever receive any thanks from it all?

Do you really think we can police the whole world?

What about the billions of taxpayer's money that is handed out year in and year out?

As a Christian I feel very sure that you people whom we trust will some day have

April 21, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

7899

to stand before God with the blood of every boy who is killed in that ugly war and give an account.

Why is it we can't mind our own business? Are we so desperate, Mr. MORSE, that we have to induct young men with only one eye into the Army?

Please tell me. Do you remember Korea? I do. Why, oh, why can't our Congressmen stand up and be counted?

Whom are we afraid of anyway? We have so many problems right here at home to keep us all busy.

I know, Mr. MORSE, that your thoughts are of many Americans on this Vietnam mess. Why let all Americans protest.

Why should these mothers and wives carry burdens on their hearts, day in and day out, something not of our own making?

Why should we buy savings bonds to support wars? We are selling ours. These are some of the questions that trouble me greatly.

Is this the Government of all the people, for just two or three?

Get those in Washington who are anxious to get us involved in a big war change places with the servicemen for a few days. Thank you very much, Mr. MORSE, for listening to me. I am concerned. We can't end these wars.

God has promised to end all wars. He will, I know, for I have him in my heart. Let him have your views.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. GEORGE MCGLATHEN.

CHARLESTON, W. VA.,
March 26, 1965.

1. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I had the pleasure of meeting you many years ago while I was a member of Chapman Revercomb's staff and have always admired your honesty and integrity.

Last month I attended the Convocation on Democracy in Terris given by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions in New York and was impressed by what was said at that meeting but I didn't hear any reference to the reasons you have given for the United States being in Vietnam rather than having the United Nations settle the dispute.

Based on my very limited knowledge of our thoughts on the above subject, I am inclined toward and interested in your position. However, it seems that you are cut off from virtually all the news media in this area and I wish to know more about the reasons for our opinion thereon.

Would you be kind enough to have one of our staff send me any speeches you have made on the subject either contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or any other available writing concerning your views on the subject of our participation in the war in Vietnam.

Thanking you in advance for this favor and trusting your staff will have time to do so for a nonconstituent, I remain

Sincerely yours,

E. FRANKLIN PAULEY,
Attorney at Law.

COLUMBUS, OHIO,
March 24, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wanted to write you a short note expressing my appreciation at your existence. It would seem that on the whole of your position on Vietnam you are the only honest man left in Washington. At the same time you have the courage to pronounce obvious is one ray of light on a dark sea of lies and abysmal stupidities which pass as a U.S. policy in Vietnam.

I have a heartfelt question: What can I do to end my government's hopeless and dangerous policy against the North Vietna-

mes Government? I have written to Senator LAUSCHE, a warhawk; to Congressman DEVINE, almost as bad; to Senator YOUNG who is not quite so bad. If there is something more tell me. If you run for President I'll vote for you. Had not even one Senator raised his voice, I would be a sad man indeed.

I would be very grateful for any information you might be able to send me on the subject of Vietnam policy. Local papers and newscasts are understandably quite chary with meaningful information.

A gratified admirer,

JOHN H. FRYE.

WATERTOWN, MASS.
March 25, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Let me congratulate you and shake your hand for your courageous and unflinching stand on the Vietnam crisis and for your farsighted criticism of U.S. foreign policy. I regret that, as a Massachusetts resident, I cannot express my fundamental beliefs at the ballot by voting for you.

For years I have been frustrated while trying to understand how a great nation can tie itself down to untenable situations, assume without hesitation or a moment's thought, the role of setting things straight around the world and of policing and guiding other nations; or how people like McNamara, Taylor, Mr. McGeorge Bundy, and other able administrators do not hesitate to adopt brutality in foreign policy and commit a great country to a cause utterly in opposition to its basic interests and to the concepts on which it was founded.

The United States are not historically responsible for what is happening in Asia or Africa. Why should they be so eager to shoulder the colonial heritage when the former colonial powers themselves, by force or reason, find it advantageous to adjust to the realities of the 1950's and 1960's? In order to clear up the mess and fill the power vacuum? But what mess and what vacuum? No power vacuum can be filled from the outside and any such attempt smells very much like the old, cherished colonial policy tantamount to unrestricted intervention. Neither can the aim of scaring the Vietnamese into withdrawal be considered any more realistic or historically justified. Unlike individuals, nations, no matter how small, are very rarely scared when attacked, as evidenced by the valiant fight put up by Greece, Yugoslavia, Norway, etc., against the Nazi aggressors.

Such policies have been ruled out and rendered ineffective by the realities of the nuclear age. This may be frustrating to certain policymakers in Washington, who would rather change reality than their views, but the truth is that people the world over prefer to live, compete, and prosper rather than die for somebody else's frustrations. No amount of American force or anti-Communist propaganda would persuade Africans or Asians to do otherwise. As a matter of fact, some of them, and I mean Nasser, Toure, Ben Bella, etc., are resisting communism much more effectively than any American suggestion would have accomplished.

Wishful thinking or the attitude of good-doing may produce some interesting plots in the movies or television, but the foreign policy of a great nation should be guided by far deeper and more realistic motives. It often appears to me, however, that this is the only reason that can be offered, officially or otherwise, in support of many recent Washington policies. The overthrow of Castro or Mao may seem to many a good cause to fight for, but none of them ever felt obligated to offer an alternative to these established and organized states. Does anybody seriously believe that the United States has the answer to China's problems and can

feed the Chinese millions after Mao's overthrow? Unless the U.S. obligation stops right there, after millions of dead and without any hope that a new and more fanatical Mao will not reappear in a few years.

Another incomprehensible attitude, at least to me, is that of Senator F. CHURCH. He lost his voice as if the reasons for his initial criticisms have disappeared or explained away. If the explanation offered in Time magazine, that the President threatened withdrawal of his political support in the Senator's home State, is true, his silence seems even more ominous to me. If this kind of pressure can silence beliefs and convictions of such fundamental importance to the interests of this country, I wonder about the strength of Senator CHURCH's convictions or his motivation in expressing them in the first place. He did, in my opinion, a disservice to his initial beliefs by expressing them without being prepared to defend them vigorously.

I would very much appreciate any literature on your views and your general political philosophy that you would care to send.

Respectfully,

JOHN G. FIKIOUS.

DEAR SIR: Today as I read my newspaper, I was stunned to learn that the United States and South Vietnam are employing gas in this war.

Lethal or not, I fail to see why we must use it with all the other types of weapons found in our arsenals.

It appears to me that the "war" is being escalated while the administration says that it is not closing the doors to negotiation. I can well understand that the President is waiting for the right moment to head for the tables but are they not pushing the date further into the future with this new tactic? And have we not given Hanoi, Peiping, and Moscow some great material for propaganda in this undeclared war?

I hope you will write me and try to explain what the administration is doing because I cannot make heads or tails of it and especially this unwarranted and grossly non-humane mode of battle.

Thanking you in advance, I remain,

Faithfully yours,

JAMES E. NEWTON.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
March 28, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We were thrilled with the message over KVOM you gave at Cooper Union. If you have the script for that speech, we would be happy to distribute printed copies in our State. We'd do our best to get at least 1,000 copies to voters, and try to get it into printing in county papers as much as possible. Does this seem good to you?

Deep appreciation,

VERA STEPHENS.

BIG TIMBER, MONT.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Would you send me a copy of your views and reasons for our withdrawal from Vietnam? Our aggression against South Vietnam is unforgivable. This should be handled by the only force with a jurisdictional right to arbitrate disputes. The American taxpayers never gave any President a mandate to police the world. The U.N. must have its forces and power increased so it can deal with such messes as those in Vietnam and try to find what the Vietnamese want, not what the Pentagon thinks it should have.

I admire your courage and statesmanship when it is so sorely needed.

Mrs. MABEL BRENDLEN.

7900

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

April 21, 1965

FISHER'S ISLAND, N.Y.,
March 31, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: It would give me great pleasure to be able to think that yours was not a voice in the congressional wilderness crying out against the policy of power-mad brutality and recklessness now being pursued by America in Vietnam.

Are you alone in your clear-cut condemnation? Or is it simply a matter of the radio and press not reporting your unpopular views anymore, thereby proving your early contention, that 85 percent of the information was being withheld from the American people, correct in more ways than one? Since that statement of yours I only once more heard that you had said (in Tulsa, Okla.) that "the United States is waging an undeclared war in Vietnam, and this country is an aggressor Nation."

I would certainly appreciate copies of any other statements you have undoubtedly made (several copies, for distribution to friends). For that matter of fact, if you know when and where Mr. Eisenhower admitted that he "had never talked or corresponded with a person knowledgeable in Indochinese affairs who did not agree that had election been held in 1954, possibly 80 percent of the Vietnamese would have voted for Ho Chi Minh," I would like to suggest that you have it entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

To quote the poet Leigh Hunt: "May your tribe increase."

Sincerely,

RAINER F. MEYEROWITZ.

MARCH 26, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have just heard a rebroadcast of a speech you gave at Cooper Union entitled "That Mess in Vietnam." You gave one of the most helpful presentations I have heard or read on the history and solution of our involvement there. I would like very much to have a copy of it, if this is still possible.

Several people here would like to make our concern about U.S. action in Vietnam felt in Washington. Where do you think letters should best be sent? We assume that we start with our President and our own Senators and Representatives.

We would also like to raise the issues for discussion in groups in our community. If your speech is not available in quantities of 50 to 100, can you suggest any other brief presentations which we could order to use as a background of reading before group discussions?

Thank you very much for the job you are doing in questioning present U.S. policy of unilateral action in South Vietnam. We are very proud to call you a former Minnesotan.

Sincerely,

LANELLE OLSEN
Mrs. Kenneth Olsen.

NORTHFIELD, MINN.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
March 29, 1965.

Hon. Senator MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please accept our appreciation and gratitude for your efforts to end our participation in the war in South Vietnam. I want you to know that both my wife and I fully support your position. We read about your speech at Stanford University a couple of weeks ago, and if possible would like a copy of it. Could you also fur-

nish us with a copy of the State Department white paper including all of the appendixes?

Thank you very much for your consideration, attention, and efforts.

Sincerely,

MAURICE FREEDMAN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
March 31, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I was sitting here at the typewriter when I heard your speech on the radio concerning Vietnam. I was unaware that any of our legislators were against the policy of the Government in Vietnam, and it does my heart good to know that you feel the way you do. Of course, I might have known from your past record, but there has been so much silence from any opposition (either accidental or planned) that I thought that I was alone. Then I heard Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, of North Dakota, on "CBS Reports," and I wrote him commending him on his stand.

He replied stating that he had received thousands of letters like mine.

I would like to suggest, Senator, that the legislators who feel like you and Senator MCGOVERN, get together and speak to others. I am sure there are many who are either wavering, or afraid to speak out.

I would like to have a copy of your speech. Keep up the good work.

Respectfully,

MRS. ROSALIE SHENEFIELD,
Mother of two boys.

SAN JOSE, CALIF.,
March 4, 1965.

Senator MORSE,
State Capitol,
Sacramento, Calif.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: Your address to the Young Democrats at Stanford University was quoted on the 8 a.m. KABL broadcast. Senator MORSE, I love you.

You are expressing the concept held, I feel, by the majority of U.S. citizens, not only in California, but across the Nation. How else was President Johnson elected by so overwhelming a vote? The issue uppermost in the minds of the voters was, I believe, not so much race relations, educational aid, war against poverty, as it was the sharp demarcation between President Johnson's and Mr. Goldwater's foreign policy in regard to Vietnam. Now that the former is firmly enshrined is he about to be pressured into adopting Goldwater's stand?

I voice the feelings of the mothers in my neighborhood and among my friends. It is not (as yet) so much the knowledge that we have sons of military age as it is the horror of knowing that American bombers are wiping out defenseless jungle villages, maiming, blinding, and burning infants and children such as we have cradled and nursed.

Why is this problem not placed before the U.N.? Do we only refer crises to the U.N. if we are sure of a pro-United States decision?

Most respectfully yours,

MARIE E. CURRY.

MARCH 31, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
U.S. Senate.

SIR: It is not surprising, but still reassuring, to find you continuing to fight for what you believe in. Your stand for negotiations in Vietnam is something which I am sure has the support of most Americans.

Thank you for your courage and best wishes for your success.

Sincerely,

NANCY FREDERIKSEN (Mrs. Nils).
BROOKLINE, MASS.

KEY WEST, FLA.,
March 31, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: With great apology for the low quality of the reproduction (Key West weather has not been good to my gelatin). I am sending you for your archive a rewrite of my March 14 sermon to the local Universalist-Unitarian Fellowship. The after-sermon discussion which is usual in this gathering was enthusiastic and wholly favorable. The only criticism was the effect that I was too obviously pulling my punches.

I think that I meet a fair sample of literate Americans of varying shades of political and philosophical opinion and allegiance, and find them pretty much in agreement with you on the matter of Vietnam, the more the more that they know the full story; principal trouble is that too few of them really know many of the facts. It is difficult that I am trying to do something to cure. Our media of information have us down.

Sincerely yours,

MORTIMER GRAV

(NOTE.—I should add that almost years—since 1927—of professional contact with Asian matters, gives me some right opinions. MG.)

SERMON BY MORTIMER GRAVES

Now that the Department of State's paper on Vietnam has made us the laughing stock of the civilized world, it is perhaps for us to chide the news media for their reluctance to keep the American public informed about how we got this way. It is true finding a news commentator or editor who has not overnight become an authority on the subject is an almost impossible feat and that reports of weekendapers to Saigon, military and civil, jostle responsible news in print and on the waves. But almost universally the author of such comment consider themselves pinning the limits of antiquity if they mention President Eisenhower's October 1954 letter to Ngo Dinh Diem and regard anything that happened before the Geneva agreements earlier in that year as prehistory. The fact is that it is quite impossible to have an intelligent concept of the present mess without going back in relevant history at least as far as 1940.

American involvement in Indochina in the present unfortunate state is the result of the magnificent historical stupidities. The first was President Truman's acquiescence in the mad idea of forcing French colonial rule back upon the Indochinese without consulting them at the end of World War II. The second was Secretary Dulles' equally foolish obsession that Indochina might be made, however unwillingly, to fight his undeclared war against China for him. The first took place in 1945; the second seems to have been formulated sometime around 1950, when Dulles was an adviser to Secretary of State Dean Acheson.

Pearl Harbor and American entry in World War II came at the end of 1941. At that time Japan had been at war with Chiang Kai-shek Chinese for a decade, a full partner with Nazi Germany, and well started toward conquest of south Asia; indeed, the Japanese interpreted Secretary of State Hull's note of late November 1941 as an ultimatum precisely because it pressed American disapproval of this venture toward the south. President Roosevelt and his advisers felt that Vichy France's readiness to cooperate with Japan's control of Indochina was a disservice to the anti-Nazi forces in Europe and expressed their objection in statements to the effect that "if Japan wins, she will take over Indochina; if

April 21, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

7901

loses, we will." In any event France was never again, in their minds, to have Indochina as a colony.

Once the United States was in the war, our allies in the Pacific were Chiang Kai-shek China and the British Empire. Military jurisdiction between them was fixed at the 16th parallel of north latitude, which happens approximately to divide Vietnam in half. The Pacific war lasted until August 1945 and the defeat of Japan. Meanwhile, there grew up Vietnamese nationalist resistance to the Franco-Japanese government of Vietnam, aided, and in some cases led, by dissident French and by the American Office of Strategic Services military operating from and with the help of China. In May 1941 the Vietnamese formed the Viet Nam Doc Lap Dong Minh Hoi (League for the Independence of Vietnam), which we now call the Vietminh, under Ho Chi Minh; 3 years later it proclaimed the Provisional Republican Government of Vietnam in Liuow, China.

In the summer of 1944 France was freed from the Nazis; the Free French replaced the Vichy Government. The Japanese in Vietnam then turned on the French there and on March 10, 1945, declared Vietnam an independent state under the Emperor of Annam, Bao Dai. The United States, dominated by Roosevelt's distrust of the French under either Pétain or De Gaulle and his determination not to reestablish French colonialism in Indochina, refused help to the French though the British did aid them somewhat desultorily. In any event, August 1945 brought the final defeat of the Japanese, the abdication of Bao Dai, and the establishment of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam under the great Vietnamese hero Ho Chi Minh to which Bao Dai was attached as counselor. He was, and still is, a Vietnamese nationalist who is convinced that a Vietnamese communism is the only kind of government appropriate to his country.

When Gen. Douglas MacArthur, upon the surrender of the Japanese, became Supreme Commander of the Japanese south of the 16th parallel to the British, and of those north to the Chiang Kai-shek Chinese, in accordance with the earlier division of military responsibility. The British committed the operation to General Gracey, an Australian in command of Indian troops. Under his divided command the disarmament of the Japanese was turned into a war against the new Vietnamese state, carried on with an obscene ferocity and rapacity disgraceful to any nations claiming to be civilized. Americans had no part in this disgusting episode; General MacArthur said it made his blood boil. It ended with the arrival of a highly intelligent and sympathetic French commissioner, Jean Sainteny, a hero of the French resistance, who on February 26, 1946, signed with Ho a pact recognizing the Democratic Republic of Vietnam as a free state within the French Union. A French political figure was to comment later that by 1953 the French had performed this gesture no less than 18 times, but never fulfilled it once.

If France had honored this agreement, the whole story from here on might have been different. But unfortunately France was at the moment in one of those fits of political and constitutional disarray chronic to her for the next decade or so. Sainteny was de facto repudiated; the new French Constitution contained no provision for associated or independent states within the French Union. From at least 1943 on, President Roosevelt had committed himself to a postwar international trusteeship for Indochina. At the Cairo-Tehran Conferences in 1945 he had convinced Stalin and Chiang Kai-shek and leveled that Churchill had come around, though reluctantly. Secretary of the Navy had wanted to be assured that the United States would have naval bases there.

But by the time of the events recounted in the preceding couple of paragraphs, Roosevelt had been dead for a year or more and President Truman had succeeded him.

For some reason or other, Truman scrapped the Roosevelt policy and committed himself and the United States to the reestablishment of French control of Indochina. The result is history; a decade of American effort to reestablish the French, followed by a decade of American effort to replace them, neither a howling success.

On November 8, 1946, the democratic Republic of Vietnam adopted its first constitution. Hanoi was full of favorable American observers, the new Truman doctrine not yet having penetrated; there were French military forces arriving in Haiphong, Chiang Kai-shek's troops were just across the Chinese border, and Mao Tse-tung and his Communists were holed up in Yenan, whence nobody but the best China service in the world—the American—predicted their escape for a decade. But by now the French had accumulated enough military force in Vietnam to launch a new offensive against the democratic Republic. They succeeded in securing by force a rather precarious hold on the ports and some of the more industrialized centers but they made no headway at all among the general population in the hinterland villages. These remained committed to the Vietminh and Ho Chi Minh, who were indeed giving them a taste of better popular government than they had ever had. Paul Mus, the eminent French authority on Indochina, could write even so late as 1949 that "the French have succeeded in establishing themselves in certain of the cities of Vietnam, but not in the interior of the country, the stronghold of the villages. Large areas of the country have resorted to armed resistance under leftist leadership. * * * This is an organized popular movement (not, as the French claim) a mass of apathetic peasants who have been terrorized by their leaders."

Five years thereafter Joseph Alsop could find himself surprised at the democracy and popularity of this "Communist" village rule. Neither of these, of course, could possibly be identified as a Communist before any congressional committee or anywhere else. The dirty, destructive, expensive little war then resumed was to last under changing auspices down to the present day.

As the United States began to realize that this costly French venture was devouring resources which might better have been used to rehabilitate European France—an American concern of the impending Marshall plan—American missions to Vietnam began to proliferate. William C. Bullitt is usually credited with first proposing that some of the unpleasant odor of French colonialism might be relieved by the creation of an independent Vietnamese Government under Bao Dai. Late in 1948 the French "recognized solemnly" such independence within the French Union. This Bao Dai regime was dominated by southern landowners and the feudal sects. It was never recognized by any considerable portion of the Vietnamese people and was the target of constant demonstrations. The French never really consummated its independence; it was a French puppet. The United States and Britain recognized it in February 1950; the Soviet bloc had recognized the Democratic Republic of Vietnam a week earlier.

In 1950 there were three formal American missions to the new Bao Dai government: Jessup, Griffin, and Melby. This last is the most interesting. John Melby was a U.S. Foreign Service officer in the Department of State. He reported (paraphrase) "there is no evidence that the French forces will succeed for many months or even years. * * * French efforts to gain the support of the people are a complete failure. An absolute

majority of the politically conscious Vietnamese support Vietminh which is fighting for the independence of the country." Mr. Melby did not last very long in the Department of State after that. Meanwhile, President Truman—as he states later in his memoirs—was directing "acceleration in the furnishing of military assistance to the French in Indochina and the dispatch of a military mission." The U.S. Military Assistance Advisory Group (USMAAG) reached Vietnam in July 1950.

It is worthwhile to point out here that the Chinese Communists did not have effective control of China until 1950. Hence, it is impossible to blame much of what has been recited to this point on the wicked Mao Tse-tung.

There follows increasing American support and control of the war and increasing deterioration of the Franco-American-Bao Dai military position. The French—including ex-Nazis and African troops—were doing most of the fighting; the Bao Dai Vietnamese were not much help. By the end of the Truman administration we find Secretary Acheson complaining that the United States is carrying almost half the cost of the French war in Indochina but that the French are already defeated psychologically and the native population is "sitting on the fence."

The Eisenhower-Dulles regime began on January 20, 1955. Secretary of State Dulles who had, indeed, been an adviser to the Department of State during the Acheson tenure, continued this disastrous policy with almost fanatic zeal. As succeeding French governments attempted to discover honorable ways out, Dulles found ways of pressuring them to persist. When, in the spring of 1954, the French position at Dienbienphu was seen to be precarious, Dulles succeeded in getting, in spite of Eisenhower's better judgment, some support in Congress for the idea of a heavy American bombing operation. Fortunately too many Congressmen went home for their Easter vacations and found, as one of them put it "no disposition among constituents to fight and die for dear old Dong-Dong at the other end of the earth." One Senator named Johnson asserated that he was "against sending American GI's into the mud and muck of Indochina on a bloodletting spree to perpetuate colonialism and white man's exploitation in Asia." Senators named Kennedy and Draxsen seized the opportunity to express much the same sentiments and to reveal a rather confused ignorance about Indochina, so that fortunately this folly was averted at that time. One can but wonder whether the Easter vacation idea might not be a good one for 1965; the U.S. News & World Report's survey of congressional mail indicates that it would.

By this time even Bao Dai was beginning to be restive under French control. He commenced fighting the French politically; the Vietminh was doing pretty well militarily, as was exhibited when General Giap destroyed the French Army at Dienbienphu.

Early in 1954 the Four Power Foreign Ministers' Conference in Berlin decided to sponsor a Conference in Geneva of the nine powers concerned with Indochina (United States, U.S.S.R., Britain, France, Laos, Cambodia, Vietminh, the Bao Dai government, and China). Mendès-France became Premier of France with a promise quickly to end the Indochinese war. The Conference convened. Dulles tried to sabotage it in ways for which Anthony Eden never forgave him. The victorious Vietminh, held somewhat in check by the conciliators of the Conference, Molotov and Chou En-lai, agreed to settlements less than they might have considered themselves entitled to. The Geneva agreements, concluded in August, established a cease-fire line at approximately the 17th parallel behind which both sides were to withdraw their military forces, the French

to the south, the Vietminh to the north. The French were to regroup for eventual complete withdrawal, upon which by 1956 a general election over the whole country was to decide upon a unified government. In other words, the 17th parallel did not constitute a division of the country into two parts. Unfortunately some matters were left unclear. Since the Bao Dai regime did not sign the agreement or even accept them, it can have no standing under them. Apparently the French considered that they were still responsible for the region south of the 17th parallel because Mendès-France immediately airlifted reinforcements into the area and ordered two French divisions in Germany prepared for tropical service, at the same time appointing Gen. Paul Ely High Commissioner. The United States refused to sign the agreements but formally and solemnly promised to abide by them. This promise was not kept.

