

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

19831

society, and concentrate their efforts in those points and places which are key—not only because of their potentiality for influence but also because of their capacity for democratic leadership.

I can think of no propositions more widely accepted in Washington than these. Our Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, Thomas C. Mann, who regretted very much indeed that he could not be here today, and whose special greetings I bring to you, had this to say less than a month ago:³

"I should like to state in the very beginning—and to say it very clearly—that the Government and people of the United States do not forget that their own Nation was born in revolution. Nor can we forget that the process of social, economic, and political change in our country has been continuous since 1776. It still goes on. We still seek that kind of change which will bring about the greatest good for the greatest number of our people.

"We therefore have a natural sympathy and affinity for those governments who seek change and progress. Those governments which institute bold, soundly conceived programs of reform designed to achieve national and individual freedom, a high and sustained level of economic growth, a greater degree of social justice, and equal opportunity for all to rise as high in society as their talents and efforts will take them, will find warmhearted sympathy in Washington."

That Secretary Mann's position is supported in depth by the highest authority of the U.S. Government is equally clear. President Johnson himself recently said:⁴

"To struggle to stand still in Latin America is just to 'throw the sand against the wind.'

"We must, of course, always be on guard against Communist subversion. But anti-Communism alone will never suffice to insure our liberty or fulfill our dreams. That is going to take leadership, leadership that is dedicated to economic progress without uneconomic privilege, to social change which enhances social justice, to political reform which widens human freedom."

Likewise at his meeting with ambassadors at the White House on May 11, 1964, to review the Alliance for Progress, President Johnson proclaimed:⁵

"We will continue to join with you to encourage democracy until we build a hemisphere of free nations from the Tierra del Fuego to the Arctic Circle.

"But the charter of the Alliance is not confined to political democracy. It commands a peaceful, democratic, social revolution across the hemisphere. It calls upon us to throw open the gates of opportunity * * * to the poor and to the oppressed. It asks that unjust privilege be ended and that unfair power be curbed."

The President said, "We say now, if a peaceful revolution is impossible, a violent revolution is inevitable."

THE LATIN AMERICAN FRONTLINE

President Johnson was addressing himself to this hemisphere—to those "20 nations * * * who take strength from the richness of their diversity."⁶ And what he said has particular relevance to this hemisphere because of the changing world challenge we have been discussing this morning. For at the height of the cold war, the American Republics were geographically not on the frontlines. Although presumably no one wanted to be closer to the frontlines, there was a feeling in some quarters that less attention was

being paid to our hemispheric problems because of their distance from the fray.

The converse is true under today's conditions of nuclear stalemate. Today the problems confronting this hemisphere move more and more to the forefront. They become less and less distinguishable from the problems which the new forms of Communist aggression present worldwide. Vast oceans protect us less against these new forms than they did against the old. Targets for Communist attention in the Americas are now as inviting as they are anywhere in Africa, or the Middle East, or in south and southeast Asia.

Indeed, Latin America may appear to Moscow and Peking to be especially valuable experimentally. In a sense the Communists may think they can risk more in Latin America. Cuba was a risk. The Communists lost gravely there in October 1962, but they by no means lost everything. Moreover, there is a special advantage which the Communists think they see in this hemisphere. They hope to manipulate in a direct way whatever specific anti-United States feeling they can find. They tell themselves that they can find it here in the Western Hemisphere more than elsewhere, and they would like to exploit the opportunity for as much as it is worth.

This hemisphere of ours has a rich and politically honored tradition against "intervention" from the outside, a feeling which we North Americans came to respect after a few unhappy and misguided attempts to infringe upon it ourselves in the Central American and Caribbean areas two generations ago. Yet as Communist-inspired threats to the peace and violations of human rights begin to occur increasingly within countries, rather than by direct aggression across borders, the ambit of our common interest grows. It does so in spite of our deep convictions for "sovereignty" and against "intervention." We all, in fact, have a stake in each successful popular government in the hemisphere.

In this connection the international community, too, will have to address itself increasingly to new, imaginative, and legal means for the internal safeguarding of our common interests. Recent United Nations activities in the Congo, Cyprus, and now Cambodia are hopeful examples of international action legitimizing international intervention, just as the OAS action at the time of the Cuban missile crisis provided a necessary legal basis for inspection-by-reconnaissance over Cuba against a threat which endangered the whole hemisphere.

Then, too, there is another form of international involvement going on which will affect us more and more—an increasing internationalization of specialists. Military experts and advisers from various countries will be called upon, often under international auspices, for service in a variety of ways in foreign lands. Increasing attention is being paid to the new role of armies in transitional societies: the active furtherance in an orderly manner of the processes of progressive change. Successful experience in Latin America could become an invaluable laboratory for useful transplantation elsewhere.

