There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR THOMAS J. DOOGH AT THE MASSACHUSETTS VOCATIONAL ASSOCIATION ANNUAL CONVENTION, NORTH DARTMOUTH, MASS., SATURDAY, MAY 15, 1965. I am pleased and privileged to be here today with those who have made a national and international reputation in the vital field of vocational education—the members of the Massachusetts Vocational Association.

You and I are really in the same field, that of helping our young people to build constructive, decent, fruitful lives.

Your task is to prepare them for a productive place in society, and your success in that is widely known and heralded.

My field, as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, is to try to find ways of preventing boys and girls from being already warped and destroyed by the time they come to your classroom—and I wish that I could claim the success that you have enjoyed.

But we are making progress in many directions.

A variety of youth programs centered around the school dropout is now underway.

Today I wish to speak about a vital critical area that has to up to now remain neglected, the area of the young, the preschool and primary school child.

Ten years ago, a group of social scientists made a study and ventured some predictions that should have a stunning impact on contemporary society.

The subject of this inquiry was a large number of 6-year-olds who were starting school in a Bronx slum.

I was asked to predict the future for the youngsters.

What kind of people would they become in years hence? Would they be climbing toward productive lives or on their way to prison? The factors in this study were the child's family and neighborhood, and for most of the slum first-graders these factors were uniformly bleak—an unknown or absent father, a sickly, reedy mother, or an overworked, overpatronized mother; a vice-infested neighborhood; grinding poverty on the outskirts of plenty; and the tendency of authority, discipline, and good example, lacking even the elemental germs of culture or worthy endeavor.

On the measurable influences the sociologists made individual forecasts on the fate of each child and foretold for most a useless and fruitless list of degeneracy and crime—up to something in the picture changed.

Ten years passed.

The sociologists checked out their tragic prophecies and sadly pronounced them to be incredibly accurate.

By the age of 16 almost every one of the designated innocents of a decade before was well advanced from promiscuity into hardened criminality.

There were 3 per cent; 3 out of 200 were spared.

And when the sociologists inquired as to why, they found that in each case their predictions were upset by the unexpected intervention of significant influences—caring, concerned and dedicated grandmother who took over the child's upbringing just in time to change the pattern of predictability from claiming another forlorn victim.

Surely this episode confronts our people with the hard realities of conditions that do little to the comfortable formulations of old.

If these children could be scientifically assigned to primary influences—a condition education, or the environment, the results received from society, what light is thus thrown on the theological dogma of free will, or upon the political concept of free choice, or upon the judicial doctrine of due process of law, in its broadest sense?

To say the least, they seem largely operative when environmental circumstances sink below certain levels of decency.

And if we travel with our eyes on crime, against what or whom is it to be

against conditions which breed criminals with almost infallible mathematical precision?

Or against the youths whose essential crime is that they are the faithful products of their environment, just as much as is the Irish girl at the end of a long line of the poor, whose drudgery, who earns her bread in a sweatshop, is revealed as non sequitur.

They are necessary, to be sure.

But necessary for what?

Not to worry about what we like to think of as an alien condition called crime, but rather to defend society from the brutality of its own product.

We can go on multiplying canine corps and radio patrols until the squad cars outnumber the number of the streets, and the police will not be safe nor the prisons sufficient.

Or we can do something else, we can stop regarding the monstrous byproduct of our civilization with which the police are desperately grappling.

The only practical answer, the only intelligible answer—ever leaving aside such considerations as idealism and charity—is for society to develop its own intermediary to the criminal; a substitute in the interest of the grandmother for all those 6-year-olds who have no interested grandmother, or any other substitute about them to introduce love, discipline and discipline into their lives.

Social science is able to do far more than accurately predict the degeneration and imprisonment of infants who have not even reached school age.

If society can diagnose a townhouse boy as an inevitable criminal on the day he enrolls in the first grade, it can also meet with the same success at the school door with the means of delivery—whether it be a social worker, or a psychologist, or a "big brother," or a grandmother.

One of the gravest weaknesses of our society is that its redemptive organs, its saving mechanism, its barriers of function in most places until too late, until the child has already been warped into a chronic rebel or an incorrigible lawbreaker.

This need not be so, it is preposterous that it is so.

If free will, free choice, and equal justice are to have full meaning the community must take on some overseeing role in the life of every child that has been abandoned at birth, so far as life's essentials are concerned.

The Commissioner of the District of Columbia, Mr. Walter Tishler, recently requested that the law for Washington be changed to require doctors to report to authorities on the grounds and the physical abuse of children.

That this should have to be proposed in our National Capital in the year 1965 is of itself a dismal commentary on the heedlessness and irresponsibility of adult society.

But, things being as they are, can we not do something, can we not begin somewhere?

Why cannot we set up machinery for periodic physical and emotional checkups on children, both to ferret out those conditions so neatly categorized by the underlying crime forecasters?

The skilled eye can usually perceive whether there is something physically or mentally wrong.

We are told that a child experiences about half of his mental and emotional growth during his first 5 years of life.

Yet this is the very period when the child is to be the most receptive to the ideals of our changed institutions and is at the mercy of chance—the chance that he will be granted the blessings of education and enrichment.

For many an infant, this supreme gamble of life is lost; for better for them to have been born in orphanages and to have had their parents selected and their environment watched over by an adoption agency.

We must lift the veil that shrouds these early years.

Many communities require an annual inspection of automobiles to protect the public safety.

How about children?

Public policy has begun to move in this direction.

This summer the Federal war-on-poverty program, working in cooperation with hundreds of community-oriented preschool clinics for 600,000 youngsters, aged 4 and 5.

And the children involved will be primarily underprivileged children who are already so far behind their contemporaries in the rudiments of civilization as to be unable to crawl in the race of life at its outset and unable to meet the meager demands of the first grade.

The Federal effort to bridge the cultural gap and the health gap that yawns so incredibly between the underprivileged and the average, its results remain to be seen, but it is hoped that a high percentage of these preschool youngsters are suffering from malnutrition and hearing and eyesight failures which can be corrected.

Others will be unable to use or to understand the language sufficiently to know what is going on in a primary school classroom.

Still others of little souls will be emotionally unable, for a hundred good and valid reasons, to adapt to the classroom atmosphere without extensive remedial training.

We should consider this program as one of the most important and promising enterprises of our time, and I hope that every community will respond in kind.

But it faces great odds.

How much of the crimes against childhood can be undone in a few weeks of summer training?

How many of the children who must need this training will not attend, through parental neglect?

But it is an important step forward toward the assumption by society of its rightful responsibility toward the child and I hope and expect that it will lead toward the more comprehensive approach I have suggested today.

And I suggest further that every school, beginning with primary schools, have a unit concerned solely with the total health of each child in its care, with ready access to whatever mental and medical assistance that is needed.

Would that such concern and care had been available to Lee Harvey Oswald and a million like him—abandoned in limbo on the streets in bitterness and hatred.

What better investment can we make than in the child who brings with him the child—and prevents the adult invalids and psychopaths.

Thankfully, under legislation begun by President Kennedy and carried forward by President Johnson, we have begun to build and to staff mental health clinics in hundreds of cities for the public at large.

But how much more thoroughly we should be when it comes to children, in their pre-
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Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my colleague in the House, Mrs. EDITH GREEN, has made an eloquent statement in a discussion, explanation, and statement of a recent vote, on which she voted against the President's bill providing for a $700 million military appropriation to conduct his declared war in South Vietnam.

Of course, the bill was but a vehicle that the President used, by his own admission, to obtain a vote of confidence from the Congress of the United States in support of his unconstitutional war. Representative GREEN has made a statement as to why she voted against the appropriation. It was in accordance with the Constitution, in my opinion, that the statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF EDITH GREEN REGARDING ADDITIONAL $700 MILLION MILITARY APPROPRIATION BILL

Couched in the disguise of a military appropriation bill—this House was asked to approve—and did approve—this Government's involvement in the tumultuous, bloody, tragic, and wasteful war in Southeast Asia. Six of my colleagues and I dissented.

Since it is conceded by everyone, including the President, that the $700 million was not to directly support the war effort in Vietnam, then it is clear that this $700 million is in this body which the Speaker refers to as the greatest deliberative body in the world, there should be full discussion of what this relationship does mean at this time, hopefully, to resolve these tragic affairs before we bring down upon our heads the wrath of God and shatter the frail edifice of world peace.

To my colleagues and my constituents I want to say that every day for many months now I have searched for every possible excuse to support my Government in the policies it has followed in Vietnam. I have supported it. In spite of the shabby logic of the domino theory, I have done my best very to believe in it; in spite of the fact that the people of South Vietnam have been subjected to one unpopular and unstable dictatorship after another, we are defending their freedom; in spite of the fact that we have violated the Geneva accords, I have done my best to believe this was justified because the North Vietnamese did also; even though I know that two wrongs do not make a right; in spite of one humiliating military defeat after another, I have done my best to believe all the optimistic reports about our really winning the war over there; in spite of all the lies of the domino theory, I have not deserted our support. I have been incapable of believing that people really want us to do—but my fellow Americans, there is a point beyond which credit can stretch—and it is that somehow by waging a wider war—we pursue a policy of peace.

This vote represented—in my opinion—a vote for that delusion. It could not have been a vote for $700 million, for the President himself said this was available in any case. It could not have been a vote to show our united determination to halt Communist aggression, for if more than a decade of effort, more than 400 American lives, more than $5 billion expended does not show this, then how can $700 million demonstrate it?

One of the things the vote could mean, though, is what in fact everyone knows it will be interpreted to mean and that is congressional approval for the unlimited bombings of North Vietnam and commitment of thousands and thousands of American troops in the battle for the justice which has been questioned inside and outside this Nation by citizens and friends of unimpeachable integrity. I think this means the relinquishment by Congress of its constitutional authority to declare war, for if the President can direct bombing raids on North Vietnam by simple Executive fiat, why can he not direct similar action against any other nation at any other time?

When I ask this question, as I have before, the answer is that my colleagues across the floor get so worked up that they are out of control. The question of who is responsible for the emergency is not the one in which we are interested. The real issue is the one I have posed. Since the bomb is dropped, it can always be pointed out that rightly or wrongly—legally or illegally—we cannot win the war. The American lives are at stake and that it would be disloyal to not approve funds for the war.