A funny thing happened on the way to the Geneva agreements. Ngo Dinh Diem suddenly replaces Buu Luc as Bao Dai's Prime Minister. There seems some question as to how he got into the act, Drew Pearson blames it on Francis Cardinal Spellman. Bao Dai was persuaded to abdicate practically all his powers to his new Premier and was restrained from returning to Vietnam from Europe where he was waiting out the conference. This was accompanied by a strange campaign of denigration of Bao Dai in American newspapers which was something less than deserved. A month after the agreements, the United States notified the French that all American military aid would henceforth go directly to the Indochinese native states (Laos, Cambodia, and Ngo Dinh Diem) instead of to the French as hitherto. In October President Eisenhower wrote his famous letter to Ngo Dinh Diem, now usually quoted as the foundation stone of the American commitment to Vietnam of the south. It did, indeed, confirm Diem's status as a complete American puppet. The suspicious French, not unreasonably, have always considered these moves just the last steps in ousting them from Indochina with a view to replacing French control by American.

In accordance with the agreements the Vietnam military withdrew north of the 17th parallel, but much of the area south of that line remained under Vietminh civil control. The new Saigon Government of Ngo Dinh Diem was dominated by the Central Vietnamese and the close to a million northern Vietnamese Catholics who flooded into the Saigon area and then on provided the hard core of Ngo Dinh Diem's political support. This Government hardly existed anywhere except in Saigon and the coast cities and certainly never gained the acquiescence, to say nothing of the affection, of much of the South Vietnamese population. Until October 1955 it functioned under the name of Bao Dai, but on that date a "popular referendum" disposed of the latter; 5.7 million votes were alleged to have been cast, 88.8 percent for Diem, 63,017 for Bao Dai. Enough said.

On April 26, 1955, the last of the French military left the country somewhat mitigating the Franco-American hostility which had distinguished the last months of their stay. In July the deadline for the plebiscite which was to unite Vietnam under one government passed. Diem refused to cooperate with the Vietminh in making arrangements for it on the grounds that his government was not signatory to the Geneva agreements. The real reason, of course, was that the Vietminh was certain to win in a free election.

Instead of a plebiscite, Diem instituted a persecution. This was aimed not only at the Vietminh pockets in central and South Vietnam but at a number of nationalist and religious groups who became the object of Diem's witchhunting and religious intoler-

ance. A series of repressive decrees made about 80 percent of the population of southern Vietnam subject to arrest. This kind of nonsense sealed Diem's doom. From about 1957, opposition was active though more or less clandestine; by 1960 it was vocal and organized for resistance by force. Within the next couple of years a reluctant North Vietnamese Government was induced to take cognizance of its struggling southern compatriots. More American missions, more American military help simply accelerated Diem's deterioration. The appointment of Gen. Paul Harkins as head of a high command for the Thailand-Vietnam theater signaled direct and patent American intervention. Diem was overthrown by his own military and then murdered in November 1963; the nature and extent of American implication in Diem's political and physical extinction is still something of a mystery.

The 7 years of Ngo Dinh Diem's stoogery and the 18 months of his even less effective successors are a recital of the same story, perhaps at increasing tempo. The American puppet regime, under whatever military or civil head, has been little more than the local government of Saigon, and nothing to boast about even in that function. After \$7 billion, more than 300 Americans killed (not many, considering that the French killed were 60,000, and the Vietnamese killed and homeless must run into the millions or more) the southern part of Vietnam is a shambles and shows no signs of being anything else for a long time. It is proposed to remedy this situation by reducing northern Vietnam to this same condition.

In all of this it is difficult to find any of that "peace and freedom for Vietnam" with which Government officials are accustomed to decorate their public pronouncements. Quite the reverse. While the first phase, the attempt to reestablish French rule, may be attributed largely to ignorance, the second, that of trying to get the Vietnamese to fight our undeclared war against China for us, is simply hoodlumism on an international scale. This is especially heinous because it has involved constantly recurring violations of our most solemn commitments under the United Nations Charter, a species of wickedness of which we are never hesitant to accuse other less-powerful nations. One must feel very sorry for Americans who are proud of this record.

Some facts stand out. We were not, as Walter Lippmann suggests, "sucked into" (his words) this situation in an innocent fit of absence of mind. Surely there can hardly be a more premeditated, deliberate, intentional operation in all our history than Dulles' conversion of southern Vietnam into an American satrapy. The Saigon Government is a purely American creation, established and maintained by American Armed Forces. If it had been a good Government for its own people or even served some overriding international purpose, one might find grounds for condoning its illegality, but it has done neither. The Vietnamese Government of Hanoi, on the other hand, whatever else may be said of it, is Vietnamese, and, if for no reason other than that it signed the Geneva agreements of 1954, has a greater claim to international legality than the foreign-supported dissidents of the south. If there is any reason for calling either side "rebel," the title should be awarded to the south.

It should give us pause that no other substantial nation shows such disposition to provide anything but token support to our Vietnam venture. Only some assurance of moral rectitude, quite impossible to anyone who knows the facts, could make palatable the immense Asian hostility which our Vietnam policy is engendering. This is very sorry preparation for entering what promises to be an Asian century.

President Johnson deserves all the sympathy and help anyone can give him in his

ordeal of asking decisions with respect to an awesome problem bequeathed to him by earlier administrations. This sympathy might well include a certain restraint in critical comment but it should not involve sweeping any facts under the rag. President Johnson's testy characterization of critics as people "who do not know the facts" hardly encourages such sympathy, for if Americans do not know the facts, the major blame rests upon the administration. If the time has come when Americans are supposed to acquiesce in national policies ignorant of the facts because the Government has shirked its responsibilities, we had better stop talking about our democracy. The Department of State's recent "Aggression from the North" compounds this dereliction, for its facts do not support its argument. It is, indeed an insult to American intelligence. If assistance to one's compatriots struggling free themselves from an externally dominated bad government is to be called aggression what name is to be given to the activities of 25,000 foreign troops from half way around the world imposing that government?

It is in President Johnson's interest Americans should know all the facts, knowledge of the facts will determine the spirit in which the search for an honorable settlement is made. If we go into negotiations in any spirit other than a sincere desire to redress two decades of wrong which we have as much responsibility, anybody, and probably more, negotiators can be only acrimonious and fruitless. President Johnson's main defense against resentment of his fellow citizens, and indeed the rest of the world, at the unpalatable decisions which he has to make alone can only be more general knowledge that the problems he faces are none of his making. If must be called seeking scapegoats so in the worse.

Finally, it is folly to expect China to acquiesce in the creation of hostile states on its borders; that day is over. We venerate ourselves on our Monroe Doctrine, the Americas are in now position to cavil a Chinese desire for a similar barrier to extant continental interference in eastern Asia.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.

March 31, 1965

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I heartily support your position on a negotiated peace in Vietnam.

I respectfully urge you to raise your voice again and again on this issue.

Respectfully yours,

EUGENE GOLDSTEIN.

HAGERSTOWN, MD.

March 31, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It seems to me you evidently have very incompetent men in charge of our Vietnam venture.

Recently when an outpost was badly hurt we called it "a sneak attack." Did they expect to be notified in advance?

Recently a hospital in Saigon was bombed. How do you account for the failure to have our Embassy well guarded after the two above mentioned experiences?

What we need are keen alert men who ready for any emergency. I wonder what people of Asia think of us. We evidently prove very foolish to them.

We had better get out of Vietnam as quickly as possible.

I appreciate your readiness to speak
Sincerely yours,

J. C. FULD

WALNUT CREEK, CALIF.

February 28, 1965

To PRESIDENT JOHNSON.

DEAR SIR: Why is the United States fighting in South Vietnam? Supposedly, to protect the people of South Vietnam from being deprived of their human rights and their democratic right to choose their own gov-

April 21, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

7903

ment. But these are rights which the South Vietnamese Government, with U.S. support, has already taken away from the people of South Vietnam. None of the governments of South Vietnam during the past 9 years has been representative of the wishes of the people, and none of them has been elected by a free democratic process. Human rights? We read accounts and see (color) pictures every day of the torture and murder of Vietcong prisoners, of the involuntary relocation of peasants into strategic hamlets; of indiscriminate napalm bombing of entire villages which are suspected of harboring a few Vietcong; of religious persecution; of arbitrary arrests, and bans on newspapers and political activities.

Every day that we pursue the war in Vietnam, we help convince them that we are ruthless and inhuman, and we make a mockery of our voiced concern for humanity and democracy. Every day we stay in Vietnam, we convince more Vietnamese that the Vietcong are a lesser evil.

If we had insisted on a true democracy when South Vietnam was created, if we had not supported the Diem dictatorship and its cruelty, corruption, persecution, and oppression, if we did not support the recent "musical chairs" succession of councils and juntas, irregardless of their concern for democracy and humanity, then we might have saved South Vietnam from the Communists.

It is much too late to deny the lessons that the Vietnamese have learned at our hands over the past years. It is said that we will lose prestige if we admit defeat. Perhaps. But how much prestige will we lose if we continue to deny our defeat when the situation is perfectly clear to the rest of the world? We once loudly criticized the French for pursuing a hopeless war in Indochina, and now we pursue a hopeless war on the same ground.

It is unpleasant to lose a battle, but it is a virtue to realize that one has lost, and not compound the loss by attempting bull-headedly to lose even more. The lesson we must learn from Vietnam is the lesson we should have learned from Cuba: that if the United States supports corrupt and inhuman dictatorships because they are "anti-Communist," then all the suffering and misery that exists under that dictatorship will bear the label of "democracy." The people of that land will learn to fear and hate us, and we will have made another opportunity for the Communists to convince them that they can offer something better. If we do not learn this lesson now, we shall have other opportunities, when people rise up against the other dictators whom we now support. If we refuse to learn this lesson, we will be forced, by our own stupidity, to lose again. We cannot afford many more losses. We must get out of Vietnam where we have already lost, and put our effort into places where we can still win by insisting on democracy and human rights as well as anti-Communism from governments that we support.

Sincerely,

JOHN O. STEVENS.

WALNUT CREEK, CALIF.,
March 26, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want you to know how very much I appreciate your outspoken views on the abominable situation in Vietnam.

I wonder if you are aware of the half-truths and lies about Vietnam that the State Department is sending out in answer to letters written to the President? I enclose copies of some of this State Department propaganda. With it are copies of my original letter to President Johnson and a copy of the cover letter from the State Depart-

ment Assistant Secretary on which I typed an answer which I sent back to him.

Keep up the fight for honesty, democracy, and humanity.

Sincerely,

JOHN O. STEVENS.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 15, 1965.

DEAR MR. GREENFIELD: I want you to know that I consider your enclosures to be propaganda of the simplest and most inexcusable kind, and I am ashamed that I am a citizen of a government that is forced to distortion of the facts in order to justify and unjustifiable war.

For instance, regarding circular "4/34a-1064BT" which says, "The Communists have worked ceaselessly to prevent the success of the treaty" (the 1964 Geneva Accords). It was Diem, supported by the United States who canceled the elections that were to be held in 1956 at the latest—not the Communists, because they would have won that election. President Eisenhower has been quoted as saying that in 1954, 80 percent of the Vietnamese supported Ho Chi Minh—which is not surprising. No matter what his ideology, he was the leader against the corrupt French colonial government, which the United States supported to the extent of \$4 billion. If we are so sure that the people of South Vietnam will gladly choose us, then why not call in the U.N.? And why, if we are so completely correct, are our allies not supporting our stand? Even England, our staunchest ally is not enthusiastic.

Do you sleep well at night Mr. Greenfield, after being paid to mail out lies? Lies that do nothing to support democracy and human rights, but lies to support inhuman dictatorship like Kahrh.

I hope not.

JOHN O. STEVENS.

Mr. JOHN Q. STEVENS,
Walnut Creek, Calif.

DEAR MR. STEVENS: The White House has asked me to reply to your recent communication regarding Vietnam. We appreciate your taking the time to send us your views.

Perhaps you will find the enclosed material useful. I hope you will write again if you desire additional information.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES L. GREENFIELD,
Assistant Secretary.

NEUTRALIZATION OR NEGOTIATED SETTLEMENT
IN VIETNAM

Your concern over the situation in Vietnam is understood and shared. At this time, no issue commands more of the time, energy and attention of the President and his senior advisers.

The United States desires no permanent military presence or base in Vietnam. Nothing would please us more than the creation of a situation in which American soldiers could be withdrawn from a peaceful, secure, and independent Vietnam. That is, in fact, precisely the situation we are struggling to bring about.

Suggestions for solving the Vietnam problem by neutralization or negotiation have come from several quarters. A negotiated settlement of hostilities in Vietnam was the intention of the Geneva Accords of 1954, but the Communists have worked ceaselessly to prevent the success of the treaty. Although the situation in Vietnam is a complicated one, the cause of the crisis is not. It is caused by the simple fact that the Communists in North Vietnam are attempting to conquer South Vietnam. It is Communist aggression which makes a negotiated settlement in Vietnam impossible at the present time. As of now the Communists are not interested in a neutral Vietnam. Hanoi has specifically rejected neutrality for itself. Their rule for negotiation is "What's mine is mine, and what's yours is negotiable."

Neutralization would simply be a way station on the road to a Communist Vietnam—and after that a Communist Laos—and after that a Communist Thailand—and ultimately a Communist dominated southeast Asia.

As President Johnson said:

"No negotiated settlement in Vietnam is possible, as long as the Communists hope to achieve victory by force.

"Once war seems hopeless, then peace may be possible. The door is always open to any settlement which assures the independence of South Vietnam, and its freedom to seek help for its protection."

VIETNAM: BASIC POLICY

So many conflicting statements are being made about Vietnam that I think it is useful to restate the bedrock truths about the situation there. First, the problem of Vietnam is Communist aggression. We are certainly there in force now, but the South Vietnamese asked for our assistance only when the Communist assault reached such proportions as to imperil the very existence of South Vietnam. Second, we have no desire for a military presence or base in Vietnam. Our goal is precisely to create a situation in which we can withdraw from a peaceful, secure, and independent South Vietnam. That will be possible whenever the Communists decide to leave their neighbor alone. Third, until the Communists call off their assault, our withdrawal would simply mean turning over 14 million people to the Communists. A political settlement is possible only when the Communists are convinced they cannot win by force. Finally, the situation in Vietnam cannot sensibly be isolated from the general world situation. Vietnam is not the end of Communist ambition. After Vietnam there is Laos, and Cambodia, and Thailand, etc. And if we permit Communist armed subversion to succeed in southeast Asia we will surely see it again—and soon—in Africa, in the Middle East, and in our own hemisphere.

It is certainly true that Vietnam is not an ideal place for a test of American determination. That is why the Communists choose it for the test. And it is true that there is much in South Vietnam and in the war there that is not as we would wish it to be. Your concern with the situation is understood and shared at all levels of this Government. No issue commands more of the time and energy of the President and his advisers. Our policy has been examined and reexamined and is kept under constant review. As a result of this study it is the rooted conviction of this Government's policymakers that our involvement in Vietnam is essential to our security. I am enclosing material which explains why Vietnam is important to us and contains other information regarding that area which may be of interest to you.

WITHDRAWAL FROM VIETNAM

First, I want you to know that your concern over the situation in Vietnam is understood and shared at all levels of the U.S. Government. No issue commands more of the attention and energy of the President and his advisers. Our policy has been examined and reexamined untold times and is under constant review. We are involved in Vietnam because it is the deep conviction of the policymaking officials of the Government that our involvement is essential to American security. I am enclosing material which explains why Vietnam is important to us and contains other information regarding that area which may be of interest to you.

You suggest that the United States should withdraw from Vietnam. South Vietnam is literally under a siege mounted by the North Vietnamese Communists. Without our assistance South Vietnam would quickly be overrun and conquered by the Communist terrorists.

7904

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

April 21, 1965

I agree with you that Vietnam is far from the ideal fighting ground from our point of view. I agree that there is much in the situation in Vietnam which we would have different, if it were our choice. But I cannot agree that we should abandon 14 million people who need our help, asked for our help, and cannot withstand the Communist assault without our help. The situation in Vietnam is tragic—but it will become even more so if we find our responsibilities too heavy to carry. After Vietnam, there is Laos—and Thailand—and Malaysia, etc. And if armed Communists subversion succeeds in southeast Asia, we may well see it again—and soon—in Africa, in the Middle East, and in our own hemisphere.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
March 28, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I am writing to compliment you on the courageous position you have taken with regard to the situation in Vietnam. I wish to express by concurrence with your views and to state that I wholeheartedly support your intelligent and sane proposals.

The United States involvement in Vietnam is constantly increasing. Because of this a vigorous and continued campaign must be carried on in order to eliminate this dangerous threat to world peace.

My support and agreement are with you for your continued attempts at ending the war in Vietnam.

Yours very truly,

WILLIAM J. BENHKEN.

MOUNT VERNON, OHIO,
March 31, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I read with pleasure some time ago your stand regarding the undeclared war over in Vietnam. My wife and I want to commend you for your courage in taking this noble stand. Your prediction that this uncalled-for war would worsen is being borne out in the series of happenings which are occurring from day to day. Unless it is brought to a speedy end, it will probably develop into a world holocaust. Why continue to have the flower of our Nation and also many innocent Vietnam people slaughtered in this frightful inferno? We were wondering if you might not do something more to awaken the American people and Government as their duty at this time. Perhaps you could make one or more of your stirring appeals from the floor of the Senate. I am convinced that the fathers and mothers and all of the American people appreciate what you have done thus far in behalf of our people. We know that the good Lord will strengthen you for all of your efforts in the future. With our very best wishes, we are,

Yours sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. F. GUY CORDER.

[From the Vancouver (Wash.) Sun, Mar. 27, 1965]

UNITED STATES TRAMPLES

EDITOR, the Sun, Sir.—Are not the bombings by the Americans of the military and civilian populations of North Vietnam and Laos, deliberate war crimes in retaliation for alleged help to the South Vietnamese National Liberation Army just as was the massacre of the populations of and destruction of villages by the Nazis in the U.S.S.R., in retaliation for the successes of Soviet guerrillas against the Nazi invaders?

Should not L.B.J., Rusk, McNamara, Maxwell Taylor, all be denounced like the Nazis as war criminals?

By the use of terror weapons and by the language used by American military personnel describing the results obtained by the use of these terror weapons, it is shown that the Yanks are out-Hunning the Huns.

See what John Kirkwood, your special correspondent in South Vietnam, reported.

As Brig. Gen. Hugh B. Hester, of the American Army (retired), states in an article in the U.S. Farm News:

"The United States has no respect for international law, and its arrogance has no limits. It is trampling on the rights of defenseless people everywhere."

ARTHUR STRATTON.

ATLANTA, GA.,
March 31, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to encourage you in your effort to have the United States pull out of Vietnam.

I plan to participate in the coming march on Washington concerning this problem and would like some material to supplement my views. If at all possible I would appreciate a copy of the white paper on Vietnam.

Sincerely,

HOWARD SMUKLER.

PENTICTON, BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Congratulations, Senator MORSE. Your efforts to get America out of its murdering muck are most praiseworthy. The odds against you by those who like to kill, and to push others around are great. Keep on trying.

America believes in self-determination if that determination is as America wants it. A nation that has corruption everywhere should clean itself up and show the way. It has so much abundance that it could do this. Unfortunately it has so much selfishness as well. For its own greed it prefers to back Fascist dictators everywhere, those who believe in privilege for the favored few.

Believe me, I am not in any sense communistic or socialistic; but I can observe. A nation that could contribute so much to man's well-being has become the world's most hated.

J. C. HEMBLING.

[From the Ottawa Citizen, Dec. 19, 1964]

AN OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT JOHNSON

TORONTO, ONTARIO.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Canada is an ally of the United States and a partner in what are termed defense arrangements: NATO, NORAD, the DEW Line. U.S. bombers have rights on some Canadian bases and U.S. nuclear warheads have been placed on Canadian missile bases.

Therefore it is reasonable that Canadian citizens should raise their voices against certain policies and actions of your Government which may be considered as unrealistic and dangerous to the peace of Canada and the world.

END THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Of supreme importance is the necessity to end the war in Vietnam. Commonsense, justice, and a decent regard for the opinion of mankind require that the 1954 Geneva Conference be reconvened and a reasonable political settlement be made.

You cannot win the war against the people of South Vietnam. In spite of all the terrorism of your puppet regimes, the National Liberation Front government controls and governs almost 80 percent of the country.

WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN YOUR "SPECIAL WARFARE" AND HITLER'S WARFARE?

We have recently had a representative in Vietnam. We are shocked and horrified to learn at first hand of the brutal, inhuman and criminal nature of your so-called special warfare.

Thousands of villages have been burned with napalm gas, and huge areas drenched

with poison chemicals, killing hundreds of thousands of men, women and children, as well as domestic animals. You have elevated the bestialities of Auschwitz and Buchenwald into a science of "Special warfare." The toll of dead, wounded, and burned is now 1 million.

The vast majority of people in Asia and Africa are being graphically informed. Hundreds of delegations go to see for themselves. You are creating a huge tide of hatred and loathing for the United States of America.

This open letter is published to commemorate the fourth anniversary of the founding of the National Liberation Front government. These heroic men and women really represent 80 percent of the people and the territory of South Vietnam. They have earned the right to be the government of their people just as surely as did George Washington and his supporters during the grim winter of Valley Forge.

In the name of our common humanity, Mr. President, end this inhuman war, reconvene the 1954 Geneva Conference and negotiate a reasonable and just settlement.

CANADIAN PEACE CONGRESS.

NORTH HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.,
March 30, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: May I respectfully offer a bit of ammunition to use in your courageous fight against this Government's policy in Vietnam?

Administration spokesmen have repeatedly stated that the war in Vietnam is "ordered and directed and masterminded by Hanoi."

If this be true, the orders and directions must be communicated to the hundreds of Vietcong units, many of them isolated, operating all over South Vietnam. How is this being done? What means of communication is being used?

Telephone? Telegraph? Personal letter? Hardly.

Messengers? How long does it take a man to walk or bicycle the thousand miles between Hanoi and the southern part of the Mekong Delta?

This leaves us, if we are willing to reject jungle drums and carrier pigeons and clairvoyance, only radio.

But consider: This Nation, as the Japanese learned to their sorrow more than 20 years ago, boasts the finest code breakers in the world; we can crack a complicated code in a matter of hours. Further, all radio messages between Hanoi and the Vietcong are surely being monitored by our experts. We must know, then, exactly what orders and directions are being transmitted by Hanoi to the Vietcong.

Therefore, if Johnson and Rusk and Bundy and McNamara are telling the truth, if indeed that war is being "ordered and directed and masterminded by Hanoi" how is it possible for us to be surprised day after day after day by the "sneak" attacks" of the Vietcong?

To get down to one final specific: if the attack on our embassy was ordered by Hanoi, why didn't we take steps to thwart it?

Sincerely yours,

WHITMAN CHAMBERS.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.,
March 31, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to take this opportunity to indicate my support for the position you are advocating re: South Vietnam.

We haven't the moral right to be there militarily and, whether we act out of ignorance or out of aggressive desires (and I sincerely believe and hope it is the former) when our policy yields death and destruction to innocents, then this act is morally

April 21, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

7905

prehensible. Moreover, it is not even effective—for those who advocate realpolitik. My Senators seem impervious to the pleas of reason on this issue. At least let me indicate, then, my support for you. Please continue to sound the alarm of conscience and reason.