But most of all, this new, diverse, differentiated world confronts us all with choices—with opportunities for deliberate preferences in the reordering of our priorities.

For you as for us, there will be decisions on the proper allocation of resources to and within your military budgets. There will be decisions on how to shape and keep power appropriate to your real needs.

For you as for us, it will be necessary to warn against overoptimism, false assumptions, and temptations toward collective streaks of indecisiveness. There will be the problem of acting when action is required, at the same time as we resist impulses for

cheap victories, short-term results, simple slogans, and easy solutions.

For you as for us, there will be the necessity to follow several policies at once, taking initiatives all the while we hedge against their failure. There will be certain inherited and declining situations which seem to have gone beyond the point of reversal or arrest. There will be new claims on your attention and new appeals for your support.

For you as for us, answering the demand for economic and social progress will become essential, not only as an ideological preference but as a strategic necessity. In the struggle we face, economic growth and social reform are as critically important as military strength itself. We in the United States are still committed wholeheartedly to all three.

As the leaders of the American Armed Forces, you have a unique chance to influence these developments in a favorable direction. In many cases you alone can provide the crucial margin of influence which will spell success or failure. You know, better than most others, that power cannot indefinitely become a substitute for people. In the very nature of your work you have opportunities to set the course of your countries toward progress rooted in popular involvement, motivation, training, civic action, and citizenship—identifying yourselves with, and working among, the people whom armies and navies and air forces are supposed to serve. I know that there is a growing appreciation in Washington and elsewhere that many of you are already doing just that.

Everywhere all of our efforts are increasingly mixing civilian and military ingredients. Combating subversion is a typical case in point. But the subversion of the Communists cannot be met by subverting the Constitution in the process. In the long sweep of history the subversion of the right may be just as dangerous in terms of probable results for the hemisphere as the subversion of the left. The situation itself is revolutionary. We have the choice of joining the revolution and channeling it into the most constructive possible paths, or opposing it and delivering its leadership to forces which can destroy most that we hold dear. Much of what I have said, indeed, adds up to a requirement for a "revolution from above."

PREDICAMENT AND PROPHECY

So I return to my beginning. The searching questions remain: Can we cooperate as well without the cementing fear of imminent nuclear catastrophe? Can we continue to organize for the "common defense" at the time when that defense is becoming more complicated? Can we join in creating the only lasting immunity against aggression from without or within—the quick and effective building of better societies?

Of course there are still a good many ways in which the world can stumble into world war III. We could all be brought up short again by a sudden new crisis pitting us against the U.S.S.R. once more on familiar cold war lines. But in the absence of such a crisis, all of us who cherish freedom will have to work harder together if we are to maintain our unity and cohesion in this new world with its emerging diversities and its requirements for flexibility. We shall have to consult one another more frequently and have to search harder for new and more imaginative forms of cooperation. We can less and less rely on our enemies to do our political thinking for us.

From all over the world this many-sided challenge is taking on a new urgency: Act now, white men, brown men, black men, Asians, Africans, Europeans and Americans. Act now together, creatively, ahead of chaos, so that this new opportunity is not lost, so that the tragic debacles of China and Indochina and Cuba need not become a pattern of an even larger tragedy. Act now, for in the

³ Ibid., June 1, 1964, p. 857.

⁴ Ibid., May 11, 1964, p. 726.

⁵ Ibid., June 1, 1964, p. 854.

⁶ For an address by President Johnson on the third anniversary of the Alliance for Progress, see *Ibid.*, Apr. 6, 1964, p. 535.

19832

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 19

next 10 years positive ideas, dedicated people, and peaceful action may do what no extra amount of guns, bombs, and bloodshed can ever accomplish later.

As we consider the challenge to this hemisphere, we can remember with profit the lesson of Bolivar's life and work—that revolutions can stagnate if they are not followed by the release of creative social energy. In the despair of his last days on earth, the Liberator lamented: "To serve a revolution is to plow the sea." "We must fearlessly lay the foundation of South American liberty," he had warned at an earlier moment of victory. "To hesitate is destruction." His warning, unheeded, had become prophetic.

And so too the time has come for each of us, in his own way, in his own position of responsibility, in his own American Republic, to heed the words of Lincoln, as poignant for our own generation as they were a hundred years ago:

"The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves, and then we shall save our country."

WARMAKING POLICIES OF THE UNITED STATES IN ASIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at an appropriate place in the body of the RECORD a sampling of the correspondence I have received in the last few days in support of my position concerning the warmaking policies of the United States in Asia.

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

Senator MORSE: I salute thee for your militant stand against continuing the war in Vietnam.