I cannot in good conscience lend myself to that kind of despicable, devious, and disre-
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The high point of these whole implausible proceedings was the speech of one of my colleagues. In one breath, demanded withdrawal of all United States aid to a educational project, because some of the participants criticized administration policy in Vietnam and the next breath, admiringly quotes Senator Vandenberg's statement that "every foreign policy must be totally debated, and the loyal opposition is under special obligation to see that this occurs," and this in the context of demanding our steadfast adherence to the majority party's voice in foreign policy decisions. His exact quote is: "These teach-ins are a protest against the administration. This is Vietnam. It seems to me that when we have individuals conducting these teach-ins and acting as if we didn't have this basic interest of the national security of our country for our Government to subsidize this kind of operation by financial projects in which these same people play a prominent role." I can see we are all going to have an absorbing year if we follow the advice of the gentlemen of the minority--making certain we don't subsidize free inquiry, but only subsidize thought control.

If any policy, domestic or foreign, which its supporters here in this House are unwilling to risk to the judgment of five representatives of an institution supported by thing except on the part of its advocates, an abnormal lack of confidence in its strength, something to the one billion deep can stand examination and discussion.

Mr. MORSE. I congratulate the Representative from my State. I agree with every observation that she has made. In my judgment, in due course of time, history will swallow her up. In due course of time, American historians will write about this major mistake that the President of the United States made when he asked this support of his bill. He sought this vehicle for obtaining a vote of confidence of the Congress that should never have been extended to him. I am proud to be associated in the Congress with the Representative from Oregon [Mrs. Green].

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the Record a telegram from the House committee group of Wayne University in Michigan signed by David Wineman, chairman, professor of political science, Wayne University, in support of the position which the majority Senator from Oregon has taken in opposition to America's undeclared war in Asia.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:


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

     The following declaration was adopted by the Detroit teach-in of May 15 attended by approximately 300 persons:

1. We demand the $50 billion now spent by the United States on armaments be used to eradicate poverty at home and abroad with no strings attached.

2. Our Government must adopt a policy of de-colonization of nations without qualification.

3. We demand the $50 billion now spent by the United States on armaments be used to eradicate poverty at home and abroad with no strings attached.

4. We specifically recommended that the suspension of negotiations of North Vietnam should be permanent and that the United States should immediately seek negotiations to end the war in Vietnam without qualifications as to time, place, or participants, including the national liberation front and withdraw all foreign troops from that nation in accord with the Geneva agreements.

5. We deplore the administration's failure to send a representative to the national teach-in.

DAVID WINEMAN, Chairman, Detroit Teach-In, Co-sponsored by Detroit University Committee on Problems of War and Peace, and Wayne Student Committee for the War in Vietnam.

Mr. MORSE. While I am commenting on this editorial, I wish to say that it is still not too late for the President to recommend a declaration of war. It is not too late for the President to get back the peace framework of the Constitution of the United States. It is not too late for the President of the United States to suggest that we keep our commitments under the United Nations Charter, and lay this whole threat to the peace of the world before the United Nations for his jurisdiction.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial appearing in the morning newspaper, a Texas newspaper, entitled "Brinkmanship" be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

     [From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News, Apr. 29, 1965]

     

     President Johnson is understandably annoyed with the critical of his Vietnam policy--primarily because he is right and they are wrong, at home and myopic defenders abroad—from Walter Lippmann to Charles de Gaulle—have been urging the President to go over to the other side of the argument, with the enemy at almost any price. On Monday Senator Wayne Moss, Democrat of Oregon, called the President's policy "immoral and godless."

     What these people object to is the policy of brinkmanship, honest to a fine art by Eisenhowe's military state, John Foster Dulles, but practiced to some extent by four presidents, both Republican and Democrat, since World War II. The old-fashioned brinkmanship, once said, "You have to take chances for peace just as you must take chances in war."

     The President's statement, "From Munich until today we have learned that to yield to aggression brings only greater threats and brings more destructive war," is a variation on the same theme.

     Former President Truman followed this advice by going to the brink with success to stop Stalin in Libya, Turkey, the Dardanelles and Greece, to break the Berlin blockade, to save South Korea. The major foreign-policy disaster during his term of office was the loss of China, which might have been prevented if Truman had not avoided brinkmanship. In Vietnam, we have been willing to take the risk then, there might have been a Korean war and no problem today in Vietnam.

     He obtained an armistice in Korea by going to the brink, by threatening to bomb China. He saved half of Indochina by coming to the aid of the beleaguered French with an airstrick, risking 7th Fleet bombing the defense of Quemoy and Matiu and saved Lebanon by sending in the Marines.

     There were foreign-policy losses, too, under Eisenhower. He refused to go to the brink, a decision to remain passive during the East German revolt in 1953, the Hungarian uprising of 1956, Red China's seizure of Tibet in 1959 and Castro's take-over of Cuba the same year. Perhaps the best example of brinkmanship and the resulting coldwar victory for the United States was the show of force by the President in the Cuban missile crisis of October, 1962—a risky eyeball-to-eyeball confrontation which the President won. It is recalled to the War in Vietnam, but instead sent the Russians holding their tails (and missiles) between their legs.

     There are numerous tests of the brinkmanship policy should be a few lessons. Among them are these: (1) The Communists have been successful in expanding their empire only by our use or threat of force, when we have been passive; (2) they have been repelled only by our use or threat of force; (3) protest without action has got us nowhere; and (4) the alternative to brinkmanship is slow surrender.

     The liberal isolationists and deserters were wrong when they attacked brinkmanship, saying it sent the President to the Potomac, to Kenney, and they are wrong today. They have failed to learn the lessons of history which I am sure the President himself learned Tuesday: "To stand firm is the only guarantee of lasting peace." What they cannot seem to understand is that there is no such thing as a perfect solution anywhere else, as the President warned, "would deliver a friendly nation to terror and destruction and spurs on those who seek to conquer all free nations that are within their reach."

     Mr. Morse. That editorial from Texas raises a serious question as to the wisdom of our course of action in South Vietnam.

     Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record an editorial entitled "Let's Talk," from my hometown newspaper in Eugene, Ore., the Eugene Register-Observer, which I assure the Senate is not considered a Morse newspaper.

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

     LET'S TALK

     Apparently the United States will join other nations in an effort to restore order at Geneva, to talk about the integrity of the borders of Cambodia. Cambodia is worried about this matter and wants the conference in place. Cambodia is a United States nation out of its country, and since the United States left without protest, it's a little hard to see what this nation can contribute to any discussion of a place where it isn't wanted.

     Nonetheless, the United States definitely should take part. For Cambodia is far from the burning issue in southeast Asia. A conference of the nations that met at Geneva in 1954 to reorganize the former French territories in southeast Asia would not talk long about Cambodia. Perhaps, probably sooner, the talk would shift to Vietnam. Thus, a meeting called ostensibly to talk about Cambodia would serve as a device for backing into discussions of Vietnam, where the controversy carries the seeds of world war.
Negotiation is not the same as surrender. This was an event that was overlooked last weekend at the all-night rally at the University of Oregon. One group there appeared to be chanting all Viet Nam under the Red Chinese. Period. Another, more realistic, urged that we explore ways to stop the killing. This was an event that was overlooked last weekend at the all-night rally at the University of Oregon. One group there appeared to be chanting all Viet Nam under the Red Chinese. Period. Another, more realistic, urged that we explore ways to stop the killing.

Also, it is perfectly reasonable, as Senator Morse said at the rally, that we try to interest other nations, also, in this major threat to world peace. The trouble has been thus far that other nations have been disinclined to help in stemming Communist aggression while Uncle Sam was willing to do it alone. The meeting at Geneva might be this Nation's chance to show some of the responsibility to its critics.

Mr. MORSE. The editorial went so far as to say:

Also, it is perfectly reasonable, as Senator Morse said at the rally, that we try to interest other nations, also, in this major threat to world peace. The trouble has been thus far that other nations have been disinclined to help in stemming Communist aggression while Uncle Sam was willing to do it alone. The meeting at Geneva might be this Nation's chance to show some of the responsibility to its critics.

I highly commend the Eugene Register-Guard for at least lifting its journalistic blinkers slightly and letting a few rays of light and truth creep into its journalistic policy. It is very encouraging, indeed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print in the Record an article entitled "Curry Democratic Central Committee Backs Morse's Views on Viet," written by Ruth Brewer, and published in the Coos Bay, Ore., World of April 28, 1965.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Curry Democratic Central Committee Backs Morse's Views on Viet

(By Ruth Brewer)

GOLD BEACH.—An apparent grass-roots movement supporting Senator Morse on Viet Nam gained strength this week when the Curry County Democratic Central Committee unanimously agreed to go on record as approving the Senator's views.

To his knowledge, this is the first such action taken by a county central committee, according to Charles Brooks, Morse's administrative assistant in Oregon, who was reached by telephone this week.

Prior to agreeing to notify Morse of the committee's stand, members heard a lengthy discussion on the Vietnam question. The speakers involved and damage to prestige of the United States as the results of actions in Asia.

The full text of a speech delivered last Friday, April 23, in Eugene by Morse was read to the committee by chairman Bruce Manley.

On the basis of past knowledge, Morse's fight to get the United States out of the situation is being supported by such Senators as Gruening, of Alaska; Fulbright, of Arkansas; Church of Idaho; and Hart of Ohio, and of the House task force, the committee appeared unanimously in agreement from the beginning of the discussion.

Senator Morse was carrying this almost alone * * * he needs all the support he can get, and it's time he realizes that help is there.

While it was generally thought that many persons in the country do not keep up with the situation in Asia through the news, and actually avoid trying to understand the complicated matter, "the men on the street are changing their views," another stated.

"It we are trying to impress Asia, we are doing it in a country that is a private state administered by the United States as much as if it were administered by one of the countries of Asia," he contended. "We are so interested in putting rice in their bellies and don't care who runs the shoe store down the street," was the opinion of another member of the committee.

It was felt that public opinion is going toward the Senator's views, though few of the papers had given their support. One of those mentioned as having come out in favor of Morse's opinions was the World, which has supported him editorially.

Though, in the opinion of one, Democrats taking an open stand might split the party, it was felt that after such action, others who share the same sentiments would soon make themselves heard, and regardless of any repercussions, the seriousness of the issue warranted the action.

Though the cry of "communism" might soon be raised in speaking out, "let them do it," another declared. "There is one thing I abhor, it is communism. I stand for this country and freedom, and it is my duty to see that the people who are pretending to be Democrats are not containing communism, we are helping it (by loss of friendship among the nations of the world due to the Viet situation)."

It was concluded.