Sincerely,

NATHAN SORKIN.

P.S.—If the New York Times article ofering continued and expanded economic aid after the war is won (sic) is a trial balloon, yes; but this can be done even if we withdraw militarily. We can offer economic aid to the people through Communist governments as well as (or sadly even better than) some of the rightest governments we've supported.

N.S.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
March 31, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your courageous stand raised against the madness in Vietnam is strength to us who are appalled by the human bombing of schools and hospitals, shameless use of gas and the false justifications offered by the Government. I beg to keep up your splendid opposition.

Yours gratefully,

JULIET GREEN.

CARBONDALE, ILL.,
March 29, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I hope you will continue your role as an active critic of our tary misadventure in Vietnam. Today, few voices are heard in public debate on the nation of this American involvement. I believe the President should ask immediately for a meeting of the Security Council of the United Nations to consider the problem of Vietnam—and we should urge to withdraw our troops. The phosphorous bombing, napalm, and questionable use of gas shall not bring peace. The equation "war equals peace" is a dream of madness—one wholly unbefitting the conditions of our country. Let your voice, Senator MORSE, be heard and often on Vietnam.

Yours respectfully,

ROBERT J. BROOKS.

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF.,
March 31, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is a letter to thank you for your realistic and forthright views on South Vietnam, and to encourage you to continue doing all you can to make our leaders see how awfully wrong they are. Robert M. Hutchins said a few weeks ago: "The bankruptcy of American policy is now so clear that even the administration must be ready for a new start."

"The essential element of the old, tired policy is the containment of communism. Everybody in the world is supposed to be interested primarily in containing communism. The people of Vietnam and the Congo are not permitted to say whether they would rather die than see communism rear its head in their country. It is assumed that every Asian or African peasant knows that communism is worse than death and that should be delighted to have his country destroyed in the effort to repel it. * * *

The obvious substitute for containment is United Nations. By working out the methods—and they must eventually be worked out—by which the United Nations may maintain order during revolutions, we may obtain peace with justice. That should be the aim of the foreign policy of the United States."

It seems to me that this 20th century hunt has lasted long enough.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. WALLACE ROBINSON.

HILLTOP STUDIO,
Harpursville, N.Y., March 31, 1965.
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to commend you for standing against our involvement in Vietnam. I hope many will rally to your side and get our men out of Vietnam and prevent a disastrous war.

Yours truly,

GENEVIEVE KAREN HAMLIN.

JAMAICA, N.Y.,
March 31, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It is indeed reassuring to hear your voice calling for an end to the war in Vietnam, I and most of my friends support your call for the United States to get out of the fighting.

It is quite clear that the past and present governments of South Vietnam do not represent the people of South Vietnam, but rather whatever military clique happens to be in power.

Please keep up your honorable fight for the U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam.

Sincerely,

STANLEY OFSEVIT.

WEST WEBSTER, N.Y.
March 31, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR: We commend the enclosed article from the current New Republic to your close attention, and urge you to continue your efforts to secure agreement to negotiate now on Vietnam, before further escalation makes it impossible to avoid full scale war.

We have already caused untold suffering in both North and South Vietnam, among friends and foes alike, with our napalm bombs, our nausea gas, our approval of native torture tactics. Further such policies will only multiply suffering and harden more hearts against the cruel aggressors we must appear to be. We will inevitably drive what's left of this poor country into the arms of China, which she fears and distrusts, but which will look like the only refuge if this continues.

We also urge investigation of the bombing of our embassy in Saigon. News reports tell us this scheme had been known for 3 weeks, yet not even the ground floor offices immediately next to the public street had been evacuated. It almost seems as if an "incident" were desired—certainly no steps were taken to prevent the loss of life or to remove offices to a safer area.

Do not allow yourself to be silenced by the concept of "consensus" or the call to "patriotism." You will serve your country far better if you continue to stand up and speak against further fruitless and damaging displays of "strength" on our part, and in favor of negotiation now.

Sincerely yours,

ETTA RUTH WEIGL
JOHN W. WEIGL
Dr. and Mrs. John W. Weigl.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please forgive the carbon copy. We are deeply grateful for your courage and persistence in fighting for the recognition of human values over empty military objectives—particularly in Far Eastern affairs.

Best wishes to you,

THE WEIGLS.

WAR WITH CHINA?

(By Hans J. Morgenthau)

(Hans J. Morgenthau is director of the Center for the Study of American Foreign and Military Policy at the University of Chicago.)

It illuminates the many misunderstandings that beset our Vietnam policy that in order to criticize that policy in public one has first to justify one's right to do so. The

President himself has declared such criticism to be unhelpful and even damaging. A former President has supported him, and many eminent men interviewed on television and elsewhere have at least implied that to support these policies was the only decent thing to do under the circumstances. This position is incompatible both with the principles of democracy and the requirements of sound policy formation.

The Constitution assigns to Congress the right to declare war. How can Congress discharge this function if its Members and the citizens who have elected them are precluded from discussing the merits of the issues which might lead to war? The Constitution implies that Congress has a choice in the matter of war. How can it make that choice if neither it nor the people it represents have the right to debate the issues? To say that the most momentous issues a nation must face cannot be openly and critically discussed is really tantamount to saying that democratic debate and decision do not apply to the questions of life and death and that, as far as they are concerned, the people have given carte blanche to one man.

Not only is this position at odds with the principles of democracy, but it also removes a very important corrective for governmental misjudgment. Would Great Britain have been better off if in the months preceding and following the outbreak of the Second World War Churchill had kept quiet and rallied behind Chamberlain, however disastrous he thought his policies to be? The Chamberlain government was driven out of office in the midst of war; was it the duty of the opposition to keep quiet and rally behind it? Should the German Reichstag have kept silent in 1917 instead of passing a resolution asking for a peace without annexations? The German Government of the day indeed thought so, but history showed that the parliamentary opposition had better judgment than the government. In the years preceding Pearl Harbor, this country engaged in a great debate about the best foreign policy to follow. Did the country not benefit from this clarification of the issues and was its later unity not in good measure founded upon it?

Two main arguments are advanced in favor of the proposition that the people should rally behind the President and not criticize his Vietnamese policies. One is that only the President has all the facts and therefore only he has the right to judge. The truth is that nobody has all the facts and nobody needs them all. What both the President and his critics need and have are the relevant facts, and what they need more than anything else is sound judgment. No one man can have a monopoly of that judgment. More particularly, the President cannot have it under present conditions.

It must be obvious to anyone who is acquainted with the President's principal advisers that the most powerful advice he gets seeks the extension of the war, and that it is hardly anything more than his innate good sense that has thus far prevented these advisers from carrying the day completely. The President ought to welcome, rather than regret, those voices from Congress and the public at large which give arguments and support to his sound instinct. The President would no doubt have personally an easier time of it, but only in the short run, if his Vietnamese policies were not exposed to criticism. Yet what the President must seek is not the convenience of 1 day but the approbation of history for all time to come. President Johnson is as conscious of his historic mission and of his place in history as any of his predecessors. Why, then, does he in this instance not practice what he knows to be right?

The answer to this question is to be found in the other argument in favor of silently rallying behind the President. It is the conception of consensus. Certainly the political

health of the Nation and the effectiveness of Government are greatly enhanced when the policies of the Government are supported by the great mass of the people. But consensus is a means to an end, not an end in itself. Here is one of the differences between a totalitarian and a democratic society. In the former, dissent is a moral vice and a political crime by definition and, conversely, consensus is the ultimate good. In a democracy, the ultimate standard is the soundness of policy for the support of which popular consensus is sought.

The democratic statesman is faced with an inevitable dilemma if he cannot get popular support for the sound policies he would like to pursue. He will choose the easy disastrous way out if he sacrifices sound policies on the altar of a fleeting popularity. If he chooses to pursue the policies he deems to be right against the opposition of the popular consensus, he must seek to change the consensus in favor of his policies in order to be able to pursue them. Doing this, he risks domestic political failure, but if he succeeds domestically, he will gain the immortality of a great statesman.

George Washington knew how to resolve this dilemma of democratic statesmanship. He proclaimed the neutrality of the United States in the War of the First Coalition against revolutionary France in 1793, while the popular consensus fervently wanted him to join France in that war. For weeks, crowds roamed the streets of Philadelphia clamoring for Washington's head, and John Marshall reports in his biography of Washington that if a motion for Washington's impeachment had not been tabled in Congress, it would have passed with an overwhelming majority. Yet if Washington had made consensus the ultimate yardstick of his policy, he would have gone down in history as the wrecker, not the Father of his Country.

TWO DIFFERENT ANSWERS

A critical assessment of our involvement in Vietnam must start with the question, Why are we involved in Vietnam? Spokesmen for our Government have given two different answers. One answer is implicit in the Secretary of State's often repeated statement that our military mission in Vietnam will end when North Vietnam leaves its neighbor alone. In other words, we are in Vietnam in order to protect the independence of a sovereign state. Once that sovereignty is assured we can go home. It follows from this position that we would not presume to control the way in which that sovereignty might be exercised. If, for instance, the Vietcong should take over the government in Saigon without support from the North or if a South Vietnamese Government should come to an understanding with the North through which the country would be united under Ho Chi Minh, we would not intervene.

The other answer to our question has been most clearly formulated by the Secretary of Defense when he said on February 18 that "the choice is not simply whether to continue our efforts to keep South Vietnam free and independent but, rather, whether to continue our struggle to halt Communist expansion in Asia." It is the same answer Senator Dono has given at length in his Senate speech of February 23. This answer is tantamount to saying that we shall oppose communism in South Vietnam or wherever else we find it in Asia, by military means if necessary. In other words, we shall contain communism in Asia, as we have contained it in Europe. Other official spokesmen, such as Undersecretary of State Ball in his speech of March 16, have expressed the same thought less concisely by defining our mission in Asia as the defense of freedom, that is, of non-Communist governments, against communism.

It is obvious that these two positions are irreconcilable. For if one takes the Secretary of State at his word, then we are en-

gaged in a limited undertaking which could be liquidated through a negotiated settlement without too much difficulty. If Hanoi made a gesture toward noninterference in the affairs of South Vietnam, we could find a formula which would allow us to disengage ourselves from South Vietnam. If, on the other hand, one takes the Secretary of Defense at his word, then we are engaged in a global crusade against communism which we must fight wherever we find it. Consequently, there is no possibility for a negotiated settlement, and we shall stay in South Vietnam as long as communism threatens to expand in Asia, that is, indefinitely.

There can be no doubt, on the basis of external and internal evidence, that the position of the Secretary of Defense is at present in the ascendancy in our Government. It is with that position, therefore, that I am here concerned. I am emphatically opposed to it on two grounds: because of the intellectual errors from which it derives, and because of its likely consequences.

The intellectual errors of that position are two: misunderstanding of the nature of contemporary communism; misunderstanding of the policy of containment.

We are in Asia in order to contain communism. But what do we mean by communism? To answer that question we must take a critical look at the two equations that provide the implicit foundation for our Asian policies. On the one hand, we have equated communism with the power of China; on the other hand, we have equated communism anywhere in Asia with Chinese communism. Yet what has been true of the Soviet Union in Europe has proved to be true also of China in Asia: that the basic direction of her policies is determined primarily by her traditional national interests, and that communism only adds a new dynamic dimension to the means by which those policies are to be achieved. In other words, the fundamental fact in Asia is not that China has a Communist government but that she has resumed her traditional role as the predominant power in Asia. That that power has been restored under Communist auspices is the only relevant fact for our anti-Communist crusaders. Yet it is but of secondary importance to the nations of Asia which, from Japan to Pakistan, behold with awe and admiration the new Chinese power and try to come to terms with it.

The identification of Asian with Chinese communism is similarly the result of the crusading opposition to communism as a political philosophy and a way of life. Such identification is justified in philosophy and ethics, but it has no place in foreign policy. For it is an obvious fact of experience that in the conduct of our foreign policy we are faced not with one monolithic communism, but with a number of different communisms whose character is determined by the character and the interests of the particular nation embracing it. Thus we find in Asia, as elsewhere, different kinds of communism whose relations to China and the Soviet Union range all the way from complete independence to complete subservience. To treat all these communisms alike on the assumption that they are all equally subservient to either China or the Soviet Union or to both is the height of doctrinaire folly. In its intellectual debility, it is no different from the doctrinaire excesses of a vulgar Marxism which sees the capitalistic world as a monolithic monster bent upon the destruction of communism.

Not only is such an attitude of indiscriminate hostility intellectually untenable, but it also precludes any possibility at diplomatic maneuver, subtle bargaining, and tolerable accommodation. In other words, it renders impossible the conduct of a foreign policy worthy of the name. One only needs to consider in the light of such opportunities for creative diplomacy the present relations among the United States, the Soviet

Union, China, North and South Vietnam in order to see how self-defeating this doctrinaire crusading attitude toward communism is. Instead of bombing North Vietnam because we don't know what else to do, would at least have a chance at bending the situation in southeast Asia to our ration defined interests if the President were advised by a Richelieu, a Talleyrand, a Bismarck or—why go abroad—a Hamilton.

FOREIGN POLICY CURSE

Alas, the President of the United States has no such advisers. Instead, he is advised "to continue our struggle to halt Communist expansion in Asia," regardless of its character, its aims, its relevance to the interests of the United States. For such simple-minded conceptions of the enemy, the complex and subtleties of diplomatic maneuver and promise. It needs an instrument as simple, indiscriminate, and crude as itself it has found such an instrument in policy of the peripheral military containment of China. Here we are in the presence of the other intellectual error that dominates our Asian policy.

It seems to have been the curse of our foreign policy since the end of the Second World War that it has become the victim of its own successes. The Marshall plan was a remarkably successful in Europe, and so we have fashioned a global policy of foreign policy on the assumptions of the Marshall plan. The policy of containment was eminently successful in Europe, and so we have exported it to the rest of the globe.

Yet the factors which made the policy of containment a success in Europe are present nowhere else and least of all in Asia. A line could be drawn across the European Continent which clearly delimits the eastern borders of the Soviet Empire. So two armies face each other across that line, a demarcation, which is guaranteed symbolically by the presence of American troops actually by the nuclear power of the United States to which the Soviet Union is vulnerable. Third, to the west of that boundary there lies an ancient civilization which but temporarily in disarray and proved capable of containing Communist subversion. These factors add up to a threat which is primarily military in nature and is countered primarily by military means. None of these factors is present in Asia.

The threat here is not primarily military but political in nature. Weak governments and societies are exposed to Communist subversion, which may or may not be an extension of Chinese power, as Chinese power may or may not be carried abroad by communism. Military containment has no bearing upon such a threat. Thus SEATO has been irrelevant to the expansion of Chinese influence into Indonesia and Pakistan. Particularly, China can, in the present stage of her development, be hurt but not destroyed by nuclear weapons.

But even if the threat emanating from China were primarily military in nature, it could not be contained through the defense of accidentally selected local outposts at the periphery of China. For since the ascendancy of China in Asia is due primarily to cultural and political predominance, it is futile to think that one can contain that dominance by militarily defending Southeast Vietnam or Thailand. That Chinese dominance is as much a fact of life as American predominance in the Western Hemisphere, and our attempts to contain Chinese predominance in Asia through military operations is about as sensible as would be China's trying to contain the American predominance in the Western Hemisphere by committing her military for defense of one or the other of the American countries.

Whoever wants to contain American dominance in the Western Hemisphere must strike at the very sources of American

April 21, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

7907

e must destroy that power itself. The same conclusion applies to the containment of China. Thus the policy of the peripheral military containment of China leads with logical necessity to war with China. Such a war cannot be fought with even a remote chance for success from the air and the sea; must be fought and won where the sources of Chinese power lie, that is, on land. It must be fought as Japan tried to fight it, from 1932 to 1945, without ever coming close to winning it.

It is beside the point that all our leaders, past and present, even those who have dreamed a war with China inevitable, have been misled from the idea of sending millions of American soldiers to the mainland of Asia to fight. President Eisenhower said on February 10, 1954, that he "could conceive of greater tragedy than for the United States become involved in an all-out war in Indochina," and General MacArthur, in the congressional hearings concerning his dismissal and in personal conversation with President Kennedy, emphatically warned against sending American soldiers to the mainland to fight China. We are here concerned not with the intentions of statesmen but with the inevitable consequences of their policies. None of the statesmen who made the fateful decisions in July and August, 1914, could have looked back in November 1918, on the European scene and said, "I miscalculated that way." Yet what happened in Europe during the First World War was an inevitable result of what statesmen decided at its beginning, without wanting or without imagining the consequences. As Euripides said to Faust: "At the first you are free, at the second you are a slave."

In Vietnam today, we are in the process of making that fateful first step. At the moment of this writing, at least, our policy is still ambiguous. On the one hand, it seeks to create a position of strength from which to negotiate. There is an ominous similarity between this attempt to fashion somehow, out of the wreckage of a lost war a favorable negotiating position, and the French policies leading to the surrender at Dienbienphu. General Navarre's last offensive also sought to establish favorable conditions for a negotiated French withdrawal, and the concentration of the French forces in strong points at Dienbienphu was to serve the protection of these armed forces from uncontrollable guerrilla actions. Is Danang destined to become the American Dienbienphu? And if so, shall we follow the French example and withdraw, or shall we go forward until we encounter China? It is here that the ambiguity of our present policy comes into play.

The extension of the war into North Vietnam can be interpreted as an attempt to create in Hanoi the psychological precondition for a negotiated settlement. But it can also be interpreted as an attempt to change the fortunes of war in South Vietnam by rupturing the assumed causal nexus between the policies of Hanoi and the victories of the Vietcong. This causal nexus is a delusion, which has been given the very spurious appearance of fact through the White Paper of February 28. A policy derived from this delusion is bound to fail. Yet when it fails and when failure approaches catastrophe, it would be consistent in terms that delusory logic to extend the war farther. Today, we are holding Hanoi responsible for the Vietcong; tomorrow we will hold Peiping responsible for Hanoi. The first step you are free, at the second you are a slave.

Let us call attention to these implications of our present policies. There is nothing to do with isolationism, appeasement, and appeasement, and nothing to do with communism. The difference between calling attention to these implications now, when we have still the freedom

of choice, and of stumbling unawares deeper and deeper into a morass from which there is no retreat, is the difference between prudence and recklessness; between a rational, discriminating understanding of the hierarchy of national interests and the power available for their support, and a doctrinaire emotionalism which drowns all vital distinctions in the fervor of the anti-Communist crusade.

France owes more to Mendès-France who liquidated the Indochinese War, and to De Gaulle who stopped the fighting in Algeria, than to those who wanted to continue fighting without regard for the limits of their country's interests and power. Those few who warned Athens against the Sicilian expedition, which was to become the grave of Athens' greatness, were better patriots than its promoters. To point to the likely consequences of present policy is, then, not only a right, which ought not to require apologetic assertion, but it is also a duty, burdensome yet inescapable.

BALDWIN PARK, CALIF.,

April 13, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I know I speak for thousands and thousands of American citizens who are most grateful for your courageous stand against the abominable business in Vietnam. I speak also for those who write in protest and whose protest is ignored.

Enclosed is a copy of a letter I sent to President Johnson March 31. Its receipt was not even acknowledged. Heretofore when I have written the President or the State Department, back comes a letter. Perhaps now there are so many protests about his Vietnam policy he is simply provided with extra wastebaskets.

I would be delighted if you get a chance to show it to him, or you might like to put it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There is still some hope for our country when the Senate has in it a man like you.

Sincerely,

JOHN MANNING.

BALDWIN PARK, CALIF.,

March 31, 1965.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the United States of America,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Like thousands and thousands of the American people, I believed that what you said in your campaign expressed your real meaning and purpose; that you were against any widening of the war in Vietnam; that you would work for peace; that a vote for you was a vote for peace. While a vote for Goldwater meant increase and expansion in that "dirty war" in Vietnam, on which course he was verbally insisting.

I supported you strongly in the 1964 campaign and urged everyone I knew to do likewise.

I will not forgive you for allowing your administration to use the vast resources of our country, its manpower, its influence—not only to continue the "dirty war," but to promote and accelerate it with ever-increasing savagery.

Just as the Buddhists in Saigon are opposed to anyone who doesn't stand for peace, I am opposed to you or anyone who is promoting or endorsing this gigantic evil.

How long it will take to get out, I do not know; but out is where we belong. Every successive day and hour American forces are in that unhappy country, devastating the land, murdering its inhabitants, is one more day and hour of disgrace—indelible disgrace for our beloved country.

Yours truly,

JOHN MANNING,

Former member Democratic State Committee of California.

I enclose a brief account of earlier activities for our Democratic Party which, I feel,

give me a right to object as forcibly as I can to the disastrous course along which you are leading this country.

BALDWIN, CALIF.

Re John Manning, former member Democratic State Committee of California.

Since 1932 I have worked intensely for the success of the Democratic Party, out here in California.

As soon as Garner won in the primaries and "had" the California and Texas delegations, being convinced that a Roosevelt-Garner ticket would carry the Democratic Party to victory, I went about the country urging Garner for Vice President; went down into Texas.

Texas was poor then. Everybody was poor. Texas couldn't even get 10 cents a pound for its cotton. "Look here," I said, "Garner never could win as President but he'll make a corking Vice President. Roosevelt and Garner, is a ticket that will sweep the country."

With the bonus marchers from Texas, I traveled from Texarkana to Louisville, Ky. and campaigned all the way for Roosevelt and Garner. Also I sold them on the idea of making their camp on lower Pennsylvania Avenue. "Don't let them shove you boys out to Quantico," I said, "where no one in Washington will see you. There are empty buildings about to be demolished there on lower Pennsylvania Avenue, why not use them?" They did. And stayed there until MacArthur and his lieutenant, Dwight Eisenhower, drove them out.

I continued my campaign until reaching Washington, D.C., buttonholing everyone who counted in behalf of the Roosevelt-Garner ticket. After the convention, I returned to Pasadena and took charge of the campaign at the East Pasadena headquarters. We succeeded in getting the Catholics to go along for the whole ticket. Including McAdoo. In election districts that never before in Pasadena history had been carried for the Democratic Party, we carried for the Roosevelt-Garner ticket. After the election, Senator McAdoo offered to have me appointed as an appraiser for the farm loan bank. I turned down the job because I knew that if I was to be useful to the administration, it would have to be in the Labor Department.

Texas has gone a long way since those days when I was working indefatigably to convince the Texas voter that the winning ticket was Roosevelt-Garner. No longer is Texas poor. Yet, for all the wealth amassed by Texas since 1933, if John Garner had not been elected Vice President in 1932, you today, Mr. Lyndon Johnson, would not be President of these United States.

YELLOW SPRINGS, OHIO,

April 12, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have read and heard many of your strong criticisms of this country's policy and actions in Vietnam and I want to state my support of your position. I am very much opposed to what our country is doing in southeast Asia. We are losing friends and gaining more enemies. Each bomb creates more Communists than it kills.

I hope you will continue to speak out against our country's present policies and work for a peaceful solution to the problems of southeast Asia.

Sincerely yours,

ART LANDES.

DETROIT, MICH.,

April 14, 1965.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Oregon Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am with you wholeheartedly on your Vietnam views.

Your courage has been well demonstrated in standing up and speaking out against

7908

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

April 21, 1966

what you, and others, consider a useless and terrible war in Vietnam. We are spending millions of dollars and sacrificing thousands of lives for what and whom? We were wrong to have entered into this in the first place and I feel, as a Nation, we should admit our mistake and get out now before it is too late. Our so-called American image is getting worse day by day and personally I can see why.

Thank you for speaking up, against all the odds, and trying to give truth to your fellow Americans.

Sincerely,

MISS CARYL MASSERMAN.

TOLEDO, OHIO

April 12, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We wish to congratulate you on your fine speech at Athens, Ohio, condemning the Vietnam war. President Johnson's lack of experience is leading us deeper into this conflict and action should be taken at once by our senior Senators to terminate this war. This war is hopeless and in my opinion it cannot be won. The most we can hope for is a stalemate. We didn't win the Korean war and this one is much more difficult considering the location. Its extremely hard for me to understand why the United Nations is not involved. We talk about opposing communism but there isn't one Russian soldier involved. Why? There weren't any Russians in Korea either. Why? This indicates that Russia is much smarter than we are as they get other people to do their fighting. This is a bad reflection on Mr. Rusk and Mr. McNamara. Why isn't Australia and New Zealand afraid of southeast Asia going Communist and furnishing fighting men.

This is a very unnecessary war and if it spreads we will lose all our resources; the most valuable—our young men—and everything possible should be done to get it stopped.

Yours truly,

V. E. STACY.

RICHMOND HILL, N.Y.,

April 14, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We wish to express our deepest gratitude to you for your continuing efforts to bring about an end to the war in Vietnam.

Sincerely,

ETHEL C. NAGEL,
CARRIE NAGEL,
FLORENCE MASON.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,

April 10, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Last night I was able to hear your speech on film that was made before the Yale Law School.

I would like to say, sir, that I support your views 100 percent and I only wish that my own Representatives would have the courage to stand up and speak the truth.

I am writing to ask you for more facts concerning the situation since I find the daily press more concerned with Pentagon press releases.

If you would tell me of what way I can help you I would appreciate it.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID J. PINNEGAN.

APRIL 12, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: I want to tell you of what I think of the cause you are fighting for. If only there were more good men like you. There wouldn't be the worry of war and the suffering they cause. Greed and pride guide too many of our elected Senators. I guess I shouldn't say "pride" for there couldn't be any if they just could think of others in-

stead of just their selves. May God help you and others that are carrying the burden of trying to bring peace to mankind.

Sincerely yours,

R. L. RAMSEY.

GOLETA, CALIF.,

April 15, 1965.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: I am in total support of your stand on the war in Vietnam. Keep up the good work. Hope you can speak in Santa Barbara at our "teach in" on Vietnam May 8.

I would greatly appreciate your sending some of your recent speeches on the war. Peace.

PETER RELIS.

MILFORD, CONN.,

April 14, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The President's fine recent statement on Vietnam is helpful in providing alternatives to the present policy of continuing to escalate the war.

However, more dialog is necessary to get helpful suggestions toward a sound, balanced, and more effective policy in southeast Asia.

Enclosed is a reprint of an excellent article that contributes significantly to this end. It is entitled "How America Can Help Vietnam" and was written by Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review, and appeared in the March 20 issue as an editorial.

It would be most appreciated if you would read this article and send me your considered reaction.

Very sincerely yours,

ROGER W. BURNHAM.

HOW AMERICA CAN HELP VIETNAM

(By Norman Cousins, editor, Saturday Review of Literature)

The problem in Vietnam is clear enough. What is not so clear is whether American policy and action in Vietnam are meeting the problem or whether they may be creating a larger one.

The original problem in Vietnam is represented by an unremitting Communist campaign of terror, assassination, and brutality against the South Vietnamese people and Government. The campaign has its origin in North Vietnam but many South Vietnamese are part of the undercover army, known as the Vietcong. What concerns the United States at least as much as the disorders in South Vietnam is the spread of Chinese Communist influence or dominion in southeast Asia.

The reason it is not clear whether the United States knows how to meet the problem is that the more deeply the United States becomes militarily committed in South Vietnam, the greater its apparent difficulty in attracting the support of the people it is attempting to save. Popular demonstrations of a non-Communist nature against the United States are mounting. In private briefings U.S. officials concede that the large majority of South Vietnamese are opposed to the U.S. presence.

Inevitably, this raises the question of the legal or political basis for American military action in the area. When the United States went into Vietnam in 1955, it said it did so at the request of the Vietnamese Government, then headed by President Ngo Dinh Diem. But that government has long since been violently overthrown. What makes the matter even more pointed and portentous is that, according to Frederick E. Nolting, Jr., former U.S. Ambassador to South Vietnam, the United States was directly engaged in the plot to subvert and overthrow the Diem regime. Whether that government was good or bad or in-between is irrelevant; if the United States was in fact engaged in subverting the

Vietnam Government—or any government for that matter—then under the precedent existing in international law and expanded at the Nuremberg trials, those American officials who were involved in the episode a guilty of murder. A situation raising parallel questions existed in Laos in 1960 and 1961 when the United States equipped and paid the salaries not only of the armed forces but the duly constituted and elected government but of the insurrectionist group that was pitted against it.

We have made it clear to ourselves that our presence in Vietnam is in our national interest. But we haven't made it clear to the Vietnamese that our presence there is their national interest. If this failure should persist, then why are we any better than the French in Algeria or the British in India or the Portuguese in Angola? The whole thrust of the 20th century is to keep the separate national interests in check and to substitute peacekeeping machinery for unilateral action no matter how great the provocation or urgent the problem.

In any case, when the United States today it is undertaking military action at the request of the South Vietnamese Government is not clear which government it is talking about, or whether any genuine government does in fact exist. The repeated changes in the Vietnam Government indicate that the problem of stability is not represented by subversion from the North. One way or another, the principle of self-determination at the core of historic U.S. foreign policy traditions, does not now exist in Vietnam. The full implications of this fact may have a greater bearing on America's postwar world leadership than any military reverse in Vietnam.

The related question that has yet to be answered is: What lies beyond the bomb of North Vietnam? Let us assume that bombings do not lead to a wider war. Let us also assume that they accomplish their announced purpose of destroying the military installations of North Vietnam and persuading the Hanoi Government to cease its offensive activities against South Vietnam. This still leaves a large part of the problem. Most of the arms used by the guerrillas and undercover fighters in South Vietnam do come from Hanoi but from the United States. The arms are captured by the Vietcong or turned over to it. And even if the Vietcong retires altogether, what about the large majority of the Vietnamese who by this time have become bitterly opposed to the United States and to any government that would be responsive to American will? How is stability to be defined?

It ought to be the first fixed rule of our foreign policy never to go into a country with guns for the purpose of creating stability unless we also have an idea about making a better life for the people. Nothing could be more naive or ineffectual in the modern world than the notion that we can combat communism without a fully formed ideology of our own, an ideology that doesn't speak in freedom in abstract terms but relates concretely to a specific program for fighting hunger, disease, indignity, and joblessness.

The United States did and does have an economic program in Vietnam and Laos that program lacks grandeur. It is good but not good enough. It doesn't begin to compare in scope or depth with the military program. It doesn't sing out. It is the old story of ready dollars for bombs but reluctant dollars for a better world. In any event, this and bulging fact about Vietnam is that policy there has not worked. Instead of recognizing that there may have been some inherent wrong with the policy to begin with, we have allowed our exasperation and frustration to push us even further down an impassable road. But policy-by-exasperation is no substitute for vision.

Another question that has yet to be defined concerns SEATO. Why has the S

east Asia Treaty Organization been absent from South Vietnam? In taking leadership in the formation of SEATO, the United States said its purpose was to create a collective military mechanism for underwriting the security of that area. A threat to the security of that area now exists. The United States has said it exists. Where, then, is SEATO? Have the other governments decided that the central problem in Vietnam cannot be met by military means? Or is the operation of SEATO so amorphous that there is no way of knowing in advance what the circumstances are that would produce joint decisions and joint action?

More important still: The United States has said that the world's best hope for peace lies in the United Nations. The past four U.S. Presidents have all gone before the United Nations to proclaim American support for the objectives of the United Nations and to do everything possible to promote the development of the U.N. into an agency with the effective powers of law. How, then, can we reasonably go outside the United Nations if Vietnam constitutes a threat to the peace?

True, one reason it may be difficult for the United Nations to act effectively in Vietnam is that all the parties involved in the conflict do not belong to the United Nations. Even so, U Thant, Secretary General of the United Nations, has proposed a way of starting negotiations looking to a possible solution. He has done so because the military actions in Vietnam could erupt into a world war in which the full destructive power of nuclear weapons would come into play. But the United States has not accepted the recommendation and good offices of the U.N. Secretary General. What would the United States say if another nation acted in this manner?

In 1956 President Eisenhower condemned the military action of the French and British in Suez. He did not doubt that French and British interests were being jeopardized by Egypt, but he believed that the proper way to pursue such questions was through the machinery established for that purpose. And even if the machinery was inadequate, the interests of world peace came first. He said that the biggest need of our time was for the development of principles of world law. And he said that the United States could not maintain a double standard, invoking world law against its foes and by passing it for its friends. Appropriately, the United States turned to the United Nations to eliminate the threat to the peace in Suez.

The question, therefore, emerging from Vietnam today is whether the United States has a double standard by which it judges others and exempts itself. Do we support the principle of world law through the United Nations in all cases except those in which we feel it is to our national advantage to do otherwise?

We say again, as we said in this space 2 weeks ago, that the choice in Vietnam is not between total victory and total withdrawal. It is late but not too late to do the things that might yet serve the purposes of stability in the area. First, we can welcome the good offices of the United Nations in exploring the possibilities for effective negotiation or settlement. Second, we can call upon the United Nations to concern itself with the general threat to regional and world peace represented by terrorist actions in South Vietnam. Third, we could propose that the United Nations proceed immediately with the lower Mekong River Valley development project recommended 8 years ago by the United Nations Economic Commission for Asia.

The lower Mekong affects the lives and well-being not just of the Vietnamese but of many millions of people in Laos, Thailand, and Cambodia. The project would make possible a second crop in vast areas that now have only one crop because of the dry season.

It would generate hydroelectric power for the entire basin. Most important of all, it could shift the focus of attention to the constructive possibilities of joint action in the common good. And if offers the United States an outlet for those things we know how to do infinitely better than superimposing a military presence. We could help develop the natural resources of the area in a way that would give the people something to excite their imagination and enlist their passions in the making of a finer tomorrow.

These things are vital—not just because it is necessary to bring peace and purpose to a pockmarked land but because it is high time that American actions in Vietnam came into harmony with American traditions.

In a totalitarian society, the government demands that its citizens take pride in their nation whether it deserves it or not. The uniqueness of a free society is that the citizens have it within their means to shape the kind of nation in which honest pride is possible. So far, there is little warrant for pride in Vietnam. But a combination of objective thinking and moral imagination might yet save Vietnam and provide a tonic for both the national pride and the national conscience.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Mar. 9, 1965]

OFFICIAL HYPOCRISY ABOUT VIETNAM

One unpleasant side effect of the kind of policy our Government is pursuing in Vietnam is the moral deterioration that attends official efforts to justify it. Truth is an early victim in such circumstances, as U.N. Secretary General U Thant has observed. And the moral slippage is progressive. Little white lies have a way of rapidly giving way to whoppers; fraud and hypocrisy gain ascendancy over candor; doubletalk becomes habitual.

President Johnson and Secretary of State Rusk exhibit the classic symptoms of this ailment as they strenuously seek to convert Members of Congress, the diplomatic corps, and the public to their point of view on Vietnam.

The President, for example, keeps telling his visitors that there has not been a single sign of any interest in negotiation from Hanoi, as if this were the major obstacle to diplomatic efforts to end the conflict. He has, however, demanded that North Vietnam "end its aggression" as a precondition of any negotiation. Would we negotiate if talks hinged on our first withdrawing from South Vietnam? Of course not. The obstacle to diplomacy, therefore, is quite as much the precondition set by President Johnson as it is unwillingness in Hanoi to talk. The United States should stand ready to negotiate whether Hanoi does or not.

Nowhere does truth take so much punishment as in Secretary Rusk's repeated description of the Vietnam conflict as a simple case of aggression across national frontiers—like Korea, like Hitler's invasions, and so on. If this were the simple truth, as the Goldwater extremists have always claimed, then our moral posture in Vietnam would be defensible. But the complex truth is that national aggression and support of a native revolution are not the same thing; that the great majority of Vietcong guerrillas are natives, not outside infiltrators; that the 1954 Geneva accords did not establish South Vietnam as a nation, but on the contrary clearly intended all of Vietnam to be unified under a government chosen in free elections; that our own Government supported South Vietnam in refusing to hold those elections, and has done as much as anybody to destroy the military neutrality that the 1954 accords sought to establish for the whole of Vietnam.

When Mr. Rusk says we are only repelling aggression, he is stating the proposition to

be proved, without proving it. In all honesty, the United States cannot support the claim that our military aid is a noble defense of freedom while North Vietnam's is a reprehensible act of aggression. That may be why our Government has never presented the case to the United Nations, the proper and lawful body to decide when aggression has been committed and how it should be responded to. In candor, the United States shares responsibility for the conflict in South Vietnam and must end its own intervention as a part of any peace settlement.

The President and Mr. Rusk speak as if no peace settlement is needed, but only a withdrawal by North Vietnam. The fighting will not be ended by fiat, however. There will have to be a settlement in some form, and the best basis for it remains the principles of the 1954 Geneva accords, which the Johnson administration so righteously accuses Hanoi of violating.

Those principles were: an immediate ceasefire, an immediate freeze on the levels of foreign troops and military aid, followed by gradual withdrawal; no foreign military bases to be permitted anywhere in Vietnam; respect by all concerned for the "independence, unity and territorial integrity" of Vietnam; unification to be achieved within 2 years under a government chosen in free elections, internationally supervised; protection for persons and property, and no reprisals for past activities in the civil war.

The main lines of these accords still hold good, though of course they would have to be adapted to meet changed circumstances. Unification, for example, may now have to be delayed until passions of the civil war cool. But military neutralization of the whole of Indochina could be established, with more direct guarantees by all interested parties than in 1954. Under such terms American troops could be gradually withdrawn and the future of Vietnam left to the decision of the Vietnamese people.

The Johnson administration keeps contending these are its only aims—that the United States covets no territory, no military position, no bases, no political gains. The best, and the most honest way to realize such aspirations—if indeed we entertain them—is through an honorably negotiated peace settlement.

ON THE WAY TO THE BRINK

(By Walter Lippmann)

The war in Vietnam has reached the point where the President is wrestling with momentous and fateful decisions. For what has happened is that the official theory of the war, as propounded by Gen. Maxwell Taylor to President Kennedy and by Secretary McNamara to President Johnson, has proved to be unworkable. The government in Saigon has not been able to pacify South Vietnam even with the help of American munitions, money, and 25,000 military advisers. The crucial fact today is that for all practical purposes the Saigon government has lost control of the countryside, and its followers are increasingly holed-up in cities.

The roads and the railroads connecting the cities have been cut by the Vietcong. The cities now have to be supplied in great measure by air and by sea. This condition of affairs has been well reported by Mr. Richard Dudman in a series of reports to the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and his findings are confirmed in all essentials, though not yet publicly, in the well-informed quarters in Washington.

The surest evidence that Mr. Dudman's reports are substantially correct is that in the Pentagon and the State Department there is mounting pressure for the commitment to southeast Asia of American infantry. The current estimate is that the President should be prepared to send 350,000 American soldiers, even though this would compel him

April 21, 1965

to order a mobilization of reservists and draftees.

This call for American ground forces is the logical and inevitable consequence of the virtual collapse of the Saigon government in the villages. Having lost the countryside, Saigon has lost the sources of military manpower. This deprives it of the means for winning the war. The official estimates today are that the Saigon government commands forces superior to the Vietcong by a ratio of not quite 5 to 1. Experience shows that no guerrilla war has ever been subdued with such a low ratio of superiority. It is estimated that in Malaya, the British and the Malaysians, who were fighting the indigenous Chinese guerrillas, reached a superiority of 50 to 1. In Cyprus, which they gave up, the British had overwhelming force. In Algeria, though the French army had unmistakable superiority, the country became untenable. It is the deficiency in South Vietnamese military manpower which explains why the pressure is now on to put in Americans to fill it.

After 2 months of bombing North Vietnam, it has become manifest also that the bombing has not changed the course of the war. As a result of this disappointment, the President is now under pressure to extend the bombing to the populated centers around Hanoi and Haiphong.

There is no doubt that American air power can devastate North Vietnam and, if China intervened, could do great damage in China. But if we had an American army of 350,000 men in South Vietnam, and extended the war in the air, we would have on our hands an interminable war without the prospect of a solution. To talk about freedom and national independence amidst such violence and chaos would be to talk nonsense.

In order to rationalize, that is to sell, the wider war, we are being told by Secretary McNamara and others that this war is a decisive test for the future. It will decide the future of wars of liberation. This is a profoundly and dangerously false notion, and it shows a lamentable lack of knowledge and understanding of the revolutionary upheavals of the epoch in which we live. It assumes that revolutionary uprisings against established authority are manufactured in Peiping or in Moscow, and that they would not happen if they were not instigated, supported, and directed from one of the capitals of communism. If this were true, the revolutionary movements could be suppressed once and for all by knocking out Peiping or Moscow. They little know the hydra who think that the hydra has only one head and that it can be cut off.

Experience shows that there is no single central source of the revolutionary upheavals of our epoch. What is there that is common to the Irish rebellion, to the Jewish uprising in Palestine, to the civil war in Cuba, to the Arab rebellion in Algeria, to the Huk revolt in the Philippines? What is common to them all is violent discontent with the established order and a willingness of a minority of the discontented to die in the attempt to overthrow it.

What has confused many well-meaning Americans is that in some of these rebellions, though not by any means in all of them, Communists have become the leaders of the rebellion. But that does not mean that they have owned the rebellion. The resistance to the Nazis in France and Italy contained a high proportion of Communists among the active partisans. But 20 years later it is General de Gaulle who presides over France.

It would be well to abandon the half-baked notion that the war in southeast Asia will be decisive for the future of revolutionary upheavals in the world. Revolution is a home-grown product, and it could not be stamped out decisively and once for all—supposing we had such delusions of grandeur—by stamping out Red China. In southeast Asia we have

entangled ourselves in one of the many upheavals against the old regime, and we shall not make things any better by thrashing around with ascending violence.

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, Apr. 8, 1965]

LIMITED WAR

A funny thing has happened between November and April. Those who were most critical of Barry Goldwater last fall because of his tough line on southeast Asia are now President Johnson's principal critics in the Vietnam dispute. Conversely, those who thought Johnson was too wishy-washy then are in his corner now. The President finds a champion in Nixon, a foe in Morse.

But the whole thing is not so topsy-turvy as a first look would make it appear. The difference between the Goldwater and Johnson approaches is explained in part by the Riverside (Calif.) Press-Enterprise.

Senator Goldwater said he would try to win the war in Vietnam. President Johnson doesn't want to lose it, but doesn't think, as we get it, that a people can be won over by annihilation. Nor does he want to carry the war so far that it could erupt into a general, global fire-storm. The President says he will negotiate at any time the Communists feel the burdens of war intensely enough to buy a compromise which, from this country's point of view, would be honorable and enforceable. Senator Goldwater and his admirers scoffed at the idea of negotiations.

The idea of limited war, a war that would be neither lost nor won, was at the heart of the Truman-MacArthur controversy. Yet, it is a concept that was not foreign to our ancestors. In the colonial age and the age of rising nationalisms, many wars were fought less to attain a new objective than to maintain a status quo. The idea of unconditional surrender, winner take all, is relatively new—with only such ancestors as Carthage.

VIETNAM: AMERICA MUST DECIDE BETWEEN A FULL-SCALE WAR AND A NEGOTIATED TRUCE

A spiraling exchange of blows and counter blows in Vietnam can lead to a major war involving the United States and China—a war nobody wants and no one can win. The present tragic conflict can only be resolved by political, not military means. Join with us in asking negotiations to end the war in Vietnam. Help mobilize public opinion to stop the widening of the war.

Bombing North Vietnam will not stop the conflict in South Vietnam. Widening the war only serves to invite the intervention of the North Vietnamese regular army, the U.S.S.R. and China.

SEEK A CEASE-FIRE

No issues will be decided by prolonging the bloody and fratricidal conflict in South Vietnam. The fighting must be brought to a halt so that the devastated nation may recover.

NEGOTIATE AN INTERNATIONAL SETTLEMENT

Now, before the war escalates into a major disaster, means must be found and found urgently to take the issue from the field of battle to the conference table.

Michael Amrine, editor, author; Stringfellow Barr, author and lecturer; John C. Bennett, theologian; Robert S. Browne, Farleigh Dickinson University; Stuart Chase, economist, author; O. Edmund Clubb, East Asian Institute, Columbia University; Alexander H. Cohen, producer; Benjamin V. Cohen, former counselor, U.S. State Department; Edward U. Condon, University of Colorado; Charles D. Coryell, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Edwin T. Dahlberg, Crozier Theological Seminary; William C. Davidson, Haverford College; Mrs. Valerie Delacorte, New York; Martin Deutsch, Teachers College, Columbia University; Rabbi Maurice N. Elsendrath, president, Union of American He-

brew Congregations; James Farmer, national director, CORE; Jules Feiffer, cartoonist; W. H. Ferry, Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions; Rabbi Leon I. Feuer, president, Central Conference of American Rabbis; D. F. Fleming, professor emeritus, Vanderbilt University; Harry Emerson Fosdick, minister emeritus, the Riverside Church, N.Y.; Jerome D. Frank, M.D., Johns-Hopkins Medical School; Erich Fromm, psychoanalyst, author; William Gibson, playwright; Rabbi Roland B. Gittlesohn, Temple Israel, Boston.

Nathan Glazer, University of California; Bishop Charles F. Golden, chairman, Division of Peace and World Order, Methodist Board, Christian Social Concerns; Patrick E. Gorman, secretary-treasurer, Amalgamated Meat Cutters; Rev. Dana McLean Greeley, D.D., president, Unitarian Universalist Association; Nat Hentoff, writer; William A. Higinbotham, Brookhaven National Laboratory; Hudson Hoagland, Worcester Foundation for Experimental Biology; David R. Inglis, Argonne National Laboratory; Herbert C. Kelman, University of Michigan; Jerome B. King, Williams College; Rabbi Edward E. Klein, Stephen Wise Free Synagogue; Mrs. Robert Korn, New York; Mrs. Philip Langner, New York; Mrs. Albert D. Lasker, New York; Chauncey D. Leake, University of California; Abba P. Lerner, Michigan State University; David Livingston, president district 65, Retail Wholesale Department Store Union, AFL-CIO; S. E. Luria, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Rollo May, New York University; William H. Meyer, former Congressman, Vermont; Mr. and Mrs. Frederick Morgan, New York; Hans J. Morgenthau, director, Center for Study, American Foreign and Military Policy, University of Chicago; Stuart Mudd, M.D., microbiologic research; Lewis Mumford, writer.

Gardner Murphy, Director of Research, Menninger Foundation; James E. Newman, Editor; John H. Niemeyer, President, Bank Street College, N.Y.; Robert Osborn, Artist; A. H. Parker, Chairman, Old Colony Trust Co.; Hildy Parks, Actress; James G. Patton, President, National Farmers Union; Eleanor Perry, Writer; Frank Perry, Film Director; Darrell Randall, American University; Tony Randall, Actor; A. Philip Randolph, President, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters; Anatol Rapoport, University of Michigan; John P. Roche, National Chairman, Americans for Democratic Action; Frank Rosenblum, Secretary Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union AFL-CIO; Bruno Rossi, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; John Nevin Sayre, Nyack, N.Y.; Dore Scharf, Writer, Director; James T. Shotwell, President Emeritus, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace; Jack Schubert, Radiation Chemist; Theodore Shedlovsky, Rockefeller Institute; J. David Singer, University of Michigan; B. F. Skinner, Harvard University; Pitirim A. Sorokin, President, American Sociological Association; Edward J. Sparling, President Emeritus, Roosevelt University; C. Maxwell Stanley, Stanley Engineering Co.