Senator Morse is to be notified of the committee action.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have received from or at the hands of Landstrom a letter dated May 10, 1965, expressing his disagreement with my position on the undeclared war in Asia, and also commenting, by way of criticism, that he did not think I had called enough attention to communications of criticism that I have received. Perhaps Mr. Landstrom has not been diligent in reading the remarks of the senior Senator from Oregon; but I would not want him to feel slighted. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Landstrom's letter of criticism of the senior Senator from Oregon be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:


Dear Senator Morse: I want you to know that I believe your position in regard to the Viet Nam problem is entirely wrong. It is disturbing to me, as a graduate of the University of Oregon, and at one time a student in commercial law under your own tutelage, and as one who remembers your service as a member of the law school, to note that in the Congressional Record of May 7 you inserted, with apparent approbation, a letter from the University of Oregon professor who threatens nonpayment of her Federal income tax as a means of producing a change in the administration's policy in Viet Nam. Surely you do not endorse so-called peaceful civil resistance to the point of violation of the law.

I am surprised that Mr. Landstrom should think that because I respect the right of citizens to petition their Government, I agree with all phases of their petition. So I replied to him, saying:

Inserting letters in the Congressional Record, contrary to your false implication, does not carry any approval or disapproval of any point of view expressed by the writer. The letters do show the great concern of a section of the American people in regard to the warmaking aspects of American policy. I insert the letters because I think people who are opposed to American policy are entitled to petition their Government and make known their disagreement with our foreign policy in Viet Nam. I intend to continue to insert letters of protest in the Congressional Record.

If you will check my insertions in the Record you will find that I do not disapprove of the United States conducting an undeclared war in South Viet Nam. My recent motion in support of my opposition to our undeclared war in Asia.

I am inserting in the Record, your letter and my reply so that you will not feel slighted.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my complete reply to Mr. Landstrom be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

May 16, 1965.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mr. Landstrom says, in part:

It is disturbing to me, as a graduate of the University of Oregon, and at one time a student in commercial law under your own tutelage, and as one who remembers your service as a member of the law school; to note that in the Congressional Record of May 7 you inserted, with apparent approbation, a letter from the University of Oregon professor who threatens nonpayment of her Federal income tax as a means of producing a change in the administration's policy in Viet Nam. Surely you do not endorse so-called peaceful civil resistance to the point of violation of the law.

I am surprised that Mr. Landstrom should think that because I respect the right of citizens to petition their Government, I agree with all phases of their petition. So I replied to him, saying:

Inserting letters in the Congressional Record, contrary to your false implication, does not carry any approval or disapproval of any point of view expressed by the writer. The letters do show the great concern of a section of the American people in regard to the warmaking aspects of American policy. I insert the letters because I think people who are opposed to American policy are entitled to petition their Government and make known their disagreement with our foreign policy in Viet Nam. I intend to continue to insert letters of protest in the Congressional Record.

If you will check my insertions in the Record you will find that I do not disapprove of the United States conducting an undeclared war in South Viet Nam. My recent motion in support of my opposition to our undeclared war in Asia.
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I am inserting in the Record your letter and my reply so that you will not feel slighted.

Very truly yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain other letters, articles, and editorial, which I have received from other sources, be printed at this point in the Record.

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

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Apr. 28-May 2, 1966]

A SOUNC INSTANC AGAINST ASIAN WAR

A massive public discontent with American policy in Vietnam, unexplained but nonetheless real and persistent, has made it necessary for President Johnson, Secretary of State Rusk, and Secretary of Defense McNamara to explain themselves once again.

The President at his news conference Tuesday was asked why the actions of Americans are hated by an instinctive if often inarticulate sentiment that our country has taken the wrong course in Asia. His instinct was: we think it is a lot harder than their rationalizations. We hope it will continue to make itself felt until the course is changed. The President was asked to join some of his subordinates in raising his critics as appeasers. He appears to invite honest debate, and say no at the same time.

The rationalization of his policy rests upon a distortion of history and an obscenity of purpose, it denies us consistency as to where we have been, and a hazy ambiguity as to where we are going.

Like the Secretaries of State and Defense, President Johnson describes the situation in Vietnam as a simple one of armed aggression by one nation against another, which we have not caused. It is in fact an infinitely complicated case of civil war, growing out of the determination of Asians to throw off the chains of colonialism, a civil war in which we are involved on one side and the Communist power on another.

The Indigenous Communist-led nationalist movement which now governs North Vietnam began its revolution over 20 years ago, which is not to say it was always in ideological harmony during World War II, and continued it against the returned forces of France, finally driving them out in 1954. Mr. Johnson called on the war under the terms of an International agreement which provided for military neutralization, independence, and self-determination.

Under the Geneva accords, North and South Vietnam were set up as temporary political zones, each to be cleared of foreign military forces and then to decide its own future in supervised free elections. The elections were never held because the United States promptly established an anti-Communist government in Saigon and started building up economic and military facilities; and an outpost of American influence. Thereafter, the Hanoi regime began organising and arming the South Vietnamese Communist-led insurgents in the South.

Despite 10 years of massive American aid, successive governments in Saigon were unable to control most of their people; today the Communists control more than half, perhaps 70 percent, of South Vietnam. This is the Communist-led government, they wage guerrilla war. The United States, having done everything possible to help win his own war, is now in process of taking over and fighting the war itself, at the risk of world war with China and Russia.

To say that all this is identical with the situation in Hitler's Europe, and that any reluctance to deepen our military involvement amounts to appeasement, is to mis-

understand both history and the nature of revolutionary forces in ex-colonial lands. The United States has no strategic interest that requires it to hold a land base in Asia; the President has repeatedly disavowed any territorial expansion. Neither have we any responsibility to act as a global policeman, putting down revolution wherever it occurs, over every country that comes along. We can help free nations build the economic and social conditions which immunizes them against Communist revolution, but if they do not do the job themselves we cannot do it for them by war.

Admittedly changing our course in Vietnam presents enormous difficulties at this late date, but it must be done if sanity is to prevail. We cannot get out tomorrow, we cannot cut and run, in precipitate retreat; we can and should, however, make peace and disengagement our long-range objective instead of simply accepting the drift to ever-widening war.

The President's reaffirmation of willingness to enter unconditioned discussions is welcome, along with his assurance that active discussion will be "everyday" to get talking. Regrettably missing is any hint of ultimate objectives or terms of a peaceful settlement that would show we are really bargaining instead of total surrender of the other side. Talks about what? They are not likely to occur in addition to Geneva a cease in the air bombardment, we give reason to believe that all we want to talk about is the end of North Vietnam invasion but not an end of our own intervention.

The essential principles of the 1954 Geneva accords, recognition of what has happened in the intercal, offer a base for a fair and reasonable settlement. From them grows the clear objective of his policy, instead of inventing twisted rationalizations for a war policy, he should have the American people overwhelmingly on his side.

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Times, May 9, 1966]

ADVERTISEMENT Sponsoring END of WAR in VIETNAM


We believe the only conditions under which such negotiations are possible are (1) cessation of bombing raids on North Vietnam, and (2) a cease-fire with the Vietcong in South Vietnam.

We believe the people of Vietnam are as entitled to peace and the opportunity to see their home, to develop their economic and socially as are people everywhere, so that the United States must take the lead in bringing a solution to this peaceful end, which has known no rest from war for over 25 years.

We therefore, call on the President to seek an end to the fighting through immediate peaceful action rather than through rhetoric or show of force.

If you agree with the views stated above, one direct action you can take is to add your name to this advertisement and mail the page to: President Lyndon B. Johnson, The White House, Washington D.C.
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[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, May 9, 1965]

A REPLY TO SECRETARY RUSK ON VIETNAM

In his address on April 23 before the American Society of Intercollegiate State Dean Rusk attacked academic critics of the administration for talking "nonsense about the nature of the struggle" in Vietnam. He continued: "I sometimes wonder at the gullibility of educated men and the stubborn disregard of politicians who are supposed to be helping our young to learn—especially to learn how to think." This abusive language goes far beyond the administration wants to silence its critics. This suggestion is confirmed by instances from other administration spokesmen about the loyalty of such critics. Precisely in this time of crisis, however, the academic community has both a right and an obligation to point out hazards and inconsistencies in our military and diplomatic policy. It is easy to see why the Secretary of State is so alarmed. The reason is that we do "gullibility" in the academic community. He is angry because the facts and wider implications brought to light by Vietnam have contradicted so many official pronouncements. It is not the scholars but the leaders of the administration who have shown a "stubborn disregard of plain facts."

"PLAIN FACTS?"

For example, on March 25, 1965, President Johnson said, "We seek no more than a return to the essentials of the agreements of 1954—a reliable agreement to guarantee the independence and security of all in southern Asia." But the "plain fact" is that the Geneva agreement did not provide for a division of Vietnam into two nations. On the contrary, the agreements provided for the "regrouping" of the two parts of Vietnam as "regrouping zones" and said that the "military demarcation line is provisional and should be interpreted as constituting a political or territorial boundary." It provided that "general elections shall be held on July 1956, under the supervision of an international commission." No such uniting elections have been held. The Saigon regime, with U.S. approval, refused. Ever since, the United States has insisted that Vietnam remain divided. On April 7, 1966, the President gave another description of his own government's goals. He said, "Tonight Americans and Asians are dying for a world where each people can chart its own destiny and he can say: 'My goal is democracy, and further on: 'Our objective is the independence of South Vietnam, and its freedom from conclusions.
The plain fact is that the scale of American intervention is incompatible with the goal of self-determination. North Vietnam has, to be sure, intervened by helping their associates at every stage of the war, but the scale of American intervention has been far greater. The manner of combat shows that unaided South Vietnam with every kind of military equipment the terrain allows. We airlift troops and supplies, drop napalm on civilian populations intermingled with guerrillas. We burn and defoliate crops and forests. We have resorted to napalming gas. An intervention as massive as this does not furnish a choice to the people. It deprives them of one.

If American actions in Vietnam are defensible, administration attempts to defend them should square with the "plain facts." Self-deception about American intervention can be a greater peril than discriminating protest. Only by recognizing the ambiguities of neutrality can we reach accord with the deepest levels of the American conscience and with the common conscience of mankind. The administration may have contributed to the discreet silence or the grudging lip-service of some foreign governments and of some U.S. Scientists and intellectuals. The present policy is widely recognized both at home and abroad.

The situation in Vietnam raises serious moral questions, not merely diplomatic and tactical ones. As a nation we hold immense power. To permit it to be used in reckless and barbarous ways is to imperil the entire basis of American leadership.

We must return to the Government and to our compatriots that we oppose the disastrous policy of continued bombardment of North Vietnam. Continuation of the present policy makes it impossible for Americans and Russians to talk further about peaceful co-existence and encourages all Communist nations to close ranks in opposition to the United States.

World opinion does not support U.S. military operations in Vietnam. Throughout the world these operations appear increasingly to be a campaign in the self-interest of a Western power rather than in the interest of that stricken Asian nation. Indochina has been macerated by 20 years of anti-colonialist, nationalist and Communist warfare. The United States has the military might to defeat the Vietcong. But unless we impose a restraint, and show human imagination in bringing interested parties to the peace table, we risk the loss of the respect and sympathy of men and nations far beyond the Pacific theater of war.