Albert Szent-Gyorgyi, M.D., Marine Biological Laboratory, Woods Hole, Mass.; Harold Taylor, educator, author; Howard Thurman, minister at large, Boston University; Louis Untermeyer, author; Mark Van Doren, writer; Maurice B. Visscher, University of Minnesota; Jerry Voorhis, executive director Cooperative League of the U.S.A.; Bryant Wedge, director, Institute for the Study of National Behavior; Ber-

April 21, 1965

hard S. Weiss, Jenkintown, Pa.; Paul Weiss, Yale University; Quincy Wright, University of Virginia.
Board of directors: cochairmen: BENJAMIN SPOCK, M.D., Prof. H. STUART HUGHES.
Vice chairmen: STEVE ALLEN, Dr. M. STANLEY LIVINGSTON.
Treasurer: LAWRENCE S. MAYERS, JR.

Counsel: William J. Butler; Roy Bennett; Norman Cousins; Helen Cahagan Douglas; Rabbi Isidor Hoffman; Homer A. Jack; Walter Lear, M.D.; Lenore G. Marshall; Stephanie May; Prof. Seymour Melman; Orlie Pell; Victor Reuther; Robert Ryan; Robert J. Schwartz; Norman Thomas; H. B. Allinsmith, New Jersey; Robert D. Bloom, New York; Mrs. Jeanne Coggeshall, New York; Norman Hunt, Connecticut; Mort Junger, New York; Dr. John A. Lindon, California; Frank McCallister, Illinois; Dr. Paul Olynky, Ohio; Gilbert Seldes, Pennsylvania; Snowden Taylor, New York; Samuel Tucker, New Jersey; Clayton Wallace, District of Columbia.

Staff: DONALD KEYES, MARIE RUNYON, SANDFORD GOTTLIEB.

Wire or write President Johnson today about the war in Vietnam. Ask your friends to write to him, too. You can send a 15-word Western Union public opinion message for 99 cents.

Published as a public service by SANE, National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, Inc.

National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, 17 East 45th Street, New York, N.Y., 10017.

I have written the President and asked my friends to write.

I enclose \$..... to help publish this ad in other communities.

Please send SANE's background material on Vietnam (35 cents):

Name _____
Address _____
City _____ State _____ ZIP _____

It's STILL Gas

One of the most disturbing bits of news from the disturbing battle zone in Vietnam is the announcement that South Vietnam's troops are using nonlethal gas. This is not the mustard of World War I memory, but a kind of gas that makes victims temporarily ill. It can be argued that this is really humane, as the work of war goes, because the victim soon recovers. But it's still gas.

The danger is that in using this gas one side, our side, has pulled the plug out of the bottle. If one side can fight with such a weapon, the other side can retaliate with such a weapon or a better one. How big a step is it from nonlethal gas to gas that might be lethal under just the right circumstances? And then how big is the step to the real thing? What next? Germs? Will this lead to an "escalation" of a new and terrible kind?

There wasn't much humane about World War II. But no major power used poison gas, although all were probably prepared to—if the other side did first. The belligerents in World War II were not being polite. They were scared, each worrying about the new kind of gas the enemy might have and each hesitating to risk having its own troops and cities used as targets. It was this balance of terror that saved us.

The first use of a humane, little nonlethal gas is like the first use of a humane, little, low-yield atomic bomb. The important thing is not what that first bomb does, but what it could lead to.

The United States cannot wash its hands of such decisions in Vietnam. The world holds us responsible for what South Vietnam does, and the chances are the world is right. We lament both the use of the gas and the fact that it was our side that started it.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Mar. 14, 1965]

THE AMERICAN MISSION

Apologists for the war in Vietnam argue two ways. On the one hand they say we face there an entirely new kind of warfare which we must learn and master lest we perish; on the other, they say the conflict is nothing new, but simply another chapter in a long struggle that began when doughty Harry Truman stopped the Communists cold in Greece and Turkey with the Truman Doctrine.

The arguments are contradictory, and illustrate why the Vietnam crisis has called into question the whole muddy philosophy of "containment," which has served all too long as substitute for a sane and balanced American foreign policy. The flaw in "containment" is that it makes no distinction between restraining the power of a hostile nation to injure our vital interests, and undertaking as a kind of world policeman to intervene in other nations' lives and beat down revolution wherever it appears. The first is necessary, the second is folly.

The Truman Doctrine did indeed have something in common with the "Dulles doctrine" now being followed in Vietnam, but not to the credit of either. In Greece as in Asia we intervened unilaterally in a nation's internal affairs to help the Government fight a Communist insurrection.

Fortunately the Communists were beaten in Greece without need for large-scale military operation by our forces as in Vietnam. They were beaten, however, not by the Truman Doctrine but by Tito's closing of the Yugoslav border, the main route for infiltration into Greece, after his split with Moscow. U.S. power did not "contain" the Soviet thrust into Greece; it was contained by the divergence of national interests within the Communist camp.

It was Mr. Truman's Marshall plan, rather than his venture in Greece, that proved to be our great success in helping free nations stay free, and thus restrain the undue expansion of Soviet national power. In Western Europe we gave massive economic aid; we held intervention in internal affairs to a minimum; we helped rebuild an already viable society whose people knew how to govern themselves; we were fighting economic distress rather than political revolution, hunger rather than communism.

The principles of the Marshall plan, of Mr. Truman's point 4 technical assistance, of the Alliance for Progress, economic development aid, the Peace Corps—these and not the doctrine of military containment ought to govern our policy toward underdeveloped lands emerging from colonialism, such as Vietnam. Only by building social and economic conditions that undercut the incentives for revolution can free peoples stay free—and then only if they want our kind of freedom badly enough to sacrifice for it.

Instead of pouring futile billions into a senseless Vietnam war, we should be investing millions in the U.N. plan for Mekong river development.

There will be occasions when judicious military aid may help a beleaguered government stave off revolution long enough to effectuate needed reforms itself. A strong and vital government with the confidence of its people can win a civil war, even when the rebels are getting outside support. But when a government loses the elementary power to preserve order—when armed troops successfully challenge its authority—revolution is often inevitable. It is then utter madness for

the United States to take over a war which the people themselves will not wage. Any victories are bound to be temporary, and can gain us only hatred by oppressed peoples elsewhere.

Our country has a long history of armed intervention in Latin America's internal politics—the latest venture being the Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba in 1961—and not once has the policy well served our own interest in the long run. It cannot serve our interests in Asia or Africa either. We do not have the right, or the power, to decide for any nation what kind of society, economy or government it shall set up.

Must we then reconcile ourselves to triumph after triumph for communism, until at last America itself is conquered? The Birchites and other fanatics with little faith in the power of democratic ideas hold this out as the only alternative to a holy war against the Reds. Neither history nor commonsense supports their view. National identity and the love of freedom are stronger than any ideology. Yugoslavia, Eastern Europe generally, even Ho Chi Minh in North Vietnam, all discredit the fears of a monolithic world revolution controlled by Moscow or Peiping.

What Americans must understand is that revolutions will occur so long as social injustice endures. Some revolutions will take a Communist form or be exploited by Communists. But this does not mean they will become mere agents of Russian or Chinese national power, nor does it mean that the United States has a messianic mission to suppress revolution everywhere in the world.

The American mission is to develop our own society into the best of many in a diverse world; to aid peoples, not governments, in the struggle for a better life; to live at peace and unafraid alongside systems of which we do not approve.

[From the Oregonian, Mar. 13, 1965]

MORALE BOOSTED

The use of U.S. jet bombers against Vietcong concentrations within South Vietnam, starting less than 3 weeks ago, has brought no conclusive evidence of turning the tide of war. But evidence is hard to come by. It requires ground observation of the results of strikes and this is difficult in jungle and mountain areas.

One of the purposes of the United States and South Vietnamese air strikes across the 17th parallel, in North Vietnam, and of the employment of U.S. bombers and crews within South Vietnam, was to strengthen the will of the South Vietnamese ground forces to resist the Communists. Military and civilian sources report that the strikes have, indeed, encouraged the South Vietnamese. After all the talk in the United States of negotiation, withdrawal, and neutralization, this showing of U.S. determination to fulfill President Kennedy's and President Johnson's promise to go all the way to help South Vietnam remain independent has bolstered the morale of the military and of those civilians in South Vietnam who care.

The war in South Vietnam, of course, cannot be won by air strikes alone. As time goes on, however, positive results of this aerial support of the ground forces should become evident. Those who say the war is already lost may have to revise their opinion. The Vietcong are not supermen.

PENTAGONIAN PUSSYFOOTING

(By Richard Starnes)

Scarcely a month ago as the truth-seeking hindsight flies, U Thant stirred up the conditioned reflexes that lurk in all editorial pages when he said the American people "if they know the true facts, will feel that further bloodshed is unnecessary and that negotiations alone can create conditions which would enable the United States to withdraw gracefully" from Vietnam.

A lot of chronically short fuses sputtered angrily at the suggestion the American people are not being told the score in Vietnam, and poor Uncle T. was compelled to issue a statement that appeared to disavow what he'd said the day before. Close reading (a dying art in our soap-selling culture) discloses that the Secretary-General didn't really recant at all. But he seemed to and thus honor was saved.

Now we find that U Thant was uttering prophetic truth of a high order.

The American people are not being told the truth about the clandestine war that is being carried out against North Vietnam. American reporters have been arrested by U.S. troops (a circumstance that would have caused an outraged cry in a more vigorous day) and they have been denied access to news, at its source in Vietnam.

Reporters have been forbidden access to officers' clubs and mess facilities at the Da Nang Air Base and in the city of Da Nang.

This sort of totalitarian abuse never occurred in the blackest days of World War II. The theory in that war was that the people who were paying for it and sending their sons to die in it were entitled to know about it.

Rump-sprung old correspondents flew combat missions, landed on beaches, shared the dangers, with the tough young kids who did the fighting. Ray Clapper and Ernie Pyle, to name just two of a gallant and tragic company, died in combat—armed with nothing but their determination to see the truth and write it.

There is no security consideration in the news controversy in Vietnam. War reporters exercise built-in precensorship; indeed all willingly submit to more formal censorship when circumstances demand it. But pruning potentially harmful facts from copy and choking news off at the source are two vastly different things. In the first instance, the enemy is properly deprived of information that might help him. In the second, it is the American people who are kept in shameful ignorance.

Defense Secretary Robert McNamara, who once shuttled between Saigon and Washington like an optimistic yo-yo, has long been displeased by the nature of the reporting from Vietnam.

Some weeks ago Mr. McNamara instituted a dangerous innovation by offering selected stateside journalists free 10-day junkets to Saigon, where they were to be met by military shepherds and shown any aspect of the war they wanted to see. I have been unable to learn if this determination to show everything to these U.S.-subsidized reporters included the air base at Da Nang, or in any event if it still includes it.

The official rationale of this experiment in news management was in exquisitely poor taste. It was to the effect that the arrival of handpicked squads of fresh—and inexperienced—reporters in Saigon would encourage resident correspondents to go more into the field and see what the war was really about. This, to be sure, was a thinly veiled libel of a courageous group of newsmen. Some (including Scripps-Howard's Jim Lucas) have spent far more days in combat than many American troops now in Vietnam.

These circumstances bring into sharp question the reliability of the accounts of the war that are being made available to the American people. Many air raids against North Vietnamese targets are now recounted only by Radio Hanoi—a bitter commentary on the present Pentagonian view of the people's right to know.

[From the Oregonian, Apr. 1, 1965]

ASIAN NOVELIST CRITICIZES UNITED STATES
VIETNAM POSITION

WILLAMETTE UNIVERSITY, SALEM.—United States action in Vietnam is promoting communism and "you should pay attention to your Senator, WAYNE MORSE, on the Vietnam

issue," claimed Dr. Han Suyin in talks at Willamette University, Tuesday.

Dr. Han, a doctor of medicine and successful novelist who knows many of Asia's leaders personally, criticized U.S. policy and actions in Vietnam and said "you're not reassuring your friends, you're frightening them and consequently losing them."

Dr. Han, who lives in Malaya, backed Morse's position calling for United States withdrawing a solution that she feels is necessary to achieve the ends which the United States claims to be seeking in Vietnam.

Her comments came during informal talks to students following a morning address on "The Many Faces of Asia," as part of the Willamette lecture series.

UNITED STATES SAID MISINFORMED

Dr. Han indicated that the United States is sadly misinformed on the Vietnam situation and that citizens in general are trying to take a short cut to knowledge on the basis of mass communication that still doesn't present the whole situation.

In speaking on the many faces of Asia, Dr. Han stated that the "bedrock problem of Asia today is that it did not invent the steam engine."

"While the western world has been involved in an industrial revolution for the past 400 years, only in the last 100 years has Asia begun to emerge from the feudal age in a struggle to assume its identity in the world."

POVERTY PREVALENT

Dr. Han indicated that 80 percent of the Asian population lives in the countryside, where peasants stagnate at the level of poverty.

"But," she added, "the peasant no longer accepts the problems of poverty as God-given; he knows they are from the hand of man."

Land reform was seen as a necessity before any industrial revolution and "we cannot look forward to anything but change and turmoil for at least the next two decades."

TRADE, NOT AID

"Trade, not aid," is the motto of Asia she declared. Restrictive tariffs have hindered external markets for Asian goods and poverty hinders internal markets.

She said any form of government that offers some measure of security, some measure of prosperity to the many people who are starving, will have the people's support.

"It is good for Americans to talk of freedom and democracy, but the word freedom is unknown to the peasant—it is not even in his language. He has only the freedom to starve," she said.

There has to be an overwhelming drastic reform in Asia from the bottom up. And it's not going to be attained by means of arms or might, according to Dr. Han.

[From the Sunday Oregonian, Mar. 21, 1965]

WHOM TO BELIEVE?

The U.S. State Department's so-called White Paper on Vietnam sought to document with records, reports, interviews and photographs its charge of "a brutal campaign of terror and armed attack" in South Vietnam "inspired, directed, supplied and controlled by the Communist regime in Hanoi" (capital of North Vietnam).

The document was unconvincing to Miss Angela V. Lane, whose letter appears on this page, and to some others who have communicated with the editor. Their general view appears to be that the United States has no business in South Vietnam; that the trouble is domestic, without proof of North Vietnamese aggression, and would be settled by the South Vietnamese themselves if the United States got out.

The State Department's report, the second on Vietnam, employs the usual strong statements of government propaganda support-

ing the government's position. But it also includes specific evidence to back up its charges. We see no reason to accept the doubts of the pacifists or the charges of anti-American propagandists as more valid than the evidence submitted by our own Government.

Miss Lane cites appendix D and her tabulation of 179 Communist-made weapons captured from the Vietcong. This was a list of weapons submitted to the International Control Commission by the government of South Vietnam on January 29, 1964. She does not document her statement that the reported weapons were only 2½ percent of the captured Vietcong weapons "during the same period." But the State Department reports elsewhere in the paper, for example, the capture of approximately 100 tons of arms, ammunition and supplies brought into South Vietnam by a single trawler. The White Paper gives examples of infiltration, of which appendix D is a sample.

Reports from correspondents, American and others, and from military personnel in the field support the statements of the White Paper in section II (to which appendix D refers, incidentally).

These are, in brief, that the Vietcong relied chiefly on weapons and ammunition left by the defeated French when the V-C campaign began in 1959, and that Ho Chi Minh's troops in North Vietnam were supplied mainly from the same source.

"As the military campaign progressed, the Vietcong depended heavily on weapons captured from the Armed Forces in South Vietnam," the White Paper continues. "This remains an important source of weapons and ammunition for the Vietcong. But as the pace of the war has quickened, requirements for up-to-date arms and special types of weapons have risen to a point where the Vietcong cannot rely on captured stocks * * *. Large and increasing quantities of military supplies are entering South Vietnam from outside the country. The principal supply point is North Vietnam, which provides a convenient channel for materiel that originates in Communist China and other Communist countries."

The White Paper may be subject to criticism—it does give evidence of having been thrown together in a hurry to meet a demand throughout the country for justification of the U.S. presence in Vietnam. But we see nothing in it to support Miss Allen's assertion that it is a "white-wash of the real facts." On the contrary, more recent evidence from the field is that the movement into South Vietnam of North Vietnamese soldiers and weapons has been greater than the State Department charged.

[From the Oregonian, Mar. 22, 1964]

DOWN THE ESCALATOR

As U.S. persecution of the war in Vietnam moves up the escalator, public knowledge of what is going on moves down. At the very time information is most important to the American people, U.S. officials in the Pentagon and in Vietnam clamp tighter the lids on such information.

Public knowledge of the course developments are taking at this critical stage depends on the 115 accredited correspondents in Vietnam. Time and again it has been proved that their reports have been more reliable than those channeled through self-serving military and diplomatic sources.

In the past few days correspondents have been arrested for venturing into sensitive areas. Each of the 115 has been subjected to a babysitting procedure—one information officer per correspondent. In effect, every source of information is screened. Not even in World War II was official monitoring so tight as it has become at some points in Vietnam.

The U.S. operation in Vietnam needs all the public support it can muster in America

and throughout the world. It will not get that support by treating U.S. news correspondents in Vietnam as spies.

[From the Oregonian, Mar. 26, 1965]

RED CHINA'S THREAT

Should Red China carry out its threat to send its troops into Vietnam it could not expect to be granted, as in the Korean war, a privileged sanctuary in China. Yet the U.S. Government would be fat-headed, indeed, to disregard the threat. U.S. bombers could wipe out 100 million Chinese and there still would be 450 million or more to contend with.

What Mao Tse-tung may be considering this time is not the potential of a privileged sanctuary, but the possibility that the United States would not again, as it did at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, resort to nuclear bombs. Of course, the United States has no desire to bomb Red China even with conventional explosives. And almost certainly the use of nuclear weapons, which might bring the Soviet Union into a world catastrophe, could only be justified by a desperate menace to the United States or its principal allies.

Red China qualified its threat by saying it would send a land army when requested by the Vietcong (not by President Ho Chi Minh of North Vietnam). This may not mean anything. If Red China decides to move, it will not be governed by the wishes of the Vietnamese either north or south of the 17th parallel. It would be fatuous for Americans to consider this an idle threat, we tended to do when Mao said he would spend North Korea if U.N. troops crossed the 38th parallel.

But the Vietcong's plea for world support against "American aggression," the Soviet uttering about "volunteers" and the Red Chinese threat may be evidence that U.S. policies of bombing the North Vietnam supply lines are bringing matters to a head. The prospect of a far bigger and meaner war could lead more quickly to a ceasefire and a conference table.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
March 26, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator.

DEAR SIR: I have written the Senators who do represent me but they have not chosen to take a stand against the criminal policy we are pursuing in Asia. I appreciate the daily argument you present from the floor of the Senate. You are acting from a moral standpoint and you are interested in establishing the basis for a world in which international law is regarded. I have no knowledge of the number of treaties the Soviets and Chinese have broken, but I do know that by our unilateral intervention in South Vietnam which violates the 1954 Geneva agreements and by our intervention in Laos which is in violation of accords to which we were a party, we are doing all we can to encourage, through our example, similar violations on the part of the states we normally accuse of being the ones most likely to violate international treaties.

But the problem is how do we get out of the present morass. Perhaps the President could make a statement to the effect that the information reaching him in the past was in error and that he has since found out the true nature of the Vietnamese situation and that having so become aware of true facts he now realizes just in time the best thing for the people of Vietnam is a U.S. withdrawal under the condition that the country be unified under the leadership of the north and that the further aid we would send would be in the form of materials to rebuild the country we have destroyed. This would be a voluntary reparation; it would give us more "face" than any other plan of engagement I can think of. It sounds

absurd for many reasons but what other way out is there for us now that the war is on the brink of a full-scale limited action.

The point of this is that we are now in too far for the north to back down. That is, of course, making the assumption which is probably in error that the North Vietnamese have the power to stop the guerrilla war in the south.

Perhaps what we need around the Capital is a bunch of lobbyists whose vested interest is the establishment of new relations between the states so that the developing countries would become customers of our factories who sell the means of production instead of just the product. If there were some voice other than the interests of those who stand to gain by the continuation of our present relationship with the underdeveloped world, that is, where we buy the primary products, then perhaps there would be enough steam for us to lead in decolonization instead of allowing the Communists preempt the field.

Sincerely,

DONALD R. WASKEY.

THE CONGREGATION MISHKAN ISRAEL,

Hamden, Conn., February 22, 1965.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: I am enclosing a reproduction of an advertisement which appeared on Friday in the New Haven Journal Courier, the New Haven Register, and today in the Yale Daily News. This petition was circulated within only 3 days' time and yet it represents a group of prominent New Haven citizens, all of whom voted for you in the last election.

In November, I departed from my own usual practice and publicly endorsed your candidacy from my pulpit, even though I had heretofore never used the pulpit for partisan politics. I spoke on your behalf because I believed that you represented the voices of sanity and decency in our Nation. I still feel this way and I am proud of your many achievements.

At the same time, like so many Americans, I deplore the military approach that our Government is using to solve the problems of Vietnam. Only today, Senator Goldwater complimented you on our recent bombing raids and went even further, suggesting the bombing of Hanoi but the American people voted for you and not for Senator Goldwater. Had they wanted his policies to prevail, they had the opportunity to elect him.

May I respectfully request that you reconsider our present actions in Vietnam and be willing to negotiate, in or outside of the United Nations, to make peace in that unhappy country and to secure an enduring peace among the nations.

Sincerely,

RABBI ROBERT E. GOLDBURG.

AN OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT JOHNSON

"We will never negotiate out of fear, but we will never fear to negotiate."

—President JOHN F. KENNEDY.

We support the appeal of the Secretary General of the United Nations U Thant, calling on the countries involved in the conflict in Vietnam to move "from the field of battle to the conference table" in or outside the U.N.

We believe that the military approach cannot lead to a real solution or serve the best interests of our Nation and that expansion of the war by any party threatens the peace of the world.

Merton C. Bernstein, Yale Law School.
Brereton W. Bissell, Human Relations Council.

Walter Brooks, New Haven.

Roger Burnham, Milford.

Rev. David Byers, Wider City Parish.

Mrs. Margaret Casanova, Hamden.

Dr. Arthur D. Chiel, Rabbi, Cong. B'nai Jacob.

Mrs. Shulemitch Chernoff, New Haven.

Rev. William C. Coffin, Jr., Chaplain, Yale University.

Edward W. Cohen, Woodbridge.

George Conklin, Woodbridge.

Prof. Robert Dahl, Yale University.

Mrs. John B. Dick, New Haven.

Rev. Wade Eaton, Christ Church, New Haven.

Rev. Dr. Erwin D. Edmonds, Dixwell Congregational Church.

Prof. Thomas I. Emerson, Yale Law School.

Mrs. Ruth C. Emerson, North Haven.

Dr. Estelle E. Feldman, New Haven.

Dr. and Mrs. Stephen Fleck, Hamden.

Mr. Florence Frank, New Haven.

Laurence R. Freedman, M.D., Hamden.

Mr. and Mrs. Saul Friedler, New Haven.

Rev. Robert Forsberg, Wider City Parish.

Rabbi Robert E. Goldberg, Temple Mishkan Israel.

Paul Goodwin, Woodbridge.

Prof. Robert L. Jackson, Yale University.

Harry Klein, M.D., New Haven.

Mr. and Mrs. Bernard P. Kopkind, New Haven.

Rev. Robert W. Keeling, Spring Glen.

Kathleen and Kenneth Kuenster, New Haven.

Robert La Camera, M.D., New Haven.

Joseph Lalor, New Haven.

Prof. Paul Laviertes, M.D., Yale Medical School.

Prof. Robert Jay Lifton, M.D., Yale University.

Mrs. Betty Jean Lifton, Woodbridge.

Dr. and Mrs. Milton Lisansky, Hamden.

Rev. Sidney Lovett, Chaplain Emeritus, Yale University.

Prof. Stoughton Lynd, Yale University.
Rabbi Jordan F. Ofsayer, Congregation Beth-El.

Edward M. Opton, Woodbridge.

Herbert Paris, North Haven.

Mrs. Anita Pepper, New Haven.

Rev. William M. Philpot, Community Baptist Church, Hamden.

Irwin H. Pollack, New Haven.

Rev. Dr. Liston Pope, Yale Divinity School.

Mrs. Miriam Pouzner, Hamden.

Prof. Charles A. Reich, Yale Law School.

Mrs. Celia D. Rostow, Hamden.

Mr. and Mrs. Leonard E. Sampson, Woodbridge.

Mrs. Shirlee Schaffer, Woodbridge.

Dr. and Mrs. Jerome M. Serling, Hamden.

Prof. Albert J. Solnit, M.D., Yale Medical School.

Mrs. Martha Solnit, Hamden.

Mr. and Mrs. Robert C. Spodick, Woodbridge.

Jody Stadler, New Haven.

Dan Stewart, New Haven.

Prof. Clyde W. Summers, Yale Law School.

Earl F. Vaughn, Hamden.

Rev. Wallace T. Viets, First Methodist Church.

Mrs. Laurel F. Vlock, Woodbridge.

Richard Weirnerman, M.D., Yale Medical School.

Prof. Paul Weiss, Yale University.

Donald Wendell, Human Relations Council.

Hubert C. H. Woodward, New Haven.

Prof. Arthur C. Wright, Yale University.

Prof. Mary C. Wright, Yale University.

Ronald Zimmerman, Woodbridge.

We urge all like minded people to write or wire their views to President Johnson, Secretary Rusk and Senators Dodd and Ruskoff.

Organizations or titles listed are for purpose of identification only.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to say to my friend, the Senator from Montana, that there is no question that an international conference has to be held to stop the war in Asia. To be effective it must have a third power force at the head of the table. Let us

April 21, 1965

7914

face it. Although the President talked about unconditional discussion, he really talked about bilateral discussion. There is no hope of settling the war by bilateral discussion. Does any Senator believe that North Vietnam and Red China would come to a conference table with their diplomatic tails between their legs? The very sitting down at such a conference under the proposal of the President would require first a surrender, and those countries have no more intention of surrendering than we or the South Vietnamese do.

For that reason, the majority leader is sound when he calls attention to the fact that Russia and Great Britain have the authority to reconvene a Geneva Conference. I point out most respectfully to our foreign allies that our allies have the authority under the United Nations Charter also to bring the third party force of the United Nations to the head of the table.

We shall have to come to such a procedure under international law unless we are going to lead mankind into a massive war. I say, with all solemnity, that the senior Senator from Oregon is satisfied, from what he has heard within the administration, that if we follow our present course of action in southeast Asia, 12 months from today there will be several hundred thousands of American troops in Asia and there will be thousands of them coming back in coffins. That is how serious I think the situation is.

My plea—and I am not ashamed to plead for peace—is a plea for an honorable peace under the application of the rules of international law. We cannot apply those laws while making war.

We cannot apply those rules of international laws while at the same time we resort to the law of the jungle. I would have the representatives of my Government read Lippmann, for Lippmann makes a devastating case against the administration's policies in the two articles that I have asked to have printed in the RECORD and the one by him that I had inserted last week.

Senators talk about the Geneva Accords. As Lippmann has pointed out, is it our argument now that there is a de facto government in South Vietnam? "Watch out," says Lippmann, "for that argument, for if you are going to argue that there is a de facto government in South Vietnam, then East Germany is a de facto government because it, too, has existed for over 10 years."

No, Mr. President. The Geneva Accords did not set up a government in either North or South Vietnam. The Geneva Accords set up two zones—no government, North or South. The United States set up a puppet government in South Vietnam. The United States took a Washington-trained South Vietnamese by the name of Diem to South Vietnam and put him in power, financed him, militarized him, and then, when he blew out as far as his leadership was concerned, we proceeded to support another puppet, and then another puppet, and one puppet after another.

We talk about having been invited into South Vietnam by an independent gov-

ernment of South Vietnam. There has never been an independent government in South Vietnam. Since the Geneva Accords there has been a series of American puppet governments. That is why we have stood in violation of the Geneva Accords from the very beginning, as has North Vietnam and, in my judgment, Red China, too, as well as the South Vietnamese and the Vietcong. In fact, most people still do not seem to know that the International Control Commission has so declared.

Are we going to be big enough as a Nation to recognize that we have committed wrongs in South Vietnam? Are we going to be big enough as a Nation to return to our ideals and say to the world that we are now ready to sit down at an international conference table, not controlled by the United States, not controlled by Red Russia and North Vietnam or Red China, or the Vietcong, or the South Vietnamese but a conference table at the head of which sit the representatives of the noncombatants?

In my judgment, that is our only hope to avoid a war, because we are about to escalate it now by sending over there increasing thousands of American men. We shall leave the Asiatics no choice but to respond. I fear that we shall be bogged down there for 10, 20, or 25 years, and then there will be no victory, because a military victory will not produce a peace.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the Senator from Oregon is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. MORSE. We have reached the time in the history of mankind when wars can no longer produce peace, because new modern weapons are so devastating that they are bound to entrench people for hundreds of years in hatred for those who they will feel are the cause of the war.

Let us face up to it today. The Asiatic people will hate the United States for centuries if we continue our course of action in Asia. I have never advocated, and do not now advocate, the United States getting out of Asia. I am pleading for others to come in. I say to the Prime Minister of Great Britain, "It is nice to have your words."

I say to the Prime Minister of Canada, "It is nice to have your words."

I say to the Prime Minister of Italy, who is now in this country, "It is nice to have your words. But where are your men?"

Where are the British soldiers, the Canadian soldiers, the Italian soldiers, and the soldiers of all the other countries that are patting us on the back, egging us on? But their soldiers are not dying in South Vietnam. I am calling not for them to come in to make war; I am calling them to come in to keep the peace, as we keep the peace, through the United Nations, in the Gaza strip, in Cyprus, and have kept it in the Congo. I have been pleading for an end to war-

making in Asia and the substitution of peacekeeping. I am calling for as many divisions of men from as many countries as necessary to enforce a cease-fire order in Asia.

Mr. President, I am pleading for America to rededicate herself to the great ideal that Franklin Roosevelt set out in Cairo and Teheran 20 years ago—an ideal that was blocked from implementation by Great Britain—when Franklin Roosevelt called for an international trusteeship of Indochina. I am calling for an international conference with noncombatants sitting at the head of the table and the combatants on the two sides to try to see what we can do to set up a rule of law in Asia—honorable in its implementation to both sides—under which the third party force, through the United Nations, would maintain the peace in Asia until the happy day comes when the combatants can lay down the arms and there will be war no more. I am pleading for the nations of the world to all work together in trying to establish the seedbeds of economic freedom in Asia, so that the people can themselves, of their own volition, develop political freedom over the years.

That means that the nations of the world must maintain a peacekeeping force there—I care not how many divisions—so that there will be no massacre of human beings on either side of the dispute. The senior Senator from Oregon pleads for an honorable negotiated treaty whereby the South Vietnamese will not be massacred by the thousands or the Vietcong by the thousands.

Let us not forget that the Vietcong are a party to the dispute. They happen to be the controlling force in much of South Vietnam, controlling more than 75 per cent of the land area. I am advised that if an election were held in South Vietnam today, Ho Chi-minh would undoubtedly be elected president of both South and North Vietnam as would have been the case in 1956 when the United States prevented the very election called for by the Geneva Accords of 1954.

Let us extricate ourselves from this situation by insisting that others come in and establish the international conference for which I have pleaded for more than a year and a half on the floor of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional 30 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Oregon is recognized for an additional minute.

Mr. MORSE. I introduced certain material in the RECORD today, for it is my answer to reactionary columnists such as Mr. Chamberlain, whose column has charged me in effect with aiding and abetting the Communists. To those of us who raise our voices for peace I should like to say, "You must get ready for that kind of castigation." It constitutes a resurgence of McCarthyism. Mr. Chamberlain has not pointed out that the material I have introduced cited in the free press of the free cou-

tries of the world; of course, it will be cited in the Communist press. But my voice will continue to be raised, no matter how much castigation I receive from reactionaries and warmongers such as the Chamberlains in this country and others of his stripe. I shall continue to plead for an honorable peace before it is too late. I shall continue to try to help lead my country to a peaceful solution of this war crisis which, in my judgment, if it is escalated, can threaten the future of all mankind.

OUR MAJORITY LEADER MOVES FOR SANITY IN
SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. GRUENING subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today our distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], a noted expert on the Far East, made an important declaration on a subject which should be in the minds of all Americans—the undeclared war in southeast Asia. I commend the Senator from Montana for bringing up the subject, because there has been great need for debate in this body and elsewhere in the Nation. Debate has been going on in various colleges, but so far it has been conspicuously absent from the place where it really belongs—in the Congress of the United States.

Senator MANSFIELD began by saying:

It is time for some blunt words on Vietnam.

I agree.

He went on to say that while there is a great deal of talk about what the President meant or did not mean by his speech at Johns Hopkins University, on April 7, the bloodshed goes on, and people in both North and South Vietnam are dying.

He called for a cease-fire, for which the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and I have been asking for over a year, so that there would be a reasonable chance of a peaceful settlement and a cessation of the slaughter.

He suggested that the conferences suggested for Cambodia might very well be extended to a discussion of the Vietnam situation.

Certainly, all rationally minded people should want to find a peaceful solution to a steadily escalating conflict which is on the eve of involving us in a major war possibly a thermonuclear holocaust. Every suggestion to prevent this should be gratefully received.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has rightly expressed the hope that the world will read and take note of what our distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] has said. Senator AIKEN correctly stated, in his comment, that it was plainly evident that unless reason returned, we would be headed into the most devastating conflict the world has ever known, and that we will not come out of it covered with glory because no one can win that kind of a war. I fully agree with the able Senator from Vermont.

I compliment the majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD]. I join the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who also thinks, as he long has, that it is high

time that discussions be had so that reason and the rule of law might be allowed to prevail over the warhawks who, as the advisers to the President to whom he listens, seem to be in charge of our national destiny.

MINIMUM WAGE IN THE DISTRICT
OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there appeared in the Washington Post this morning a very fine editorial entitled, "Minimum Wage in D.C." I certainly share the opinion of the Washington Post that minimum wage and hours legislation is a very necessary ingredient to the District of Columbia antipoverty program. I ask unanimous consent that this excellent editorial be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

As one who has supported minimum wage legislation for a good many years, I am pleased and gratified with the tremendous general public support which exists in this city for improvements in minimum wage and hours conditions in the Nation's Capital. My colleagues will be interested to learn, I am sure, that the Washington Metropolitan Board of Trade recently withdrew its opposition covering a good many years to minimum wage and hours legislation. I am pleased that the Washington Board of Trade has seen fit to change its position on this very important matter and I wish to commend it for taking such action.

My colleagues will recall that I introduced S. 3233, a bill to improve wage and hours conditions in the Nation's Capital on May 1, 1962. I reintroduced the bill, S. 860 on February 19, 1963.

My Subcommittee on Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety, of which I have the privilege of being chairman, held public hearings on S. 860 on October 1, 4, and 8, 1963.

The Senate passed S. 860 on August 21, 1964, exactly as it was reported by the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia.

I have reintroduced the bill, S. 19, this year and plan to hold public hearings on the measure as soon as my schedule permits. The District of Columbia Board of Commissioners in recent weeks have had a minimum wage and hours bill introduced in the House of Representatives which is my bill with a few minor and technical changes in it.

I wish to commend Congressman MULTER and his subcommittee for the thoroughness in which his subcommittee has gone into this subject in recent weeks.

As I mentioned earlier, it is heartening to see the tremendous public support in the District of Columbia for new minimum wage and hours legislation. I wish to commend the Washington Metropolitan Board of Trade, organized labor, the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners, U.S. Department of Labor, League of Women Voters, religious and neighborhood organizations and the press for supporting much needed improvements in existing minimum wage and hours conditions in the District of Columbia.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 21, 1965]

MINIMUM WAGE IN D.C.

It is easy to get lost in the complicated details of the minimum-wage legislation for the District on which a House District subcommittee has been conducting hearings. But the principle behind these bills seems to us both simple and clear. A large number of people in this Capital City are working for less than a minimum living wage. That condition should not be allowed to continue.

The country is now thoroughly committed to minimum-wage laws. Four years ago Congress fixed the Federal minimum wage at \$1.25 per hour, although some of the groups covered by that law will not reap the full measure of its benefits until the coming fall. In these circumstances it would be highly unreasonable to talk of a lower minimum in this center of high living costs. On the other hand, it is estimated that at least 100,000 employees in the District are not covered by any minimum wage law at present and the wages of some are far below the \$1.25 figure. In these circumstances, a figure above \$1.25 per hour for local industries would seem to be premature.

Both the Multer bill and the District Commissioners' bill would, therefore, accept the \$1.25 figure as the goal to be attained. As previously amended by the subcommittee, however, the Multer bill would exclude from coverage more than 50,000 hourly employees and delay the full effectiveness of the \$1.25 floor for some until 1968. Far more desirable is the Commissioners' plan of comprehensive coverage and adjustment to the Federal minimum within 6 months.

The Commissioners' recommendation is similar to the bill passed by the Senate last year. It cannot be regarded as drastic. If the net result is to increase the cost of services now being rendered in hospitals, nursing homes, some educational institutions and so forth, the recipients of such services will have to make the necessary adjustments. It is not sound policy to subsidize such agencies through the payment of less than a living wage.

Another important provision of the Commissioners' bill would allow them to adjust the \$1.25 minimum wage to keep abreast of living costs, fair compensation and comparable work standards. Minimum wages should not be static while prices and economic conditions are constantly changing. It is necessary of course to relate the changes that can be made to specific findings on the part of administrative officials, but allowance for improvement as the economy itself improves should be regarded as vital.

This bill is a necessary part of the President's antipoverty program. It would be ironic indeed if a Congress which seems dedicated to the elimination of poverty elsewhere should remain indifferent to the payment of starvation wages in the Nation's Capital.

"WATER—THE ULTIMATE RESOURCE"—ADDRESS BY SENATOR
LEN B. JORDAN, OF IDAHO

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, no Member of the Senate is more experienced in the important field of water and water development than the distinguished junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN]. Senator JORDAN has had a long lifetime of active interest in water problems, questions of reclamation, and reclamation development. He served as a distinguished Governor of his State. He graces this Chamber as an able member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

April 21, 1965

Mr. President, you will recall with me that during the administration of President Eisenhower, Senator JORDAN's services were used in Afghanistan with respect to that country's urgent problems of water development.

On April 13, 1965, Senator JORDAN spoke before the Pacific Northwest Trade Association at Portland, Oreg., on the subject "Water—The Ultimate Resource." It is an extremely thoughtful address. Senator JORDAN devotes himself to a number of specific questions that are of concern not alone to the Pacific Northwest but to each State in the American Union, as well.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of the address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The address is as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR LEN B. JORDAN BEFORE THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST TRADE ASSOCIATION PORTLAND MEETING ON "WATER—THE ULTIMATE RESOURCE," APRIL 13, 1965

I am pleased to participate with the members of the Pacific Northwest Trade Association in this, your 53d conference, on the important subject of water.

Your fine organization is commended for the excellent public service it has rendered back through the years in providing a forum for discussion of current problems.

This is the third time I have been privileged to speak to you and I sincerely hope that my remarks here today will be of interest to you.

Water is more than a natural resource—it is a necessity of life. Here in the United States we have lived more than 200 years before the water problem became generally acute. But the uses we make of water in modern society are so tremendous that they stagger the imagination.

The coming of our industrial era, the raising of our living standards, and the increased application of water to land have now highlighted the problems until in much of the Nation there is grave and increasing concern over water resources.

Planning for the development of water resources has undergone a marked evolution during the past 50 years. At the turn of the century the use of water resources was planned largely on a single-purpose, single-project, single-agency basis. Too frequently other equally important uses of water were overlooked. This was because no agency was authorized to plan for comprehensive development. Each carried out its specific function as prescribed by law.

The local people, through established agencies, such as State water resource boards and/or interstate compact commissions should have an effective voice, along with the Federal agencies in this planning which would recognize and properly weigh all the varied and sometimes contrary programs affected by the proposed development of water resources.

Here in the Northwest we are especially favored with an abundance—sometimes a superabundance—of potable water. This is not to say that our water is always available in the right place at the right time. The problems of distribution are always with us. How to capture nature's rainfall on our watersheds and then by proper storage and supply management mold this water resource to best achieve its multipurpose benefits is a real challenge, but one that is richly rewarding. These multipurpose benefits must include domestic, industrial, reclamation, power, navigation, recreation and fish and wildlife. No longer can we tolerate single purpose planning.

One basic point I wish to emphasize early in this statement is the interdependence of land and water. Any serious study or planning for one must necessarily and inevitably involve the other. Sound water resource development depends first of all on a healthy, well-maintained watershed. This is of primary importance.

Several years ago I spent a summer in Afghanistan investigating the economic feasibility of a large reclamation development. There I found that centuries of watershed abuse had first removed all of the timber from the slopes and the higher elevations. Overgrazing had contributed to the destruction of the brush and grass cover, leaving insufficient vegetation to retard the runoff. Erosion was inevitable and devastating almost beyond belief. Soil movement had bared the hillsides to bedrock so that there was little more runoff retardation than from the roof of a building.

Masonry arched bridges perhaps a quarter of a mile long stood stark and desolate in the desert, mute evidence to the fact that a rampaging river had dammed its own channel by lodging debris against the bridge piers and then cutting a new channel as if in defiance of man's effort to contain it. At flood stage the river was a monster out of control. In the heat of summer when water was most needed the river would shrink to a docile, sluggish stream, an altogether inadequate fraction of its flood stage.

In Afghanistan I have seen drifting sand dunes uncover the houses of a village that was once the center of an irrigated agricultural community. Here are the ghosts of a civilization that perished for lack of water—a silent indictment of man's refusal to observe sound conservation practice.

This is where I learned more of the importance of watershed protection against complete ruination. Here it was indelibly printed in my mind that we cannot take for granted that water will always be available downstream, no matter how we abuse the watershed upstream.

In the Columbia basin most of the watershed is federally owned. This poses a real problem because the funds available for watershed protection on public lands are not adequate. Moreover, funds which provide technical assistance to private landowners for soil conservation have been substantially reduced in the administration's budget.

In order to protect our watersheds, sometime in the not too distant future, it may be necessary to levy against power sales for headwater conservation purposes, including additional storage. A very small assessment per kilowatt-hour on all power sold, public, private, Federal and non-Federal alike could provide a fund to keep the watersheds healthy. A prudent businessman employs similar methods to protect his long-range interest. No less prudent should be our approach to sound conservation and watershed protection.

A second point I wish to make is that there is no single uniform policy, no magic formula relating to water resources which can be applied to all parts of the country at all times and in all places. The problems involve particular needs and uses of water from State to State, from basin to basin, and from region to region.

While it is generally sound to plan coordinated development of water resources by large river basin areas, it is possible to place too much importance on this concept without giving full consideration to the States as sovereign units in basin complexes because the larger river systems have no respect for State lines. For example, basin planners must concede the validity of water rights that are protected under State law.

Too often the upstream States of a river basin are short changed in the allocation of benefits derived from main-stem plants downstream. A case in point is the Columbia Basin. Testimony before congressional com-

mittees indicates that some 13 million average kilowatts of hydroelectric power can be developed in the U.S. portion of the Columbia River Basin that will be cheaper than an alternate source. Most of this power development will be in the State of Washington or on its boundary. Yet the watersheds of the State of Washington will supply but a small part of the water that passes through these main-stem turbines.

Washington watersheds contribute less than 3 percent of the water at Grand Coulee, 8 percent of the water at Chief Joseph, and 13 percent of the water at McNary. Thus, most of the water originates on upstream watersheds, but the downstream reclamation projects receive a lion's share of the benefits. Simple equity would call for a sharing of downstream benefits with upstream States which supply the water.

Insofar as upstream Canada is concerned the United States-Canada treaty gives recognition to the contribution that will be made by yet-to-be-built Canadian storage. A cash payment of more than one-quarter-billion dollars has been made by the United States to Canada. This will pay for Canada's entitlement to a share of increased production at U.S. plants downstream made possible by Canadian storage for a 30-year period. Bear in mind that not 1 gallon of new water will be added to the Columbia. What will be accomplished is a partial regulation of the streamflow, storing the flood peaks and releasing the water when normal streamflows are lowest. In addition Canada will receive \$64 million for flood control benefit to the United States.

This treaty is a great step forward in river basin planning. As a former Chairman of the U.S. section of the International Joint Commission, I was privileged to work on the early stages of the Columbia Treaty and I know first hand the months and years of assembling the basic data which preceded the additional months and years of hard bargaining. The significant fact is that an accord was reached and consummated in a treaty thus indicating, at the international level, a meeting of trained minds as to the value of upstream watershed and storage resources.

Likewise the upstream watershed and storage resources of Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, and Oregon make a contribution similar to, and perhaps even greater than, that to be made by Canada.

Now someone will probably challenge this comparison on the basis that much of the U.S. headwater storage is for reclamation and that part of this water is consumptively used. The answer is that the purpose of upstream storage is to capture the floods or at near the source and to release the stored waters as needed.

Irrigation accomplishes this purpose admirably. Even the water that is lost by transpiration or evaporation is returned in the form of added precipitation. Only that small part which becomes a part of the plant is truly lost.

In Idaho, on the Snake River alone, we have between 8 and 9 million acre-feet of storage now through reclamation projects. Two-thirds of this water returns to the Snake River during its low flows. Thus, by shaping and improving the runoff pattern, reclamation contributes substantial flood control benefits and hydropower benefits as well.

At the present time no provision is made for upstream States to share in downstream benefits and there is no provision in the law for such a sharing. Nor is there any provision in the law that would prohibit some such arrangement as a Columbia Basin project account through which upstream reclamation projects might share in the downstream power revenues as an aid to reclamation beyond the ability of the water user to pay. This is not an unreasonable arrangement.

Let us review briefly, the evolution of reclamation law. The basic reclamation law

to establish the headquarters of the organization in the United States.

Most specialized agencies of the U.N. are headquartered elsewhere. The International Court of Justice is at The Hague; UNESCO is in Paris; WHO is in Geneva; FAO is in Rome; and so on. The original buildings of the League of Nations in Geneva are now extensively used by the United Nations for a variety of meetings. Several years ago the Soviet Union suggested moving the U.N. Headquarter to Moscow because of some incidents of discrimination against several African Ambassadors in New York.

The U.N. could establish its headquarters outside of the United States. There are those who would not only move the U.N. out of the United States but who would have us get out of the U.N. and construct a solid wall between ourselves and the peoples of the Communist world. They want a wall of implacable hostility and rigidity, a Berlin wall in reverse.

Obviously, this is impossible in the 20th century. We cannot stop the world and get off. A major effort of our foreign policy is to carry into world affairs what we have learned here at home: how men and women of different national backgrounds, of different religions, of different regions, of different cultures and colors, and of different politics, can somehow manage their lives without murdering each other most of the time.