WHAT CAN BE DONE?

Citizens must speak out on issues of national policy. We will not be intimidated by charges of unpatriotism or disloyalty.

We demand that the administration return to the "plain facts" and make an earnest attempt to obtain a negotiated peace. Retention of the phrase "unconditional discussions" is not enough, especially because the conditions implied by it that the rebel forces in the civil war are not to appear at the conference table. Peaceful intentions can be made plainer than this. We must arrange for an immediate cease-fire and seek to negotiate with the principal combatants, including Laos, before we can assure our own safety on North Vietnam; we should use the good offices of the United Nations in bringing about these ends; and we must assure the world that we will use air power in the pursuit of victory or in the "pursuit of peace."
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INSTITUTIONAL AFFILIATION LISTED FOR PURPOSES OF IDENTIFICATION ONLY.

If you approve of this statement, reprint it in other newspapers and write or wire:
President Lyndon B. Johnson, White House,
Washington, D.C.

(The cost of presenting this statement is approximately $6,500. A major portion of this amount was contributed by names listed below. Further contributions toward the cost of this and subsequent advertisements are needed. Checks payable to the Greater Boston Faculty Committee on Vietnam, may be sent to Post Office Box 543, Central Square Station, Cambridge, Mass.

PORTLAND, ORE., May 19, 1965.

Senator Wayne Morse.

Senate Building.

HONORABLE CONGRATULATIONS TO YOU AND SENATOR GATENBY FOR YOUR COURAGE.

Perhaps one day when another book is written on our country's courage, you will both be included. How sad that they aren't more senators who have the courage to speak out against the policy being pursued by our Government.

We are grateful to you and want you to know that you have our support.

Sincerely yours,

ROSE M. SCHULZ.

PORTLAND, ORE., May 21, 1966.

Senator Morse: There are a lot of words on radio and in papers about being against the war, but very little about the war itself. The mistreatment of civilians in Vietnam, the massacre in the Dominican Republic.

If you are, and if you are quoted correctly, it seems to me you should make a lot of professional politicians mad by proposing a constitutional amendment forbidding Americans from fighting on foreign soil—volunteers excepted.

At 65 I don't care what happens to any government. The government indifference of politicians has made a mess of the world, and proves that the real power of God is an honest politician. We Oregonians are also aware that "Salem and Washington, D.C., are the only insane asylums on earth run by their own inhabitants.

How about giving the constitutional amendment some thought? And words? Please have the fool to reply to me.

Respectfully,

E. P. CHYCH.

PORTLAND, ORE., May 12, 1965.

Senator Wayne Morse.

Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Much like the boy in the U.S.O. in Vietnam, I picture you back in Washington wondering "Does anybody know I'm here?" Although I am a high school student, unimportant, and therefore not "count," I am very aware of your opinions on Vietnam (as is nearly everyone else). I know you are there. I am listening (even though the Oregonian does not quote you with enthusiasm) and I am proud that you represent my State.

Out of protest more than anything else, and because I do not want to support action that I believe is unwise, I have not made up my mind to one course of action or another on Vietnam. The reason? Because the American people have not been told the facts about Vietnam. I cannot believe that we are being dealt fairly with. There is a silence between those who are doing the killing and the people who are doing the killing (or should be asked, somewhere along the line) in some measure to determine their fate. If the American Government steps into a country to maintain the status quo, rotten and corrupt as it may be, is it not, or should it not be, the American people who are stepping in? And if the responsibility is ours, does not the American Government have a responsibility to us? We are becoming the servants to a vast government machine whereas the Government should never be a machine and should always be the servant to the people.

We are losing sight of our own system of freedom, in a grave sense. But is all this ideological hinterland for eternal war? Indeed: Whose war? I don't recall it coming up before your august body of Representatives and Senators, do you, Senator Morse? Was it not the orders of the President that started this conflagration in Senegal? Was it not the President who said: "The major issue of the war is not the military one. It is the issue of the liberation of the underprivileged people of the world."

As I have said, I do not know what to advert in Vietnam merely because I do not know enough to advise you, but I do know this: that the job you are doing, is a bangup one, and I wouldn't trade you for all the hawks in the country. You are the loyal opposition, you and Senator Church (I was born in Idaho) and precious few others, and you are vital. I know you, and I am proud.

Yours truly,

MISS MEGAN TAYLOR.

P.S.—This was not an assignment for an unimaginative social studies teacher. I just had to say it.


DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I include myself among many responsible citizens who are deeply concerned about our Government's policy in Vietnam. One serious source of dissatisfaction is the lack of any adequate assessment of the feelings and attitudes of the South Vietnamese regarding U.S. aid and also regarding Russia.

President Johnson has assured us that the South Vietnamese desire our presence and defect the Vietnam. To this viewpoint is the President's assertion that it is so. Unfortunately, we have not been given sufficient proof of this and there, on the contrary, many good reasons for doubting its validity. I do not think, for instance, that the continued existence of the guerrilla movement in South Vietnam is adequately explained by Vietcong terrorism.

It seems to me that we were not helping either the South Vietnamese or ourselves by our armed intervention in Vietnam. For both practical and moral reasons it is unwise for us to continue our present policy. We could support the interests of democracy far more effectively by ceasing our bombings and leading in the negotiations to set up a viable and independent South Vietnam. The money we are now using to support the war could, if used differently, produce for the growth and development of South Vietnam.

I urge you to call for an immediate cessation of the bombings.

Respectfully,

SHERENA A. WEAVER.
work energetically for the creation of an
Asian International Armed Police Force for
protecting Vietnamese, and other people of the
world, at the earliest possible moment. We are
powerfully aware of the difficult role the
United States has taken on, and which to
Asians and other colored peoples of the
world can be so easily misconstrued. To se-
cure the peace and security with justice of
that entire region makes demands that we in
concert with other nations, and alternate,
long-term solutions commensurate with the
serious needs and great possibilities of that
area.

We want you to know, Mr. President, that
we keep you continually in our prayers, ad-
vising our God to sustain him in the midst of
your heavy responsibilities, and to do in His
power, mercy, and grace what we are unable
to do in preserving peace in our troubled
world.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM H. CATTE
Executive Secretary

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

Dear Senator Morse: We wish to commend
you on your stand against President John-
son concerning his Interventionist foreign
policy. We believe that if the United States
continues to pursue the results which will
be catastrophic. We find that by talking
to people that there is more opposition than
the polls show. We hope that you, Senator
Gruening and Representative Green will
keep hitting at Mr. Johnson where it hurts.
Sincerely yours,

CHARLES SNYDER
LOIS SNYDER
EUGENE, OR., May 21, 1965.

Dear Senator Morse: We profoundly sup-
port your U.S. policy in Viet-
man. We equally urge you to do anything
in your power to halt our appallingly
intervention in the Dominican Republic.
Sincerely,

CONRAD D. MILLER
LAURA J. MILLER
PORTLAND, OR., May 21, 1965.

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

Mr DEAR SENOAR: In response to a letter
which recently appeared in the Journal, I
am writing to let you know my attitude
about your stand in Vietman and the
Dominican Republic.

I am wholehearted in favor of your posi-
tion.

Please know that I shall continue to urge
my friends and acquaintances to listen to
your excellent points of view. Your insight
and courage are greatly admired.

Thank you,

Sincerely,

DON HAROLD KILLIAN

Senator Wayne Morse
Senator Office Building
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: This is to commu-
nicate to you for continuing to urge a nego-
tiation settlement in Vietnam.

The world’s wars have only made
matters worse by increasing the risk of
another world war.

Yours truly,

MARGARET E. SALMON
EDWARD J. GOODMAN
MADISON, WIS.,

Dear Senator Morse: I wish to take this
opportunity to thank you for having the cour-
age to vote against the $700 million Viet-
nam appropriation.

Sincerely yours,

RUTH H. MYERLAND

Dear Senator Morse: I am ineffectually
grateful for your voice of opposition to
America’s disastrous and counter-productive
foreign policy, particularly regarding Vietnam. I
find the whole thing extremely frightening, that if not
for you and the Abakan Senator, there would be
virtually no official questioners of the lie that the American people are being indo-
ctrinated by the government, asking the
President to come to the Senate and speak
for the peace and justice the people of this
earth deserve.

Sincerely,

IRA CHALEFF

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

HONorable Sir: I want to be counted
among those who are desperately against our
activities in Vietnam and intervention in other
parts of the world.

The stand you have consistently taken is
deeply appreciated by many Americans. The
Congress is really only our hope to stop the
American madness, but according to a Quaker,
visitation report in Washington early in April
(252 calls), “the Congressmen are disturbed
about Vietnam but none appeared to be in-
terested in taking any action.” -Gretchen
Tuthill, who headed up the visitation for the
American Friends Service Committee.

It is our responsibility, as the represent-
ed, to Summarize to you what many of us feel that the
work done by Senators like you and Messrs.
Gruening, Church, McCovey, Gaylord
Nelson, etc. is the only means possible to
retrieve our country from the mess it has
built up for itself under the leadership of the
President and his advisers in the Pentagon
and State Department. When a handful of
men has this much power, our form of Gov-
ernment loses even its semblance to a
democracy.

If the Congressmen are to represent the
people, as they say they do, they must
restrain the hand of America, on the future
stand can be only a horrible question mark.

Nobility really means great power in a hand
that will wield its use.

May your leadership continue to be strong
and inspired.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. MONICA KERNBERGER
ROCHESTER, N.Y., May 19, 1965.

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

Sir: I support wholeheartedly the state-
mates you have made recently with respect
to the insane, shameful involvement in Vi-
Etman and in the Dominican Republic.

Your counsels of sanity, of morality, are
to be vigorously applauded. For the sake of
the world's future, we will continue to
advise as intelligently, as wisely, as you
have in the past.

Very best regards,

ROGER E. LAMB


Dear Senator Wayne Morse: Please add
my voice to yours in opposition to the pres-
tent’s Vietnam policies. I am alone in
speaking against those who now will not even
desire to speak at all. It is doubt the news of "hawks" to fly above the "herd,"
but I hope Mr. Eisenhower is not so far away
that you can’t be heard. Respectfully,

JOSEPH P. WATZEL
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Senator WAYNE MORSE, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: At this dangerous time when U.S. foreign policy in Vietnam and elsewhere seems to be accomplishing more and more to impulsive and irresponsible action, your courageous, rational and balanced public pronouncements are a beacon of hope. I want you to know that you have earned the deep admiration and gratitude of Americans in all parts of this country.