The existing international organization through which we seek these objectives is the United Nations. These are the purposes spelled out in the U.N. Charter. The Preamble and the first two articles of the charter are but a restatement of our own Declaration of Independence. That is why such an overwhelming number of Americans are proud of the fact that no nation in the world has given more positive leadership or greater support to the U.N. than has our own country.

Most human beings prefer peace to war, and practically all of them would rather be alive than dead. Yet in every part of the world, men and women have been brought up to regard war between nations as something inevitable. But war is obsolete. Nuclear war, if it is ever waged, may prove to be incompatible, not only with civilization, but perhaps with human survival.

Yes, we could move the U.N. out of the United States, but we cannot move the United States out of the U.N. Like it or not, we are in the world to stay. It is the one existing international organization where men of all nations can meet and talk and disagree, but where hopefully they can finally resolve their differences without a war that nobody wants.



EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 21, 1965

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a series of articles on Vietnam by J. A. Dear, who has been on the ground in South Vietnam and in the area of operations. Mr. Dear is president of Dear Publication & Radio, is a distinguished correspondent, and his reports will be of great value to the Congress and to the committee. The reports have appeared in many papers. I send to the desk the

series of articles from the Henderson Gleaner-Journal, Henderson, Ky., for insertion in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIETNAM: THE WAR WITHOUT FRONTLINES
(By J. A. Dear)

EDITOR'S NOTE.—J. A. Dear, president of Dear Publication & Radio Inc., is on a tour of the Far East. This dispatch is the first of a special series on Vietnam where Dear observed the war first hand.

SAIGON, VIETNAM.—Almost every night the heavy air of this hot city throbs with the sound of artillery and mortar fire in the suburbs.

Duc Hoa, only 12 miles from the center of the city, is thought of in Washington as a striking example of how successful the pacification program can be. But in fact Americans go there by day and leave at sundown.

SAIGON, VIETNAM.—Almost every night the heavy air of this hot city throbs with the sound of artillery and mortar fire in the suburbs. Saigon, which hasn't been painted in years, retains an aura of seedy elegance. Coupled with the bustle of a booming black market and a vigorous night life, this dulls the sense of danger. Most Americans check their guns when they come to the city.

WAR IS EVIDENT

But everyone is very conscious of the war, which can be grim. In the north, for example an army officer with the Special Forces was caught by the Vietcong, who skinned him.

At the lonely outposts of the Special Forces life is difficult and dangerous. The lot of Army men serving as advisers to the regional and popular forces of Vietnam—our fellows call them Roofpoofs—is no better. There is more safety at the larger installations, perhaps, but everywhere outside Saigon the paraphernalia of war is visible.

Not counting the men of the 7th Fleet, American forces in Vietnam total about 27,000. We have never fielded a finer team. Almost without exception they are optimistic, and take the view that withdrawal would be an unmitigated disaster for the United States. Incidentally, personnel of the State Department and Information Service are equally competent and dedicated, and for the most part, as optimistic.

But all are baffled. This is a war without frontlines. The enemy, until he chooses to show himself, is indistinguishable from friend. Arvin troops—American argot for the regular Army of Vietnam—are brave and endure high casualties without flinching. (Their losses, until recently, averaged more than 1,000 weekly.)

RED SPOOL PIGEONS

Beyond doubt, however, Arvin is riddled with Communists who tip off the Vietcong before offensive strikes get underway. It is a rare occasion that we get advance warning of Vietcong operations.

Moreover, we have to do everything at once. Government stability in Saigon is a precondition for military success, which in turn depends on active assistance from the peasants, whose support hinges on the reintroduction of effective local government and a viable local economy. Of course that is an impossibility without military success and sensible guidance from Saigon.

American Economic Aid (Eusom) is channeled to the local level. But a portion of every dollar the United States commits to support the government of Vietnam in fact supports the Vietcong. For example, aviation gasoline is transported to Pleiku, headquarters of the Arvin 2d Corps and a base for American helicopters, via highway 14 from Saigon. The commercial contractors who haul this gas pay a road tax imposed by the Vietcong, which controls the highways. A study to determine how much help the Vietcong gets from us has been undertaken. (We have also begun a study,

through the Rand Corp., to see what motivates the Vietcong.)

In some areas the Vietcong governs. Our grip on the central highlanders is tenuous. The coastal areas below the highlands are threatened. As inland towns and hamlets are cut off, thousands of refugees flee to the coast.

We budgeted enough money to care for 100,000 refugees this year. Already the camps are bulging with nearly 200,000 of them. Whether this is an insidious tactic of the Vietcong or an expression of people who are voting with their feet, no one knows.

REFUGEES POUR IN

With increasing frequency refugees of another category are stumbling to our lines. Mostly old men, women, and children, some horribly wounded, they are the survivors of American jet strikes against targets in Vietnam south of the 17th parallel. These are the villages that are humming with hate and fear, where the children are sullen and silent.

Air strikes against North Vietnam have raised the morale of American and Arvin forces. What else they have accomplished is at this point a matter of conjecture.

[From the Gleaner-Journal, Henderson, Ky.,
Apr. 3, 1965]

"WE'RE HOLDING OUR OWN" IN VIETNAM
(By J. A. Dear)

KIEN BINH, VIETNAM.—Far below, the cluster of steaming hamlets fade into the sameness of the landscape, a blur of delicate green, sluggish rivers, and countless canals.

We have just said goodbye and good luck to Maj. Ralph Waara, leader of the five man American advisory group at Kien Binh. This is delta country, one of the great Asian breadbaskets, whose people eat better than the Chinese, the Koreans, the Filipinos, the Japanese. Yet the delta is a stronghold of the Vietcong, and some areas, Ca Mau, the Yumin Forest, the Plain of Reeds have never been under the effective control of the Saigon government.

When a helicopter drops down at Kien Binh side gunners hunch over their machine guns. "Yes," said Major Waara, "it's not so bad now." Gesturing toward a scratchy patch of land, "they used to shoot at us from there." Armed men stand guard over the plane.

Some nights the Vietcong fire mortars at Major Waara's command compound. But gradually Government forces are pushing out from their shaky toehold. Their aim is to pacify the region by the end of the year.

CAPTAIN GETS CREDIT

Capt. Nguyen Van Huynh, a babyfaced officer of 32, who was deflected from his studies for the priesthood by war, should get the credit for whatever success the Government is having, according to Major Waara. "He's a remarkable man," said Waara. "Without him I don't think we'd be here. Puts out patrols at night. You know, they have a price of 500,000 piasters on his head." (That's about \$3,600 at the black market rate.)

The 55,000 people of Kien Binh live in an area of about 20 by 12 miles that is divided into 55 districts—10 of these districts are controlled by the government, 24 by the Vietcong, and 21 by no one. To conduct this campaign, Captain Huynh has 780 men, 200 of them fairly well trained members of the regional force, and 580 of them village volunteers of the popular force.

"We're holding our own and maybe better," said Major Waara. That's the assessment of most American officers everywhere in Vietnam. They note that the Vietnam, after getting clobbered in several engagements, is ducking set battles. But everyone agrees the Vietcong has the capability of striking hard. The question is when, and one theory is that the tempo of the war will increase with the advent of the rainy season.

April 21, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1909

does authorize the President to detail Armed Forces personnel to serve in a noncombatant capacity, but sets a ceiling of 1,000 as the number of such personnel that might be detailed at any one time even for such purposes.

CHARGE—A U.S. DICTATOR IS EMPOWERED TO DISBAND U.S. MILITARY FORCES

In 1961, the Congress of the United States created an agency called the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The Agency is in part under the direction of the State Department, but also reports to the Congress and to the President. Its Director is William C. Foster, a distinguished American industrialist.

The Agency is to seek agreements under which nations could safely reduce armaments. The United States has proposed that armaments be reduced in graduated stages under strict international supervision and control, while at the same time the peace-keeping machinery of the United Nations be built up. Although the law authorized the Disarmament Agency to negotiate disarmament agreements, it did not give the Disarmament Agency or the U.S. President or anyone else blanket authority to reduce U.S. Armed Forces or to place the security of the United States at the disposal of the United Nations.

Section 33 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act provides: "That no action shall be taken under this or any other law that will obligate the United States to disarm or to reduce or to limit the Armed Forces or armaments of the United States, except pursuant to the treaty-making power of the President under the Constitution or unless authorized by further affirmative legislation by the Congress of the United States."

Thus, any disarmament treaty negotiated by the President could become effective only through congressional action or Senate ratification, as required by the U.S. Constitution. Even the limited treaty banning the atmospheric testing of bombs came into force only after approval by a two-third vote of the U.S. Senate.

CHARGE—THE SOVIETS CONTROL THE U.N. SECRETARIAT

The key position of the Secretary General has been filled by a Norwegian, Trygve Lie; by a Swede, Dag Hammarskjold; and now by a Burmese, U Thant.

As of May 1, 1964, there were 19 posts in the Secretariat at the Under Secretary level or of comparable importance. Of the 19, 1 is from India; 1 is from the U.S.S.R.; 4 are from the United States; 1 is from the United Arab Republic; 1 is from France; 1 is from Yugoslavia; 1 is from Nigeria; 1 is from Greece; 1 is from New Zealand; 2 are from the United Kingdom; 1 is from Brazil; 1 is from Czechoslovakia; 1 is from Panama; 1 is from Burma; 1 is from China (Taiwan).

As of the same date, May 1, 1964, there was a total of 1,389 professional and executive positions at the U.N. Of that total, Americans held 255 or about 18 percent plus. If clerical staff is counted, the proportion is much higher. The U.S.S.R. citizens in executive or professional positions was less than 6 percent.

CHARGE—UNESCO IS A PART OF THE WORLD COMMUNIST CONSPIRACY

Since its founding 19 years ago, UNESCO has been a favorite target for those attacking the U.N. The most frequently repeated charge that UNESCO is part of the world Communist movement is through international control of education in the United States and elsewhere. UNESCO is charged with infiltrating and influencing U.S. public schools by brainwashing children and teaching "one worldism."

Ever since World War II, heroic efforts have been made to teach the whole world how to read. UNESCO was created to advance education throughout the world, as well as to further a better and more tolerant

understanding among nations and people. If these objectives are un-American or against our national interest, then we do not understand the spirit or basic philosophy of our country.

"TOWARD WORLD UNDERSTANDING"

One of the publications of UNESCO is entitled "Toward World Understanding." This booklet is alleged to contain the master plan for domination of American schools.

The volume is a collection of views of participants in education seminars. The charge that this booklet serves to foster "world government" in any way in the United States could not possibly be deduced from a reading of it by any reasonably minded person. It is true that the phrase, "world understanding," appears frequently. This phrase, of course, refers to a better mutual understanding of the peoples of other lands. Certainly such understanding is greatly needed in the world today. It is hard to conceive in what way it is inconsistent with the American way of life or the teaching of American citizenship.

Such a furor was raised over this particular booklet that a special committee of the American Legion undertook a study of it. It reported that it was about "as subversive as the tales of Hans Christian Anderson."

UNESCO'S charter, like that of the U.N. itself, specifically prohibits the Organization from intervening in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of its member states. Accordingly, UNESCO restricts itself to providing assistance only upon a direct request from the government of the member state concerned. The United States has never requested any UNESCO assistance for its public educational system. In the field of education, UNESCO's assistance is concentrated in the newly developing countries.

UNESCO publications (there are over 3,000 of them) are for sale in this country as in any other member nation. Any teacher, like any private citizen, may buy them. But no attempt has been made by UNESCO to force its materials on any teacher or any school board which, in our country's tradition, is responsible for the selection of any classroom materials. So far as can be determined, these materials have never been so used in the United States.

UNICEF

The attacks on UNICEF, the Children's Fund, have always been beyond comprehension. The organization was originally created upon Herbert Hoover's recommendation. He had gone to Europe immediately after World War II to survey the needs of the people in the war-ravaged countries. It was apparent that the children were the war's worst sufferers. To meet the emergency needs of children, the special agency, UNICEF, was created within the U.N.

In the first few years of its existence, UNICEF concentrated its aid to the children of the European countries that were most cruelly devastated in the war.

Many of these countries eventually fell behind the Iron Curtain. In 1950 UNICEF moved its emphasis from the war emergency areas to meeting the long-term health and nutrition needs of children in the underdeveloped countries, in Africa, in South America and in the Far East.

Are there children in Communist countries helped by UNICEF? Yes, of course. Children are children, including children in Poland and Yugoslavia, the two remaining European countries whose babies and mothers are receiving such aid. Should infants be required to take loyalty oaths? Ridiculous.

UNICEF believes, and the United States endorses this principle, that children who are starving or ill because of lack of medicine or medical care are entitled to help regardless of what kind of a political regime under which they happen to live. If a government requests assistance, if it agrees to accept cer-

tain responsibilities set by UNICEF, including freedom of the UNICEF staff to check on the distribution of supplies within the country, then assistance is forthcoming. It is given without regard to race, or religion, or political belief or national status.

Now what kind of a Communist takeover conspiracy is that?

THE POPULATION EXPLOSION VERSUS YOUNG DEATH

We hear much about the population explosion and dangers therefrom are alarming. The statistics of newborn life are startling. It has been estimated that three children are born into the vast human family every second of the day. By midnight tonight, more than 260,000 children will have come into being.

But the statistics of young death are equally startling. There are more than 1 billion children alive in the world today. Of that number, 850 million are faced with the evils of hunger, of poverty, of ignorance, of fear, of disease. In most families of mankind, childhood is not a time of play. It is a time of premature suffering and dying. In the new countries half of the children die before their fifth birthday. They are victims of what we would consider as anachronistic scourges such as leprosy, yaws, trachoma, and malaria. In our own country these diseases have become medical curiosities. It is said that there are very few doctors in the United States that have treated or even seen a case of smallpox.

The U.N., through UNICEF, seeks to improve these miserable conditions. It is for this purpose that UNICEF has carried on the trick-or-treat fundraising program on Halloween and has raised money through the famous greeting card and note paper program.

CHARGE—THE U.N. IS ATHEISTIC AND OPPOSES ALL RELIGIONS

The members of the U.N. include representatives of all the major religions on the face of the earth. No one is required to observe any religious practice or to prefer one religion over another. U.N. meetings open with 1 minute of silence for prayer or meditation. It is true that the U.N. Charter does not mention God. But neither is God mentioned in our own U.S. Constitution. Like the United States, the U.N. permits every man to be guided by his own conscience.

Perhaps the best response to this charge is the extensive support of the U.N. by the major Christian churches, Protestant and Catholic, as well as by Jewish congregations. Over 30 religious organizations, representing all faiths, maintain permanent observers accredited to the U.N.

The support of the Catholic Church has been widely publicized by the late Pope John XXIII in his universally proclaimed encyclical, "Pacem in Terris." Recently, Pope Paul appointed Msgr. Alberto Giovannetti as the Vatican's permanent observer to the U.N. He headquarters at the Holy Family United Nations Parish, 324 East 47th Street. The Protestant Church Center for the U.N. is at 44th Street and U.N. Plaza, directly across the street from the U.N. The Jewish Center for the U.N. is being constructed at the Sutton Place Synagogue and will complement the Holy Family Parish.

"GET THE U.N. OUT OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE UNITED STATES OUT OF THE U.N."

One of these days some major issue before the U.N. is going to be resolved in a manner unsatisfactory to this country. It is then that the hue and cry to "Get the United States out of the U.N. and the U.N. out of the United States" will again be heard.

New York City may not be the most logical place to house the organization. It was due to the generosity of the Rockefeller family in making the valuable tract of land in New York available that served as an inducement

SAFER IN LARGE TOWNS

Life in the larger towns where corps headquarters are set up—Vietnam is divided into four military districts—is easier and safer. Helicopters and advisory officers, are concentrated around the headquarters. But nobody's living it up, exactly.

Asian cities are poor, dirty, and disease ridden. (Many cases of the plague have been reported.) Since dependents were sent home life goes on without women, for the most part. (Queenie's and the place next to it are off limits.)

But even at headquarters area there is danger. At Pleiku, headquarters of the 2d Corps in the central highlands, about 100 Vietcong slipped through the scrub to attack Camp Holloway on February 7.

NATIVES ARE WARNED

Apparently every native in and around the camp knew the attack was coming, but we were unwarned. One informant from the Montagnard village where the Vietcong set up its mortars would have prevented the surprise. Local help at the base left promptly at sundown, and the cyclo drivers in Pleiku refused to take personnel back to the base.

"The apathy of the people is more of a problem than the Vietcong," one officer ruefully admitted. And after 20 years of war it does seem to be true that a majority of the population of Vietnam is uncommitted to either side.

This adds to the strain and perhaps the danger. But where there are as many guns as there now are in Vietnam, there is danger. On a passenger flight from Danang to Saigon there was only one item of cargo: a dead marine in a green sack off my left boot. He was shot and killed as he returned to his lines in the hills above the airbase by a fellow marine.

[From the Gleaner-Journal, Henderson, Ky.,
Apr. 4, 1965]

VIETNAMESE ARMY NOT STRONG ENOUGH TO
COPE WITH VIETCONG

(Third of a series)

(By J. A. Dear)

SAIGON, VIETNAM.—No American out here faults the fighting spirit of Vietnamese Army troops (Arvin).

On more than one occasion Arvin troops have continued attacking until wiped out. And remember, this is an army that is underfed, underled, seldom paid, gets no leave. Its nine regular divisions are served by 500 doctors; that means there are only 200 doctors to care for a civil population of 16 million.

Having said this, the truth can be set forth. Arvin is riddled with Vietcong agents; staff work is very poor; there is no personnel setup at all except for the bureau of psychology warfare, which should be concerned with the enemy. Some political generals are incompetent, but the most serious shortage is of qualified junior officers. Approximately one-third of the companies composing Arvin are shaky. Above all, there simply are not enough government troops in the field to cope with the Vietcong.

REPLACEMENTS WERE FEW

Part of the trouble has its origin in Saigon. As a result of the coups and demicoups, Arvin received almost no replacements until recently. Because about 40,000 men were lost in operations, this means a badly wounded Arvin had to face an enemy that has been continually nourished by supplies and men from the North.

The first coup, which led to the murder of Diem, had the greatest impact. During the sorry interval between Diem's death and the present regime of Dr. Quat, effective government came to a stop. Since this is a political war for the hearts and minds of people effective government at every level is essential.

The legitimacy of the present government is questionable, but American officials are not anxious to explore this murky area. Another violent coup might destroy our excuse for being here. We are here at the invitation of the Vietnam Government; there must be a government to be the guest of.

MANY POLITICAL FACTORS

The political factors of immediate consequence in Vietnam are generals, Buddhists, Catholics, and two other religious sects, the Hoa Hao and the Cao Dai. The Cao Dai, which venerates Christ, Buddha, and Victor Hugo, once fought Diem and the Communists. Fortunately, the Communists assassinated its leader, and now the Cao Dai is with the Government.

Prime Minister Quat is confident that only a few dissidents in the religious groupings oppose his government. He is also confident that a promising economic program has been evolved, and he is sure military leaders appreciate the importance of governmental stability.

At present there is no single military strong man on the scene. Big Minh of the first coup may return, but a five-member armed forces council now advises Dr. Quat.

KY IS COLORFUL COMMANDER

General Ky, colorful commander of Vietnam's air force, is one of the most important members of the council. General Thi, commander of I Corps, is an influential general though not a member of the council. General Co of II Corps, called "dancing master" because of his fondness for this pastime, is another name to remember. Incidentally, Co's acute criticism of the deployment of the Special Forces led to the development of new tactics.

The traditional enmity of the Vietnamese and Montagnard has caused serious trouble in the central highlands. Saigon has made concessions, but not before Y B'Ham Enoul, former Saigon deputy in the highlands, skipped to Cambodia after fomenting an abortive uprising.

Most encouraging of all, said Dr. Quat, is that "your country has settled on a policy for Vietnam, for a month ago you had none."

ASSUMPTIONS ARE PLAYING THEIR ROLE IN
SOUTHEAST ASIA BATTLE

(Fourth of a series)

(By J. A. Dear)

SAIGON, VIETNAM.—What are the considerations and thinking on which our policy here is based?

These are the assumptions: Southeast Asia is vital to American security. If Vietnam falls to Communist aggression, southeast Asia is lost.

In spite of obvious apathy to the war, the people of South Vietnam are by no means committed to the Communist regime in the north. There are hostilities between these regions we can exploit.

Likewise, there are differences between the Tokinese and Chinese that can be exploited. Even the most ardent Communist in Ho Chi Minh's government probably hopes North Vietnam can escape Chinese occupation.

Ho Chi Minh is indeed dependent on Red China. But to give his regime room for maneuver he plays Peiping against Moscow. If we hit him too hard, we push him into the hands of the Chinese. If we don't hit him hard enough, he has no incentive for easing his campaign against Vietnam.

If we threaten the destruction of Ho Chi Minh, we practically assure intervention by the Russians and the Chinese. Because of the parties of the situation, Moscow cannot stand on the sidelines if a Socialist state is threatened with destruction.

EQUATION CHANGES EVERY DAY

Thus, the air strikes against North Vietnam involve nice calculations. Further, the

equation changes every day. So much for the assumptions.

Hanoi's support of the Communists in the war here is no longer disputed, even by Hanoi. But the amount and importance of the aid received from the North is a matter of dispute.

The Ho Chi Minh trail, so called, traverses difficult terrain. It has not been photographed for television because cameramen cannot get equipment to it.

The triple-ply jungle—there are trees, with secondary growth above them, and beyond that an additional growth that is rooted in the trees themselves—cannot be penetrated more than 75 yards in one day by a young man in excellent physical condition. An athlete would be hard put to make more than 3 miles a day on known trails through this growth. And a trail unused for 6 days disappears.

TRIP TAKES ABOUT 60 DAYS

It is agreed that a Communist trooper from the North will not reach I Corps or II Corps, the northern military districts of Vietnam, in less than 30 days. Probably the trip takes about 60 days.

Now, what is the capacity of the Ho Chi Minh trail? One estimate is 1,000 men and 40 tons of equipment per month. Considering the nature of the country, this does not seem unreasonable, though some say it is too low by half.

It is admitted that anyone who has traveled the trail must rest up before combat. Also, Communist arms and men reach Vietnam by sea.

But this aid—and here we are back to assumption—is crucial. Without it the Vietcong would lose vital momentum and the Saigon Government would triumph.

That is the rationale underlying our policy.

THERE IS A WEAPON WE HAVE YET TO USE IN
VIETNAM: FOOD

(Fifth of a series)

(By J. A. Dear)

SAIGON, VIETNAM.—Nothing is lost until it is lost, in my opinion, unless you walk away.

In a nutshell, that's my thought about the miserable war.

Also, the other guy has real problems. Suppose you had to group 1,000 men for a battle 100 miles away, knowing that your communications were poor, that you didn't control the roads or the air, that your only transport was manback, that equipment had to be toted piecemeal, that your security hinged on the silence of everyone in villages your men had to sleep in, that your enemy could mobilize murderous firepower in minutes, and that you would face annihilation if caught in the open country? Well, that's the way it is for the Vietcong.

PROBLEMS OF OWN MAKING

For all that, we have problems too, and some of them of our own making. The most serious is that which results from our decision to embrace a strategy of terror.

That's what bombing is. It doesn't discriminate between soldiers and/or women and children. Especially, I have in mind American air strikes in South Vietnam. We are killing innocents almost every day. (Twenty-three structures and five water buffalo were destroyed, etc.)

Morality aside, can you think of a worse way to win the hearts and minds of people in a political war? Neither can I.

If we must be terrorists, let's be effective. And there is a weapon at hand we have not touched. Food.