Sincerely,
MYRTLE BRICKMAN.

BOULDER, Colo.

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

Dear Senator Morse: Thank you for your courage in acting on behalf of the best interests of American democracy and humane thought in voting against endorsing our rash policy in Vietnam and, at least by indirection, in the Dominican Republic.

For years we have known you to be a man of courage and high principle but this action must have been unusually difficult even for you. However, I hope you realize that the majorities in both Houses of Congress by no means represent any such widespread sense of support in the Nation. Many people we know have very grave doubts about our policies. As the Dominican Republic becomes public and some of us are asked to realize that our country would use its armed might to force political decisions on other peoples.

Thank you and best wishes for many more years in the U.S. Senate.

Sincerely,
RUSSELL OLIN.


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

Dear Senator: I have recently read some of your remarks to the Senate on the President's request for more funds for that hemisphere. I must advise you that your comments were masterful. I have long admired you and your courage and wisdom but this speech was the finest.

Isn't there some way we can stop the President and Congress from going down this terrible path to future war? I have written letters to all my Congressmen and Senators, but it seems to have no avail. Letter to the President seem futile, but still I write.

Keep up your wonderful work, for even though you may not receive the praises of the press you know that millions of ordinary people applaud you and wish you success. If there is some way that I can help I would do it an honor to hear from you.

Very sincerely yours,
ROBERT G. BACH.


Hon. WAYNE MORSE, U.S. Senator from Oregon, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I have just now seen excerpts from your two speeches in the Senate on May 9. I am writing to express my deep gratitude for what you said there and for the great courage it took to express such a view. The present atmosphere in the United States is tense and style, attitude and actions, President Johnson has generated this atmosphere. It has been the conditioning of 20 years of the cold war. And in the past 4 months he has undertaken 150 years of American effort to build a world of national law and comity. He has returned to the insufferable self-righteousness and truculence in foreign affairs of President Theodore Roosevelt. The Johnson corollary to the Monroe Doctrine strikes at the core of the inter-American system, flaunts treaties, charters, and the pledged word of the United States. In Vietnam he has done the same.

He wants a greater danger of total war with China and perhaps the Soviet Union. He has destroyed the detente painfully and partially inaugurated by President Kennedy and former Premier Khrushchev. He has violated his own spoken word even as he used it to the people of the United States and to the world. Whatever his intentions his actions have widened the war, dragged it to that tragic situation, and alienated other governments and peoples throughout the world. He has acted unilaterally, arbitrarily, and intransigently; he has defied petitions and criticisms from the Senate and from many responsible persons in and outside the U.S. He has provoked millions of people and brought not only the good faith but the sanity of the administration into question. He has surrounded himself with a group of advisers who are obsessed with fear of communism and the belief that it can be combated only by the use of American military power and the threat of nuclear war.

I honor you for your heroism efforts to correct this appalling situation, and I beg you to continue in these efforts. Humanity and history will control and reward you.

Sincerely yours,
DANIEL P. LEONARD.


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

Dear Senator Morse: I was in the Senate gallery last Thursday, the sixth, just after Senator Morse, in which he attacked you, not by name, for refusing to support the President on Vietnam. You, my fellow Senator, in that you did not stop to say anything to the Senate on Vietnam, and I am glad that you and I are glad that you and I are not a part of the U.S. Senate, and I am glad to see that you and a few others are giving me a little bit of what the English poet Tennyson called "the English thing, the English heart, the English courage." One thing more, Senator. I hope that in all your attacks on this evil and, what is worse, this stupider than usual president, you will not neglect to propose alternatives. The President's offer of a TVA for southeast Asia is in his John Hopkins speech. Not only is he the most constructive thing he has done, it is the only constructive thing he has done. I hope that you will not advocate that we ignore the people there, that we start trying to help them and stop trying to rule them by force.

Yours sincerely,
RICHARD D. BULKLEY, JR.

P.S.—I'd appreciate copies of a few of your speeches on this, and being put on your mailing list.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE
May 27, 1965

CAlIFORNIA STATE COLLEGE
AT FULLERTON

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

Dear Senator Morse: I support your honest and courageous stand against the current U.S. policy in Vietnam. I feel we should withdraw immediately and unconditionally.

I would appreciate receiving any printed material that fully expounds your views on this matter.

I realize that it is physically impossible to answer each inquiry individually, but academic inquisitiveness leads me to pose the following question: If a secret ballot were taken in the Senate regarding Vietnam policy, what, in your opinion, would be the probable outcome?

Sincerely yours,
J. E. MORROW.

Assistant Professor of Psychology.


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

Dear Senator Morse: We strongly support your courageous stand in opposition to the administration's war against the people of Vietnam. It is our opinion that the United States should seek a negotiated settlement of that war, based on the 1954 Geneva agreement and leading to the withdrawal of all U.S. Armed Forces and military aid from Southeast Asia. But even if negotiations should prove impossible or should end in failure, we feel that the United States should withdraw its military forces anyway. The time has come to end this reckless policy of military adventurism before it is too late.

Respectfully,
PHILIP OKE.

MRS. RAYMOND OKE.

SOMERVILLE, MASS.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

Dear Sir: I am grateful to you for being the only articulate person in protesting the President's policy in Vietnam.

Sincerely,
P. G. MITCHELL.

(No reply needed.)


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

Dear Senator: I write in support of your recent criticisms directed against the Johnson administration's foreign policies in Viet-

nam and the Dominican Republic. I endorse wholeheartedly your negative vote on the Vietnam appropriation and regret that more representatives of the people did not show similar courage in opposing the measure. I fear that we in America are rapidly reaching the point where criticism becomes equated with subversion and where consensus politics becomes a substitute for hard thinking.

May I urge upon you the need for an immediate Senate investigation into the conduct of the war in Vietnam and into the invasion of the Dominican Republic. Such an investigation should be publicly held and constructive critics of the administration within and without the Government should be heard. Too often the mask of national security is used to hide the failures of bureaucratic decisions. Too often a veil of secrecy has hidden the narrowness of vision and the inbreeding of ideas which affects the executive branch of our Government in the conduct of foreign policy.

May your voice remain loud in opposition as long as reason lives in Washington, D.C.

Sincerely yours,
MICHAEL E. PARISH,
Graduate Student, Yale University.

PORT CHESTER, N.Y., May 18, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE, United States Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: It was very reassuring to read of your intervention in the Senate about foreign policy. It is greatly impressed by your eloquence and clarity which is a consequence of maturity and knowledge. Senators like
May 27, 1965
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you are the hope of all Americans. A policy of arrogance, aggression, compulsive possessiveness only spells disaster. The American people cannot be made to be branded with these characteristics. We voted for President Johnson because we thought he would not commit the policies of the late great President Kennedy. Yet, it seems that Mr. Goldwater is in the Presidency. We live in a time in which the policies of us can remain indifferent. The greatness of this country is due to the free enterprise of ideas and ideas. Why are we change now?

Very sincerely yours,

E. A. Gomez, M.D.

Boston, Mass.
May 18, 1965.

Dear Senator Morse: I Congratulate and thank you for the fight you are waging against an expanded war in Vietnam. I would only amend your remarks in one slight respect. You say that China moves in on the ground, we will have to send 300,000 troops. But Walter Lippmann writes in a recent column that there is plenty of talk in State and Defense these days about sending 300,000 troops to South Vietnam, regardless of what China does. In this they are consistent. We can only have our way in South Vietnam at the cost of a massive military force. The alternative is a government in which the Vietcong will play a large part, a government that is not of the people, that does not have a program that will begin to normalize relations with the North and with China.

A greatest danger of a U.S. occupation in Vietnam, in my judgment, is not that it will bring about war with China or even Russia, but that will bring, as the Algerian war did in France, the destruction of the freedom and of democratic institutions at home.

We are already on this road; we will go much farther.

Sincerely,

John Holt

Ellensburg, Wash.
May 14, 1965.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: I agree with the Danish papers, the London Guardian, and the London Observer: the United States must move with the Vietcong. I completely agree with the statement printed in the New York Times by my fellow academics in the Greater Boston faculty group, "A Reply to Senator Muskie on Vietnam", and with their conclusion, "We must arrange for an immediate cease-fire and offer to negotiate with the principal Vietnamese, including the Vietcong; we must cease our air raids on North Vietnam; we must use the good will missions for bringing about these ends, and we must assure the world that we will not use nuclear weapons in the pursuit of victory or in the pursuit of peace."

Sincerely yours,

David Morrison

Copenhagen, Denmark
May 16, 1965.

President Lyndon B. Johnson
The White House
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: I agree with the Danish papers, the London Guardian, and the London Observer: the United States must move with the Vietcong. I completely agree with the statement printed in the New York Times by my fellow academics in the Greater Boston faculty group, "A Reply to Senator Muskie on Vietnam", and with their conclusion, "We must arrange for an immediate cease-fire and offer to negotiate with the principal Vietnamese, including the Vietcong; we must cease our air raids on North Vietnam; we must use the good will missions for bringing about these ends, and we must assure the world that we will not use nuclear weapons in the pursuit of victory or in the pursuit of peace."

Sincerely yours,

Arthur Foster

Plymouth, Mich.
May 15, 1965.

Senator Morse: Thank you, Mr. Senator, for all you said at Detroit Town Meeting on channel 4, WWJ, Tonight.

When you left the Republican Party I felt very sad, but I have since learned why and have become an Independent too. Keep on pounding out the truth. We surely need it. I feel better tonight. Most of the time I am torn between, I am torn between, how must it be for our young people? I hope they keep it up on the college campuses of our country.

It was wonderful telling us again about our Senator Arthur Vandenberg. God bless him.

Sincerely,

M. P. Frieze

Mrs. Frank J. Frieze

Ashfield, Mass.
May 17, 1965.

Dear Senator Morse: I must write to congratulate you on your stand vis-a-vis the $700 million war appropriations bill rammed through by the President. It is inconceivable that this bill could be done at a time when we have, as well as the rest of the world, so many social ills and problems which need immediate attention.

My son has just registered for the draft and I can envision 18 years of careful attention to what direction his young life will take, as well as money, going into a square box. Having fought almost 4 years in World War II, narrowly missed exiting several times, I am fed up with this myopic memorandum for war displayed by men in positions of power in this country. Like you, I refuse to acquiesce to this concentration of power in the hands of a few.

Would, however, that I could do more.

In the recent past I have given up a well-paying job in a monitoring company (so-called defense) in order to pursue work toward a degree. Hopefully there will yet be time to practice what I have spent my life trying to acquire an educational background which is acceptable at the college level.

Massa makes my roommates hate you and the few others who are courageously waging the battle for human survival.

Sincerely,

Donald Fitzgerald.

P.S. 1—May I have a copy of your speeches?
P.S. 2—Please put my name on the list of subscribers to your campaign needs. Also, would you pass this on to Ted Kennedy. Thank you.

Princeton, N.J.
May 17, 1965.

Dear Senator Morse: Your stand and responsible speeches in the Senate on May 5 and May 6 regarding our foreign policy in Asia are regarded by me as a true Senator, a true leader. Everything I have read in my past 10 busy years as a man attached to you to the conclusion that in your line of reasoning is the only path to a world of hope for our children and their counterparts all over the planet. I do not intend to stop writing you and I do not intend to stop writing my Representatives and my President, urging them to take heed of your long sighted and wiser view of our changing world. Impatience and political expediency and military might cannot bring about the "better world" we must ardently work toward for those who come after us. President Johnson seems to have cast his own image as a kind of personal "7 days wonder," My husband, a busy physician, joins me in sending you best wishes and gratitude.

Very sincerely yours,

Mrs. Alfred T. Hall
Marie J. Hall

Plymouth, Mich.
May 15, 1965.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Senator: May I express, belatedly, my appreciation and admiration for your stand against President Johnson's request for $700 million for further military requirements in Vietnam. Today a similar message shall be forwarded to Senator George Mason and Senator for having joined with you in this action. I regret that I cannot number myself among your constituents, stop reading and inform my own Senators who are either in accord with President Johnson's increasingly arrogant foreign policy or lack the courage to publicly denounce it—In any case, rather of them represent my position in this matter.

President Johnson's rapid resort to and expansion of the war in Vietnam and wall of silence from the Pentagon and Congress has forced me to conclude that the President's policies which took his administration—His policies are in a strange manner relieved by the fact that the American people are now facing a new war. In his speeches and public statements he has been a leader. In his speeches and public statements he has been a leader. But I do not know what his true policies are or what his true intentions are or what he intends to do. He has been silent on the question of the future of the United States and its role in the world. He has been silent on the question of the future of the United States and its role in the world. I do not know what he intends to do or how he intends to do it. But I do know that I cannot support him in his policies or his intentions. I cannot support him in his policies or his intentions.
It would seem that the only action left to those voters feeling as I do is to do what apparently we should have done last November—refuse our vote for either candidate. If the little red kicks you, it is the mule’s fault; but if it kicks you the second time, it is your own fault.

Sincerely yours,

ANN V. KING
Mrs. G. Barr King

SPOKANE, WASH.


Dear Senator Morse: We want to thank you and express our appreciation for your courageous and lonely fight during the war and in the Senate for a more reasonable policy for our involvement in the Vietnam war. I am deeply worried. Surely there seems to be a juddering under way today, in the administration, with all of us to the brink of mad actions. What do you suggest that citizens do to reverse the dangerous policy of the United States in Vietnam? The President fails to listen to friends abroad or reasoned advice from Congress, the press, and educators.

Should those who are concerned use their bodies to stand in the path of this mad policy? I am speaking with the religious group set to Pentagon last week. Should we come again and stay longer?

Very urgently,

ROBERT ANTHONY

ST. ACHES SCHOOL

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations to you for a large degree of the only realistic and safe foreign policy I’ve heard mentioned near the White House for Vietnam.

Every day we work. We’re on your side and we’ll do our best where we live to help people understand how valuable our stake really is in Asia and how important it is that we change our present bankrupting war for a more humane method of containing communism.

Respectfully yours,

ESTHER J. LANGWORTHY

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
May 19, 1965.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Yesterday I was privileged to see your film dealing with Vietnam which you made for a Yale protest group. I can not help but admire your courage in standing up to the administration, the Pentagon, and the State Department, and thereby presenting the viewpoint of a substantial portion of the American people. I am deeply aware that there were more Senators and Congressmen with your perspective and conviction to a sound and moral foreign policy.

I fervently believe that continuation of the war in Vietnam can only result in a national disaster. We need to get the United States and with it a misunderstanding of the truly democratic principles on which this country was built and in which the vast majority of Americans believe.

May I offer my support in your continued efforts of opposition.

Very truly yours,

LOUISE SCHNEDERMAN
Frederick, May 18, 1965.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations, my heartiest congratulations on your two prophetic and magnificent speeches in the Senate, May 5 and 6. I agree with you absolutely, nor could what you have said be better expressed. Yours is a patriot’s dream of the highest and wisdom beyond dispute. I am writing in the same vein in a couple of newspaper columns here in Maine.

Good with you.

Sincerely,

DAVID L. GHISHAM

AUTOMOBILE NEWS,

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I commend you for your efforts to keep the United States from drifting into war in the East. Is it not possible to have a full-fledged debate in Congress as to what our foreign policy should be?

How can citizens help?

Sincerely,

ROBERT M. FINLAY

May 18, 1965.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just a short note to say that I appreciate your stand on Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. I am being told by some representatives of the American people have not been bowdled by the dictatorial methods of the United Administration.

We are not supporting freedom in the civil wars that exist in these two countries.

As a Johnson supporter for the presidency—politically, financially—and morally, I feel that I was deceived in voting for him. I believed we had a policy of intelligence and moderation. Now our foreign policy is supplant by the John Birch Society, the American New Party A.C.A., Richard Nixon, Joseph Alsop, Barry Goldwater and the rest of the far right.

This country needs an antipoverty campaign—in the State Department, the Pentagon, and the C.I.A. There is a poverty of intelligence, ideas, justice, humanity, and moral values.

Keep up your wonderful fight for a truly free world and the rights of all mankind.

Sincerely yours,

LIEB HORVITZ

MIDLOTHIAN, PA.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: With this letter my wife and I want to express our gratitude and respect for how, and with what courage you have spoken out protesting against what is going on in Vietnam.

In these last weeks we have been following very closely and with great interest the happenings and atrocities going on in the world. We are deeply troubled how much hate and violence there is and how rapidly it is increasing. So little respect is paid to individual lives, and life seems to be considered unimportant and worthless by so many men.

We read in the Congressional Record from your speech on May 8. It moves us deeply to know that you stand for justice and world peace and we support you fully in this.

It is so important that there be a kind of voice as yours and that of the Senator from Alaska, Mr. Grunenfeld, are heard. Again we want to thank you and hope that you do not feel you are alone and continue to express what you feel is right.

We greet you warmly.

Yours truly,

ALLISTER and JUDY MARCHANT

STOCKTON, CALIF.,
May 14, 1965.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to express my gratitude for the stand you have taken on Vietnam. I realize what terrible odds you are facing when the machine is all oiled up ready to explode at any moment.

To me I don’t seem to understand why anyone would want to push us into another war. As the saying goes, “we win the wars but lose the peace.” I am sure that the people of the world must think we Americans are a very vicious nation. How can our troops be brought home as one boy’s life isn’t worth the entire ship. The reason I speak is, I lost a brother in the first war and that is supposed to be the war to end wars.

Was I wrong in my way of thinking about the Vietnamese Republic, as I thought the President said he was only sending in the Marines to get our American people out of danger. Now we are not only there but we are telling them who they should put in power.

Wonder what this Nation would do if De Gaulle or any other foreign nation came over here with their troops and said “you can have Senator Morse of the Senate,” just what would we tell them? I am sure you know the answer. I am sure if the President keeps on going the world will go down in history as a very much hated man. Along with him the same goes for Mr. Rusk and Mr. McNamara. When I mentioned the people the things I have put in this letter they say I am either a Communist or a John Birch and I can assure you I am neither.

Anyway Senator Morse I want you to know that you have made many, many friends and you stand for your stand on the affairs of our people.

Cordially yours,

CHARLES T. COX

May 16, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been meaning to write you for a long time to advise and ask you to stand in your position on Vietnam.

Keep up the good work.

Further, I just want to say I have high admiration for some people and regard you as a man of great wisdom, courage, and honesty. With all best wishes for your continued good health and good work.

God bless you.

Very respectfully,

I. C. KERMAN, M.D.

PAC ALTO, CALIF.

St. Luke’s Methisten CHURCH
Columbus, Ohio, May 17, 1965.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Every thoughtful, well-informed and patriotic American agrees with you that the war in Vietnam is stupid and unnecessary.

I am back of you 100 percent.

Yours respectfully,

CHARLES B. WHITMAN,
Pastor, St. Luke’s Methodist Church, and Lieutenant Colonel.
May 27, 1965


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

Dear Senator Morse: I wish to express admiration and appreciation for your courageous stand against the U.S. increasingly close and deadly military involvement in Vietnam. Such reports as I have read of your speeches on the Senate floor convince me you are one of only two Senators brave enough to make clear the lack of justification for this country's aggression against North Vietnam, and the virtual military occupation of South Vietnam.

I would appreciate being sent any copies of your fine statements which you may have available. My address makes it clear I am not one of your constituents; but it seems to me that the Vietnam crisis goes far beyond the boundaries of any one State. Your recent speeches against the $700 million escalation in military aid to Vietnam, and all your courage in expressing your views in support of the administration's policy in Vietnam feels so powerless to do anything. At least we can be reassured by your words. I very much appreciate receiving three copies so I may distribute them to friends.

Sincerely,

NANCY D. KENT
Mrs. D. R. Kent.


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

Dear Senator Morse: On May 4-6, 1965, a number of religious leaders were in Washington engaged in a consultation on Vietnam. We called on a number of Senators and Representatives, and also had a conference with the Vice President. I think we were scheduled at one time to have a meeting with you, but due to the debate in the Senate on the President's request for $700 million in support of the Vietnam program, we were engaged in that debate and the meeting with you was not held.

I wish to say that a number of us were in the Senate on Wednesday afternoon when you made your eloquent speech objecting to the President's request. I wish to con gratulate you for the stand which you have taken, and I do hope that your influence and that of others who share your viewpoint may have their influence in shaping American foreign policy in the direction of peace.

I would be happy to have you keep me informed of any developments which should be shared with an informed citizen.

With best wishes,

GUY F. HERSHBERGER
NEW YORK, N.Y., May 21, 1965.

THE HONORABLE WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: I support an immediate cease-fire in Vietnam, and application of Mr. U Thant's formula for negotiations.

Very sincerely,

MICHAEL CELEBR

Dear Senator: Please keep up your wonderful workadmirer your courage and foresight. I agree that it should not be in Vietnam or the Dominican Republic.