NO WHEAT WITH A-BOMB

The technical achievements of the Communist world, including Red China, are impressive. But you can't grow wheat with an A-bomb.

Red China has the A-bomb, but not the wheat. At least she wouldn't have the wheat if Australia and Canada didn't sell it to her.

Why not stop this trade, if necessary by buying the entire wheat surplus of these allies? An accommodation with China might then be possible.

And we could abandon the strategy of terror that manufactures islands of humanity humming with hate and fear of Americans.

COULD HELP ECONOMY

At the same time, we could be breathing life into the economy of Vietnam, which is a surplus food country. Through Hong Kong, the showcase for Red China, go the water chestnuts, bamboo shoots, and so forth, that Chinese expatriates everywhere love. Vietnam could fulfill this need, given the chance.

We could do ourselves a good turn in Vietnam by becoming interested in education. That is what brought us victory in the Philippines, but the lesson has been forgotten.

In Danang I saw a French Lycee. But nowhere in Vietnam did I see an American school. If our interest is long term, why don't we think about schools and teachers?

SCHOOLS IN SAIGON

At the moment it would be impossible to establish American schools in the hinterlands. But a start could be made by bringing bright teenagers, with their parents' permission, to a first-rate academy in Saigon.

Though it will go against our Army's grain, we should consider lengthening the tour of our personnel here to 2 years. As I have said, we have never fielded a finer team than that we have in Vietnam. But considering the time for phase in and phase out, personnel spend only 9 months in action. By the time they have a grasp of the situation, they're up for reassignment. True, this system spreads counterinsurgency experience through the services. But it's victory, not experience, that we're after.

Finally, a word about the posture of the West in the Far East. Resorts in Formosa and South Korea, citadels we created, enjoyed a reputation that would attract the court of Elagabalus.

CALL GIRLS ON SCOOTERS

The playland of South Korea is closely guarded by house detectives who are charged with seeing to it that every room with a man has a woman in it before midnight. In the paradise of Formosa call girls arrive by motor scooter.

Journalists of the Philippines paint a different picture of Red China. It is a moral country, and its cities are unbelievably clean for Asia. In the battle for minds and hearts, this counts.

It would be a pity if our great country gets lost in the thoroughfares of life by forgetting this simple fact.

[From the Gleaner-Journal, Henderson, Ky., Apr. 11, 1965]

TO VIETNAMESE FARMER, WAR IS HELL

(By J. A. Dear)

TOKYO.—One reason so many Japanese are so critical of our Vietnam policy is that our effort to save the Saigon government from Communist aggression is not saving the people and their society from destruction.

The likelihood that what is to be saved by war will be destroyed in the process is a favorite irony of history. England entered the Second War to save Poland from Nazi Germany with the result that Poland became a fief of Moscow.

To understand what the war is doing to Vietnam, it is first necessary to consider the economy of the rural areas. About 70 percent of the farmers in Vietnam work holdings, which they do not always own, of less than 12 acres. Of the farmers who do own their lands, about 65 percent own less than 12 acres.

In the delta, the richest agricultural area of Vietnam, between 60 and 70 percent of the farmers are now in debt, and probably are falling deeper in debt every month. The plight of Farmer Tran Vannam, cited by Kenkichi Konishi of the Mainichi newspapers is typical.

The Tran family of six owns a delta farm of about 5 acres. They once owned a much larger farm, but gave it up because of the Vietcong. About 3 acres of the present farm are under rice. The other 2 acres had flourishing fruit trees, but these were cut down to enable Government forces to protect a bridge more easily.

Farmer Tran was not reimbursed by the Government for the loss of these trees. His family is able to live off the land, he sells the balance of his rice crop, and ekes out his existence in the off season by working as a laborer in the village. His total effort produces a yearly cash income for the family of 18,000 piasters—about \$122.

INFLATION HURTS PIASTER

At this point it must be noted that in theory \$230 is the dollar equivalent of 18,000 piasters. But inflation—war—has destroyed the integrity of the piaster. During the time I was in Vietnam the dollar equivalent value of the piaster decreased 7.8 percent. For families that must limit monthly purchases to an average of \$4 this is murderous.

But the picture really is worse than painted thus far, for Tran's princely income of \$122 yearly doesn't come in at the rate of \$10 per month. In most months the income is about \$2.25. So he has to borrow, and the going interest rate is from 5 to 10 percent a month.

He is already in debt to the Government and to other members of his family. Thus the prospects of additional debt is frightening, so frightening in fact that he often sells rice futures to escape the high interest rate. But he is caught, anyhow, because he can't get a decent price on these sales.

FACES FINANCIAL DISASTER

Of course, any serious sickness is catastrophic to a man as close to the cloth as Tran, and he has tuberculosis. The medicines he must buy drive him nearer financial disaster. Still, he is an optimist.

He dreams of another orchard that will make his small farm profitable again. In 5 or 6 years he hopes to be out of debt. He is hard working, literate, anxious that his children be educated, in every way a worthy man. In happier times he might make it. Times being what they are, he will die.

Tran is tough. Many others have long since succumbed to despair. Remember, the Delta is a fortunate region.

PEOPLE ARE WELL OFF

Parts of it are controlled by the Vietcong, and have been for a long time. But the people of these areas cannot be better off. Government forces, backed by American personnel and technology, are powerful enough to destroy the economic viability of any Vietcong area. Thus all of rural Vietnam is an area where the forces of the government and the Vietcong wage a ferocious war in a sea of human misery. Every day wavelets of misery wash into the overcrowded villages and cities, multiplying the danger of epidemic disease, drowning hope.

If the Communists win Vietnam, Red China will be encouraged to go after Laos, Cambodia, Siam, Burma, and Indonesia. And what is to stop them?

Surely no national leader in his right senses will ever again be anxious to save his country from Communist aggression by fighting a war in his country that will destroy it. Not after the lesson of Vietnam.

That is one reason why the airstrikes against North Vietnam make sense. The Communist leaders will not be as ready to embark on their adventures if it is brought

home to them that all the damage will not be confined to the country in which they choose to wage war, that their own lands will be devastated.

For too long now Red China has been permitted to forget a simple fact: War is hell.

Vietnam Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on April 2, former Vice President Richard M. Nixon addressed the Commonwealth Club of California on the subject of "Vietnam." Excerpts from that speech, as published by the Commonwealth, follow:

"STOP REDS IN VIETNAM OR FACE BIG WAR FOR PHILIPPINES 4 YEARS HENCE," SAYS NIXON

(From address by Hon. Richard M. Nixon, former Vice President of the United States)

Today the most difficult decision facing President Johnson is South Vietnam, the most difficult decision he will make during his Presidency, I believe, at home or abroad. And it is the most important decision for the United States and the free world.

There are times when the loyal opposition should support an administration. Lyndon B. Johnson needs this support not only because of the validity of his policy but because there is a deep division in his own party.

Our greatest danger to the future of our policy on Vietnam is because the Democratic party is divided. Forty-five Democratic Senators have indicated opposition.

UNITED STATES DEFENDS WORLD—AGAIN

The interests of America, the free world and of South Vietnam are being served by the present policy.

Some claim the United States has no legal right in South Vietnam and that we are involved in a civil war. Some say the war will not be won because the Vietnamese are not willing to do what is necessary.

Others believe that, even if the war could be won, the risks are too great. Many suggest another way out—negotiation—neutralization.

Lyndon Johnson should answer each of these objections now. He might well have done this before now. Not enough people know why we should support the South Vietnamese.

First, who is responsible for the war? If it were not for support of the Guerrillas by North Vietnam there would be no war; no war, at least, which would require our support. If it were not for Chinese support for North Vietnam there would be no war requiring American support.

COMMUNIST CHINA THE REAL FOE

This is a confrontation—not fundamentally between Vietnam and the Vietcong or between the United States and the Vietcong—but between the United States and Communist China.

This must not be glossed over because if we gloss it over we underestimate the risks and do not understand the stakes.

Those who question our presence ignore certain facts. In 1954 a convention was signed in Geneva guaranteeing South Vietnam its independence. The North Vietnamese are there as lawbreakers. We are

there as law enforcers, by invitation of the South Vietnamese Government.

What are the risks, the stakes? First, the fate of 15 million Vietnamese. Two hundred thousand Vietnamese casualties in the fight against communism over the years, prove they have the desire and will to keep their country free and independent.

NEED FUNDAMENTALS

In Vietnam today there is determination of the people to save their freedom—provided they have the conviction they will win.

These are fundamental reasons the stronger course of action will be more effective than may seem today.

Fifteen million people are worth saving but many argue that this is not enough to risk major confrontation and Chinese Communist intervention.

If South Vietnam falls, through U.S. withdrawal, political settlement, or neutralization (which is surrender on the installment plan), there is no doubt that Cambodia (already on the brink) will go; that Laos, practically gone now because of our gullibility, will go; that Thailand (which wants to be on our side but has held her independence by being on the winning side) will go; that Burma, an economic basket case; and that Indonesia will go.

SUKARNO'S OVERRIPE MELON

Indonesia will follow Sukarno and Sukarno once said that because of the American failure in Asia, the Communists were the wave of the future and he would be on the winning side.

Indonesia has half the world's tin, half the world's rubber. It is only 14 miles from the Philippines where guerrillas and Huk activity have begun again—guerrilla activity easily supported by Indonesian Communists.

In 3 or 4 years, then, we would have the necessity of saving the Philippines. Could we avoid a major war to save the Philippines?

Japan is the biggest prize in Asia, a miracle of economic recovery, the only possible economic counterpart to China. Strong neutralist forces are now growing in Japan. If southeast Asia goes Communist, Japan will eventually be pulled irresistibly into the Red orbit.

If the United States gives up on Vietnam, Asia will give up on the United States and the Pacific will become a Red sea. These are the stakes. And this is the reason the Johnson administration has decided to win in Vietnam—no more, no less.

AGAINST RED COLONIALISM

The possibilities of winning? How could it be possible that, where 300,000 Frenchmen on the ground failed, 25,000 Americans can expect success? But when the French were in Vietnam they were fighting to stay in—while the United States is fighting to get out.

The Vietnamese had very little interest in fighting to preserve French colonialism. The Vietnamese have a very great interest in fighting against Communist colonialism. That's why they fight with a will today.

THAT RISK OR GREATER RISK?

Risks must always be weighed. There is a risk of Russian intervention. This risk is small due to the logistic problems involved, and because the Soviets are not particularly interested in seeing the Chinese Communists succeed in their foreign policy objectives for Asia.

A greater risk is Chinese Communist intervention. Some say this is inevitable, that the Chinese Communists would come in to save North Vietnam from defeat. That is subject to serious question.

Comparing the situation now with Korea in 1950, there are major differences. Now Russia and Communist China are opponents. Then they were allies.

China without Russia is a fourth-rate military power. And that is the situation China must confront if it decides to intervene. That is probably the reason Communist China is talking big but acting little, without risking a confrontation with the United States, at this point, over Vietnam.

Adding it all, we must assume that Communist China might intervene. What should our decision be, weighing that risk and that possibility? It must be the same, because it is a choice not between that risk and no risk—but that risk and a greater risk.

NINE PINS IF UNITED STATES PULLS OUT

In the event that Vietnam falls, and in the event that the balance of southeast Asia falls, in 4 to 5 years, the United States would be confronted inevitably with a war to save the Philippines or in some other area in Asia and we would be confronting a China stronger than she is now. China today is diplomatically and militarily weaker than she will ever be in the future.

Today China has a minimal nuclear capability but that capability increases daily. It is a risk we must weigh. Do we stop Chinese Communist aggression in Vietnam now or wait until the odds and the risks are much greater?

The United States must make a decision as to what our goals are to be. Our goals are presently limited to winning the war, without unconditional surrender, without destroying North Vietnam, without destroying Communist China. It is a limited objective but one which must be achieved.

ROAD OF "GOOD INTENTIONS"

What are the alternatives? Many well-intentioned people have suggested, Why not negotiate? Negotiation is a good word. All wars are ended by negotiation. But to negotiate now would mean that the United States could negotiate only surrender, coalition government, a division of South Vietnam or neutralization, which is surrender on the installment plan.

Negotiating with the Communists now would be like negotiating with Hitler when he had France practically occupied.

We must negotiate independence and freedom for Vietnam. We cannot do that now. Once we have gained the military advantage, once North Vietnam and Communist China are convinced they cannot take over South Vietnam, then we can negotiate the freedom and independence of South Vietnam. Until then, we cannot.

Neutralization? Neutralism, where Communists are concerned, means only three things: we get in, we get out; they stay in, and they take over. That is why we can't agree to a neutralization of South Vietnam. The choice we have is to get out completely or to stay in until we achieve freedom and independence for Vietnam.

The future is our main problem. The world has been given the impression that this is our war; that we are there unilaterally for our own selfish purposes. We are there for our purposes, true, but we are there because the freedom of all Asia, not just Vietnam, is involved.

NIXON PROPOSES ASIAN COUNTERFORCE

Several suggestions can be made for future policy. Once the war is won in Vietnam, we must recognize that it will only be the winning of a single battle as far as the Communists are concerned.

It took Mao 20 years to conquer China. This is Mao Tse-tung's theory of a long war. He lost many battles, but he won the long war. If Vietnam is lost to Communist China, the long war will be stepped up in Indonesia or somewhere else.

There must be a counterforce, an alternative to Mao's long war. Let me make several suggestions. There is no question as to Communist China's purpose and plan.

They have one, and they are determined. But free Asia does not have a plan. It does not have a purpose. It is necessary to mobilize free Asia's economic and military resources so there will be the lasting alternative of peace under freedom as against the long war of communism.

JOHNSON PROPOSAL INCOMPLETE

President Johnson started down this road when he suggested an Asian economic plan. Let's go further; we need a conference of free Asian nations, including South Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, Malaysia, Burma, Indonesia, Taiwan, the Philippines, Japan, South Korea, and possibly Australia and New Zealand.

Such a conference would have three major objectives: One, economic development—a Marshall plan for Asia; a Marshall plan involving industrial development, free trade areas, and all other aspects which mean economic development for the whole area.

The difficulty is in stopping there and that is all that is suggested by the administration. Economic strength alone is not enough to stop communism, for in South Vietnam, economic conditions are much better than in the North.

Second, in Europe, the Marshall plan could not have succeeded economically unless it had the NATO military shield. There needs to be a military alliance of free Asian nations to stop any Communist aggression against freedom.

The third step is to meet the problem of indirect aggression. There should be something like the Caracas resolution of 1954 that in event of a revolution with Communist-support from abroad (as in Vietnam), all nations involved would band together to resist conquest by indirect aggression.

Now that we've stepped up military activity in Vietnam, we need to step up our diplomatic offensive in all of Asia.

We need a charter for freedom for the Pacific—an alternative to the seeming inevitability, at least to many in Asia, of Chinese Communist domination.

MOBILIZE FREE ASIA'S ECONOMY

Often overlooked today is the fact that the economic power of the nations cited is twice as great, as that of Communist China today—if it can be mobilized, if it can be united; if the United States can support it.

There is no question but that this could be the great step forward which would stop Chinese Communist aggression and the inevitable takeover of the heartland and peripheral areas of Asia as well.

I spoke of the stakes—southeast Asia, Japan, the Pacific—but they're much greater than that. A great debate is going on in the Communist world and what happens in Vietnam will determine its course. The debate is between the hardliners in Peiping and the so-called softliners in Moscow. The softliners (oversimplified), because of a risk of confrontation with the United States, are not supporting revolutions to the same extent that they did. The hardliners say "we must step up our tactics and support of revolution all over the world."

In the event the hardliners succeed in Vietnam, that will be the green light for aggression in Africa, Latin America—all over the world. If they are stopped in Vietnam, that will be a lesson just as Korea was a lesson on the use of overt aggression.

It will be a lesson to the Communists attempting to take over a nation through indirect aggression that the United States and the free world have an answer to it.

So what is involved here is not just Asia, but a battle for the whole world and because that is so, risks must be taken—risks which, I believe, in the long run will bring peace and freedom. But the alternatives could be war and loss of freedom.

In 1938, immediately after Munich, Winston Churchill said: "The belief that you can

gain security by throwing a small state to the wolves is a fatal delusion." He was right about Czechoslovakia in 1938. And today, with regard to Vietnam, the belief that we can gain security by throwing a small state to the wolves is a fatal delusion. In this year when we honor Churchill the man, we will do well to heed Churchill's principles.

ANSWERS TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM FLOOR

Question. Will you be a candidate in 1968?

Answer. The Republican Party must get off the floor fighting. But Republicans must fight Democrats and not each other. To win in 1968 the party must be unified. Until we get the party off the floor, don't talk of 1968.

Question (William Nigh). Use of gas in Vietnam?

Answer. Under the circumstances it was proper. But when the President said he was not aware of its use he gave impression we were wrong to use it, and that field commanders could make decisions of this consequence without his knowledge. He should have said: (1) This was not gas used in World Wars I or II which nations have opposed; (2) it was used not by United States, but by Vietnam; (3) it was used in attacks on villages in which Vietnamese could not tell who were guerrillas and who the guerrillas' victims; (4) so instead of blasting out friends and foes indiscriminately, Vietnamese used tear gas so they could separate guerrillas from loyal citizens. It was humane warfare and President should have said so.

Question. (W. F. Bramstedt). Can we win without a major land war?

Answer. Depends on the extent to which the Chinese Communists choose to intervene. They are basically cautious in military policy—e.g., could have taken all India but they stopped. I don't believe the Chinese will intervene. Strategically and logistically, this is no Korean type of war. We must assume the risk. Some think China should be recognized and taken into the U.N. Chinese communism is in its aggressive, virulent stage. The Soviet Union was not tempered in its foreign policy by entrance into the U.N. It has been tempered only by the power of NATO and the U.S. confrontation in Cuba.

Question. (J. C. Russell). Johnson administration now doing what Goldwater advocated?

Answer. It's easy to say "I told you so." Johnson needs Republican support, he has been learning a lot since the campaign—but we don't want him to learn so much he gets reelected.

Question. (R. J. Jajalich). What if the United States asked to leave? (Col. James S. Hughes). Effects of Diem's murder?

Answer. If any future government gets in through a coup or anything but as representatives of the people—and if it's pro-Communist—we should stay in. Murder of Diem was a major U.S. mistake. Diem and his family were sometimes crosses to bear but since 1956 he had stood strongly with the United States. We supported the coup but did not expect him to be murdered. You can't set such things in motion. A free Asian leader told me shortly after Diem's death: "It is dangerous to be a friend of the United States—it pays to be a neutral and sometimes helps to be an enemy." U.S. policymakers must understand that American-style democracy is not necessarily the answer where traditions are different.

Question. (Ivor R. Parrott). De Gaulle's attitude on Vietnam question?

Answer. De Gaulle's attitude is first French and then European: (1) If you were French would you want to see the United States succeed where you had failed? (2) Europeans see clearly the Communist danger in Europe but have a blind spot on Asia. In the East particularly we are afflicted the same way.

Question. (Stanley Brooks). Proposed changes in the new civil rights bill

Answer. When faced with a volatile situation you can't delay action over 7 years for an amendment to the Constitution. There should be action but action of right kind. Voters should be literate but literacy test should be fair. Republican platform of 1960 considered a sixth grade education as sufficient qualification. The present law applies only in those States won by Republicans in 1964—bill should be extended to all the country.

Abuse of the Sick Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1965

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, a series of articles written by Lisa Hobbs recently appeared in the San Francisco Examiner which comprise a shocking exposé of the treatment of our sick and elderly citizens in some convalescent and nursing homes in California.

Because I believe these articles should be brought to the attention of the leadership in this Congress and the executive branch, I am inserting them in the Record as separate extensions of remarks. I am not including the third article in the series since it deals primarily with State legislation.

I am indebted to my constituents, Miss Violette Hofmann and Mrs. Frank H. Schryver, for bringing these articles to my attention. I sincerely hope the appropriate individuals will consider the possibility of corrective legislation.

The first article follows:

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Examiner, Mar. 14, 1965]

BUREAUCRACY'S VICTIMS: ABUSE OF THE SICK AGED

(By Lisa Hobbs)

Scandalous abuses are being heaped on the sick aged of California by a multimillion-dollar bureaucracy.

The powers of this bureaucracy have become so diffused in the mass of related and unrelated Federal, State, and county regulations that gross abuses of the aged are now inherent in the system's functioning.

The rise of California's newest industry—the nursing and convalescent homes—is an offshoot of this bureaucracy's attempt to deal with one facet of the problem of an aging population.

In a 3-week survey of nursing and convalescent homes in the city and East Bay, the Examiner found:

Elderly persons, unheeded, crying to be turned over.

One aid doing all the household cleaning, cooking, and nursing for up to 10 bed patients.

Grease encrusted stoves and filthy kitchen floors.

Constant reference to the sick aged as being like children.

Total lack of privacy for those paying up to \$500 a month.

Debasing humiliations for lower economic aged.

These abuses are widespread throughout the State but the most scandalous fact is that for years the city of San Francisco has been dumping its sick aged into State mental asylums to die—whether mentally ill or not.

According to the department of mental hygiene's report to the legislature in 1963, the city's rate of commitment to a State mental hospital was 600 per 100,000 population. Eighty percent of these persons died within the first 3 weeks.

While San Francisco was committing 600 per 100,000 population, Los Angeles was committing only 54 per 100,000 and Alameda 300. Eighty percent of those committed were over 65 and were being committed for the first time.

Bureaucracy—the same style bureaucracy that controls the nursing-convalescent home situation today—not only allowed this but actually condoned it.

Purely economic reasoning lay behind the dumping of these aged persons into mental hospitals to end their days. By removing them from the county hospital where they were receiving medical assistance to the aged (MAA) under the Kerr-Mills bill, the city of San Francisco was freed of its 25 percent share of MAA costs for that patient. It is an old solution, however, being used long before the Kerr-Mills bill was introduced.

The procedure involved was a brief court commitment proceeding while the words "with psychosis" were added to the doctor's original diagnosis of "chronic brain syndrome." This syndrome covers everything from confusion to senility.

Officials of the department of mental hygiene are forced to play their part in the scandal, because the law requires them to accept into mental hospitals all patients committed by the court, whether mentally ill or not.

Dr. Robert Hewitt, chief deputy director of the department in Sacramento, said there are a substantial number of people in our State hospitals who do not require hospitalization, who are not mentally ill, and some of whom should never have been committed to our care.

This solution was practiced for years with the knowledge and tacit approval of the city and county of San Francisco, county hospital authorities, State mental hospital authorities, and the State department of mental health.

By setting up a honeycomb of regulations governing building and architectural requirements of housing for the aged, the State has paid a ritualistic tribute to the physical well-being of the aged.

Yet in those areas where the aged can be most easily victimized—all those areas in which they struggle to maintain a sense of value and dignity as human beings—the State has done nothing to protect them.

Instead, with slipshod regulations and ineffectual controls, the State has left the aged sick to suffer countless indignities at the hands of unskilled guardians, called nurse's aids, vocational nurses, or practical nurses.

Just as victimized are the families of the sick aged, in those cases where families exist. The expense is crippling, the load of doubt and guilt devastating.

I visited scores of homes where the price of a room for "a loved one" was plucked from the air. Only twice was I given a printed card with rates. Elsewhere, a score of little feelers as to the "loved ones" means—whether she was receiving old age assistance social security, a veteran's pension, a railroad pension—always preceded the final figures.

And the final figure was never cheap. No home will accept a patient receiving medical assistance to the aged if there is a change of selling the bed for a higher, private fee.

Twice it was intimated that if the "loved one" came in on MAA rates (which pay a maximum of \$9.10 a day) a subsidy payment to bring the rate to \$350 a month would have to be made privately to the nursing home operator.