Best wishes,

JOHN A. KINGSLEY, M.D.
are doing what Hitler Germany and Kaiser Wilhelm of Germany did, spending billions of dollars of American treasure to keep people enslaved. Under the name of "freedom" we go around the world, killing, torturing, maiming and destroying people's property—what a tragedy. It is time we faced up to what is wrong with an economic system that can't stay alive without war. We blame others for exactly what we ourselves are doing. No matter what we say to justify our immoral actions, they will not be justified. We are the only active colonial power today outside Africa. We should stop viewing ourselves as others see us. If we have the right to control southeast Asia, Russia should have the same right in South America. If it is unthinkable for us that the Russian military might should control South America, then how can we think it is right for us to do this in southeast Asia? The present governments of Russia and China are not so brutal or ruthless. Drewn Pearson affected that the Chinese method of conquering does not consider killing but mainly infiltrating with their people in business contact. Russia's method is similar. If we can't compete with them in peaceful competition, what we are doing will be the end of everything. How foolish and how can we be? It's time to take stock of ourselves, not of others, before we commit the ultimate blunder.

Sincerely,  
HAROLD and ROSINA WOODHOUSE,  

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: This is to tell you that I admire your willingness to express your unpopular views on our position in Vietnam, and I agree with your stand.

Thank you.

Respectfully yours,  
RUTH E. GOODMAN,  
DENVER, COLO., May 18, 1965.

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

Dear Senator Morse: I wish to commend you on your courageous stand against the war in Vietnam. I join you and many other people in the United States who are fighting for a ceasefire to stop the brutal killing of all people involved.

Thanking you,

Sincerely yours,  
MRS. ANNE K. BOGNET,  

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

Dear Senator: I am not one of your constituents, but I want to commend you for your stand against our military intervention in Vietnam and our dangerous escalation of the war there.

You have shown admirable courage in opposing the administration's inexplicable foreign policy which will bring us closer to Johnson's efforts to alleviate the opposition. I only wish there were more Senators and Representatives to join in your protests. At least your voices are heard.

Yours truly,  
MRS. R. B. SMITH,  
THE LABATER RANCH,  
MATHEWS, COLORADO, May 21, 1965.

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

Dear Senator Morse: May we congratulate you on your recent addresses to the Senate, on May 5 and 6, on the matter of our foreign policy. We stand ready to help you in any way we can. Please call upon us.

Sincerely,

Mary and Tom Labater  
Mr. and Mrs. Tom Labater,  
MELON FARM,  

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

Dear Mr. Senator: Since I heard you on the television, "We shall not be silenced," I have wanted to express my support of your strong and lone stand on Vietnam.

Thank you.

MRS. N. HARRIS,  
RUCLED, OHIO, May 19, 1965.

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

Dear Senator Morse: I want to thank you for doing all in your power to stop the senseless killing of American troops in Vietnam and Santo Domingo.

Our collective agreements, the United States has introduced many new weapons like napalm and white phosphorus bombs and, without the number of American troops to a point where there are almost twice as many American soldiers as there were estimates of Vietcong soldiers only year ago. In Santo Domingo, American troops are again engaged in aggression and violation of international agreements. American troops again outnumber the native insurgents and while they publicly cry for a ceasefire allow the right wing generals to bomb and attack and mass troops from areas controlled by American troops.

We are now facing the most hated nation in the world while the American people allow the military to tell lie after lie and to win repu tys at the scene.

Not once in recent history have American troops been used to protect democratically elected governments from military juntas and coup d'etats. Only when a military dictatorship is threatened by democratic insurgents who might have the backing of the American people do we interfere.

Very truly yours,  
MELVIN L. DAIHLMANN,  
NEW YORK, N.Y., May 21, 1965.

I wish to congratulate you on the position you have taken on Vietnam and on the reasons you have put forward for taking that position.

It seems to me your views are not given the circulation on the radio and in the press which they merit.

I consider the last presidential campaign the biggest hoax practiced on us in my lifetime. Only my friends who voted for Goldwater are happy today.

I offer you my best wishes for the future.

Sincerely,  
HOWARD BICKERT,  

Dear Senator Morse: Both my wife and myself would like to convey our great admiration for your honesty and courage for standing against the current Vietnam policy. We are also very much against it and wish there was something we could do as citizens. Keep up your marvelous efforts.

Sincerely,  
VICTOR and MARILYN FELDMAN,  

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

Dear Senator Morse: From the bottom of my heart, thank you for your tireless and courageous insistence on the vital leadership for what small loyal opposition exists in the consensus society our beloved maximum leader has created. It must seem sometimes that you have "lived your life talking to scaring men," as Vanzetti said, but those of us whose blood have been from the insane escalation of this new hip-shotting Barry Johny deserves a voice also. Trust us in every country, of course, may be Communist—as we always said—and that Laos and Cambodia will follow.

Thank you, sir, for your voice of sanity amidst the cries of "Ave Caesar."  
Sincerely,  
ROY J. FRANKLIN CHIBBSY,  
EXCELSIOR, MINN., May 19, 1965,  
President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.

Sen. Morse is obvious to me, as I believe it is becoming clear to many if not most Americans, that our foreign policy has reached a new depth of immorality, illegality and senselessness during recent months.

Our involvement in Vietnam has been of doubtful value and legality, to say the least. Our present formula of retaliation against and hypocritical offers to negotiate with the North is absurd and may lead to disaster. Yes now our activities in the Dominican Republic occasion nothing but outrage and humilitating to the foolish citizens. Our actions there have been cynical, from the start of the present disturbance, and are now being proved unbecoming folly from any point of view.

Worse, however, is the budgeeting that the people are being subjected to by your office. This treatment, if the fact has been in the form of a stream of "information" that is, in fact, a compound of evasion, wishful prognostication and, for the most part, lies. We feel buried under the weight of platitudes and half-truths to the point where your urgency to protect is suffocating. As, apparently, our Congress is now stified. It is this suppression of dissent under the guise of "consensus" that will bring us closer to foreign ground or to a dangerous reaction at home; or, more likely, to both.
Like millions of others, I suspect, I am quite disturbed by the pretensions and apparent megalomania of our executive. Our present expansionist foreign policy will succeed in doing nothing but isolating this country and eventually, one fears, bringing the Office of Civil Rights to a standstill on the issues of civil and human rights. I believe, and I hope others will be of the same opinion, that it is time to bring about a real relationship with the world, and not to be isolated and act like a small-minded and belligerent power.

The Honorable Waymn Morss,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: You have my vote of confidence for your position of "no-confidence" in the program of mounting military requirements in Vietnam. Although I am unable to vote for you, I am convinced that you are the right man for the job.

Sincerely yours,

Robert J. Haworthone


Dear Senator Morse: I applaud your courage and stand against your convictions with regard to our foreign policy. Although we are unable to vote for you, we would like to thank you for your stand on foreign policy.

Sincerely yours,

Dorothy and Arthur T. Kogaishi


Dear Senator Morse: I applaud your courageous remarks on our foreign policy. But I fear that we are being headed toward a showdown with China, and protest will be more and more expensive and unpopular. Please continue to speak out against U.S. militarization in Asia and in Latin America. Your voice is essential. Sincerely yours,

Dean A. Allen


Hon. Wayne Morse
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sen.: Thank you very much for your stand in the opposition to our government's policy in Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic.

We have no business in committing our troops and planes in either of these places. I suspect that you have more support in your stand that is readily visible. Please continue in your outspoken opposition to this insane and dangerous policy.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. H. E. Franqueau


Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sen.: You may never see this letter but it can be added to the ones in the basket marked "for." I applaud your stand, and I hope you have more support.

Yours truly,

96-10

Sincerely yours,

Philips Russell

North Vietnam Bombing Termed As Necessity

A U.S. State Department official here Wednesday afternoon gave direct reason for the bombing of North Vietnam—necessity.

Turner Shelton, special assistant to the Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, gave the explanation during a public lecture at Duke University. His topic was "The Situation in Vietnam."

He said: "These bombings are not pleasant; they are not by choice, they are of necessity. Evidently alluding to the American criticism of our Vietnam policy, particularly from segments of the academic world, Shelton said, "We cannot control the facts by engaging in wishful thinking."

Calling attention to American men and women who have been killed in Vietnam, Shelton then added, "In self-defense, we are bombing bridges, roads, and ammunition dumps in a totally reasonable effort to prevent the men and supplies causing the deaths of American and Vietnamese alike from reaching the south."

Noting the Communists' reaction to our bombings, Shelton said, "The fact that all this is so distressing to the Vietnamese..."
munists give the lie to their claim that they are the indigenous South Vietnamese group engaged in civil war."

Assuming that we and the South Vietnamese "are engaged in the pursuit of the basic right of self-defense," Shelton added that "it is an action totally consistent with the spirit and nature of our engagement," America has pledged itself to aid the South Vietnamese, Shelton said.

In the last and worrisome responsibility, but it is the responsibility that goes with America's tremendous power," he asserted.

Downey, Calif.,
May 18, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: We wish to commend you for the commonsense attitude you take regarding our military intervention in troubled areas, and for your courage in forthrightly opposing this.

We unalterably oppose the depressed trend which we have that only brute force can preserve our way of life. If this be so, then democracy is already lost—why pour blood over the same cup?

And it would achieve good results, why are we then not using it in our own behalfed South?

This is an urgent pattern of behavior would seem to indicate that we are willing to defend our freedom on others' soil and at the expense of their land and people; hardly a noble stand for a great nation.

Please continue to use your gift to get us back on a more American (as we would like the word to signify) course of action. We are behind you.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN VON RAAPHORST,
NAN VON RAAPHORST,
Mrs. J. VON RAAPHORST.

San Gabriel, Calif.,
May 20, 1965.

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

Dear Senator Morse: May I commend you for your courage to vote "no" on President Johnson's request for $700 million more.

It is good to know that at least a few want to take a second look and may wish to try to solve problems by other means than the military approach. Keep up your courage.

Sincerely,

ROLLAND THOMPSON.

Menasha, Wis.,

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

Dear Senator Morse: I have wanted to write to you for a long time to commend you and thank you for your fearless expression of your views on our current war.

I think that we have done our Nation a service in showing the world that our militaristic path is not approved by all of the people.

In admiration and gratitude,

ERNE BERGE.

Denison University,
Department of English,

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I want to commend you for your two speeches in the Senate on May 18 and May 20, in which you severely criticized American involvement in South Vietnam. Our involvement there is indeed cruel, for Asians now stand, as you so aptly put it, for us in the future.

In my opinion there can be no justification for our intervention in what is essentially a civilian war—if substantially the war is in the Dominican Republic—and I think we ought to give the Dominican Republic immediately from both Vietnam and from the Dominican Republic—welfare, that is, for the American people to aid the emerging countries, where there is a need and whether they protest to be our friends or not. The Biblical injunction, "If thou enemy hunger, feed him," seems more appropriate now than ever.

Our country, which at the time this was looked up to as an inspiration for social revolutionary movement, is now considered, and rightly, the enemy of such movements. Personally, I am sorry for this and I am disheartened that there is so little resistance at home to our quite immoral foreign policies. But resistance to our intervention in Vietnam does seem to be growing, and I find it especially encouraging that young people are more and more employing the techniques of civil disobedience in order to make their "No" more profound.

Sincerely yours,

James Mims,
Bellwood, Ill.,
May 24, 1965.

Dear Senator Morse: Just a note of approval of your good, sound political policies.

Keep up the good work. Yours only bring misery.

Sincerely,

John Skojuc

Michigan Technological University,

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Thanks for your reports, May 14, 1965, which are always welcome and for including a copy of the Record—very, very good, and double thanks for your fine, revealing statements. Keep up the good work.

Best regards,

Milton E. Sheer.

Memphis, Tenn.,

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I believe you were one of three Senators who had the courage not to support military appropriation to assist in covering the cost of our amplified operations in Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic. It is certainly difficult for a citizen at this time to obtain sufficient information on which to base a valid opinion. Our conventional news media are not providing conflicting stories. If we can believe "The Invisible Government" by David Wise and Thomas B. Ross published last year, there is evidence that our foreign relations have sometimes been complicated by intrigues originating within our governmental security agencies, and outside of diplomatic control.

Certainly if the executive branch of our Government evokes the impression that they will get automatic support for any hasty venture, then indeed our position is perilous. Your vote against such a situation was therefore wise.

At times like these, our international image depends to a considerable extent on the quality of our ambassadors. Their appointment is subject to senatorial influence. I lack detailed knowledge of most of Latin America but I do have friends who are familiar with Colombia. One of our former ambassadors there was unable to attempt to know the people or their language at a time when his English equivalent was studying Spanish and touring the same countries. More recently, we have done much better. In maintaining this improved record our Senators will be well advised to seek up certain basic criteria of competence for such appointments.

Yours very truly,

C. W. Sheppard

Stanford University,

Hon. Wayne L. Morse,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I thought you'd be interested in seeing the enclosed copy of a letter which appeared in this morning's San Francisco Chronicle.

H. H. Fisher is an emeritus professor of history at Stanford and for a number of years was the head of the Department of History, War, Revolution, Peace and Hoover Research Institute, now designated as the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace.

Sincerely,

David S. Jacobson

The Real Role of Vietnam Teach-Ins:
Editor: The teach-in debate is good for what all us—complacency at the top and guilt below—need right now. It cannot afford complacency in times like these and conformity alights the precious right of debate. Debasements are less useful, however, if they focus exclusively on the hot local issues and we lose sight of the larger questions of which the local issues are symptomatic.

Have we, for instance, lost sight of the most vital national interest thus ignoring the consequences of our repudiation of our treaty commitments to the global and regional organizations we took a leading part in creating in order to learn the dangers of war?

Have we lost sight of recent, shifting in the alliancement of nations and assumed that only the Communism has become victorious? If so, we have given nothing but that security that we expected from our alliances and treated our Western States as they have the duty to prevent its further establishment in Asia or Latin America, regardless of our agreements and the wishes and policies of friendly governments.

We claim that we are not only protecting our own national security which every nation immediately has a right to do, but also protecting the national security of all nations under Communist rule, which they have not asked us to do. Many of the presumed beneficiaries would feel more secure if we were not so trigger happy. And the Communists no longer have the ability to menace us, but by endangering general security just as imperialists are supposed to do.

Conflicts of national security interests are nothing, and they have led to war when one country has followed the advice of its practical realists who believe in the use of military violence against another country. After two wars of mounting scope and destructiveness, world opinion seems to have realized that in one matter there could no longer be a conflict of national security interests. The overriding security interest of all mankind has come to the protection of a third world war in which for the first time man has the nuclear chemical and biological weapons to impose an eternal peace on this contentious planet.

Global and regional peacekeeping arrangements are now in some disarray when, perhaps, we need them more than ever.

The basic issue at this moment is do we serve the security interests of all the rest of humanity by adding to this disarray by repudiating our commitments to these organizations? Resort to armed intervention in violation of treaties, which we have loudly condemned over since the Germans tore up the scrap of paper in 1935, has always been done to force an opponent to mend his ways and come to a conference table for a peaceful settlement. We are violating, and not in the exercise of the right of self-defense, our pledges to both the United Nations and the Organization of American States—"to re-
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Hon. Wayne Morse, U.S. Senator, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Thank you very much for your interest and for your letter from the Congressional Record as I am on your mailing list.

That letter covered your speeches on Vietnam starting with the one you delivered before the Senate on May 5, 1965.

Although I am at a distance of Oregon and consequently not your constituent, I am indeed delighted with both your courtesy in sending me material covering your speeches and legislation you have sponsored, as well as with the views you hold and express particularly on Vietnam and foreign affairs issues in general.

As I spent considerable time in southeast Asia generally and in Vietnam particularly throughout 1964, I am in a position to discuss with both the views you so forcefully express and fight for as well as with the conclusions you have reached about the eventual outcome of the war in Vietnam.

It is regrettable to note therefore how little support of your views you have found so far in the Senate and it is equally regrettable how the President on the advice of a small coterie of people around him bypasses the United Nations and other international forums and instead of attempting to settle the conflict by negotiations around the conference table with all concerned (and that, of course means also the Vietcong and Red China) rather escalates the war.

There is no longer any doubt in my mind that eventually all of southeast Asia will be drawn into this conflict on Vietnam and who knows if an expanded war covering most of southeast Asia may not be the start of world war III.

Once a war has been escalated—and soon it will be fought by 70,000 American men on Vietnamese soil—it will be hard to stop it. It is no way that public opinion in this country can be aroused to a point that it has to bring the White House to think twice before it is too late.

Am really so much in agreement with the views you expressed on Vietnam in your various speeches and for which you are fighting so valiantly that I feel compelled to ask you to kindly let me have eight more copies of the reprint from the Congressional Record to which you refer on the preceding page, so that I may forward same to a number of friends and acquaintances of mine.

Please do not let your office send me everything on Vietnam—i.e., not only reprints of your speeches before the Senate but also of talks you give before universities and other gatherings.

Thank you for your courtesy and with all good wishes to you personally and for the wonderful fight you are carrying on. I remain,

Yours sincerely,

George H. Corb
Journalist.

Mehmet, Turkey, May 14, 1965.

Senator Wayne Morse, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: It must be difficult to maintain a position over Vietnam and the Dominican Republic in the face of the apparently widespread support for these actions in Congress and the nation. If you were as concerned with consensus as the President seems to be, you would have to tailor your legislation accordingly but you seem more concerned with the correctness of your ideas than their popularity—it is good to where you are, raising the intelligent objections to this new American indulgence that ought to be raised.

I doubt that the President has all the support he can possibly get that it may appear he has at first glance. Consensus has some unpleasant connotations and one is that it's a fine companionship for apathy. Consensus seems to be assumed wherever there are no contrary voices to be heard which is a negative indication and one that ought only to be used when positive agreement can be found. The lack of objection from an essentially militant Republican Party is an alarming sign of serious and independent thought has perhaps led Mr. Johnson to suppose he has backing where merely silence prevails.

My very secondhand appraisal of the American situation may be wrong though from here it appears that the public is hardly as aroused as it ought to be. The Turkish viewpoint—at least of the man on the street whom I come into contact with—seems quite opposed to what is being done by the United States particularly in Vietnam but in Latin America as well. It looks very strongly to the view that, unless it can be shown that our intervention in the national affairs of sovereign nations and others can only wonder when America is going to put its effort and its country needs out of our hands. In Vietnam we've a spectacular military playground that seems easily capable of geometrical expansion. Where our notion of international proprietorship has come from I don't know, perhaps it's the old adage that power corrupts.

I am in the Peace Corps here trying hard to be proud of my country as well as understand it. There are plenty of people in Turks and Americans who support you in your proposals. I simply thought I'd write to support and encourage you in your opposition to the foolish and immoral turn foreign policy has taken.

Very truly yours,

Thomas DeMers.


Hon. Wayne Morse, U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: My profound gratitude for your courageous fight, your vote on President Johnson's draft of $7 billion and a "blank check" to the mounting Vietnam and Dominican fuses. But for you and your small number of like-minded colleagues, the semblance of Capitol Hill to the old Reichstag would be more horrendous than it is. Respectfully,

Sam Hennel, M.D.


Senator Wayne Morse, The Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: My congratulations to you and your colleagues for what you are taking on the actions of our Government in Vietnam. I am utterly sick over what our country is doing in building up the hatred of the world. Your consistent stand has been most heartening. I trust you will continue to lead the opposition against our very dangerous policy.

Sincerely,

Agnes Sailer.


Dear Senator Morse: Congratulations for your courageous criticisms of the Government policy in Vietnam. Let me add my voice to that of an American living abroad, that the United States is breeding a horrible hatred among the peoples of the
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The second portion of that report, dealing with such subversion, is now available. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record and thus be available for study by Members of Congress and the American people in general.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CASTRO'S SUBVERSION IN THE UNITED STATES—PART II

At a recent State Department briefing on Latin American affairs, the briefing officer concluded his remarks with the statement that the Communists had a chance to make a showcase out of Cuba but they had failed miserably. This conclusion was first offered by President Kennedy 3 years ago and it remains today as the accepted State Department attitude toward Castro and Cuba. Such an attitude fails to take into account that communism has never been a social or economic organization, that its subversion is irrelevant to the Cuban people's desire to be free and follow their own way of life. With this attitude, we have been led to overlook the activities of the Cuban General Directorate of Intelligence. However, I believe that if we have success against the United States has been in the area of agitation and propaganda.

In fact, it is clear to me that the failure of the CIA and other agencies to stop Cuba from following the Moscow, Peiping, or Totskische line. They range all the way from hard-line Communists to moderate liberals.

A 2-year investigation by the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security into the activities of domestic organizations and Fair Play for Cuba Committee, organized in April 1960, proved that PPFC was actually more disheartened by its achievement than the state's efforts. The Senate has attempted to make sure that Castro's subversion in the United States is not allowed to go unnoticed. As a result of this investigation, the Senate has taken steps to prevent the subversion of the United States by the Cuban government.

In conclusion, I am troubled by our Latin American policies, which seem to always favor reactionaries driving the masses of impoverished people in these lands into the arms of the Communists. This bothered me some years ago, but I naively thought things would improve.

Having expressed some of my thoughts, I again want to thank the many who have criticized me for my support of Castro government in the United States. I continue to support the Cuban government in the United States and to work for the overthrow of the Castro regime.