I salute thee for denouncing a most flagrant of unconstitutional moves—giving the power to declare war to the Chief Executive of the United States.

Your are an American.
Respectfully,

NINO J. MAIDA.

HAYWARD, CALIF.

Senator MORSE: Congratulations on the stand you took regarding the Vietnam crisis. I can't imagine the courage it took for you to stand alone in the Senate on this issue. This is just a note to thank you for that courage. Too bad I can't vote for you next time.

God bless you,

CHARLES PUTKEY.

AUGUST 4, 1964.

As citizens and active Democratic club members, deeply concerned for maintaining peace, wishing to express our attitudes toward foreign policy Democratic administration, we have resolved urge you as we have urged President Johnson to continue all efforts toward solution of the grave situation in southeast Asia, not through unilateral military action and reaction but by honorable negotiation through United Nations.

STUDIO CITY DEMOCRATIC CLUB.

THOUSAND OAKS,

August 12, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I thank you for your courage and understanding of the world situation. I am referring in particular to Vietnam.

There are too few of you.

It was like a voice in the wilderness.

I have watched closely U.S. politics for over 50 years. It frightens me.

I saw bodies washed ashore in the First World War. I cried then and I have cried since when I think of all the unnecessary suffering, grief, and devastation caused by avarice, greed, and lust for power.

Again, in 1947, I saw the terrible havoc war causes. I saw Europe in shock. I heard then and I still hear cries of anguish of the innocent victims, children, sick, old, and helpless. Why? How long?

It must not happen again. You, the Senator from Alaska, and a few, too few, men in high places must arouse the inarticulate people whose very existence depends on peace.

Thank you again for giving a little hope.
Sincerely,

Mrs. INGA LEE DENYS.

ALDERWOOD MANOR, WASH.,

August 13, 1964.

HON. SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for revealing to us the truth about the Vietnam attack.

It takes courage to do that and you have it.
Very truly,

ELIZABETH CRIS.

AUGUST 17, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I commend your courageous and principled vote against the resolution which, as you said, was a "pre-dated declaration of war."

It is deplorable that the excellent speeches against our dangerous and immoral involvement in South Vietnam, made by you and Senator GRUENING, have not been adequately covered in the press here. I am sure that if more Americans knew the facts of our actions in Vietnam there would be more support for the position you so ably advocate.

Sincerely yours,

LYLE and BARBARA MERCER.

STUDIO CITY, CALIF.,

August 10, 1964.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senator, State of Oregon,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I admire and respect the statement you made concerning our attack upon North Vietnam. Your high ideals and concern for ethical principles has certainly gained my admiration for a long time.

I thought I would drop you a note and tell you that I am behind you. I am sure that God's universal laws are fighting with you in the attempt you are making to bring our people to a realistic and spiritual understanding of their world responsibilities.

Sincerely yours,

RAYMOND K. RIEBS.

MIAMI, FLA.,

August 17, 1964.

HON. SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,
Senate of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It is certainly gratifying that someone is vocal about this Vietnam hysteria. Why should we force our values at the cost of our children's lives upon people whose outlook and way of life are totally different from ours and beside, live on the other side of the planet? Awareness to Castro and other subversives is evident. But risking war with 12 million Chinese glaring at us seems as futile as to help Rumania or Bulgaria escape from the Iron Curtain. Repulsive dictator De Gaulle has his big feet on the ground when he speaks of neutralization. I hope our leaders will listen to commonsense.

Respectfully,

THERESE DE CORIOLIS.

HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.,

August 14, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I think it appropriate that Americans from all parts of the country not merely your own constituents, make known to you their appreciation for the consistent courage, sobriety, and devotion to principle which you demonstrate in the conduct of your office. Your willingness to be the lonely if not the lone voice for rationality and peace in the Senate, as evidenced by your recent vote against the Vietnam war resolution benefits all Americans, not merely those who elect you. The courage required to resist the juggernaut of war hysteria is admirable. This is particularly true in an era like the present one in which in one short generation we have seen developed in our country, a large, rich, bureaucratic Military Establishment, a strong know-nothing right-wing movement and an intimidated middle-of-the-road body politic that is becoming as fearful of being called liberal as it was a decade ago of being called radical.

On behalf of numerous colleagues and friends in the Los Angeles area, I wish to express our thanks to you for your courage and your wisdom and our hope that we and all Americans will continue to benefit from them for many years to come.

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN G. RUDMAN.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,

August 12, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I should like to express both my admiration for your courage in your solitary fight against the U.S. policy in Vietnam, and my support for the principles you have enunciated in this fight. Without doubt, U.S. policy toward southeast Asia is not only morally wrong, but also politically foolish; morally, we now symbolize a reactionary power determined to prevent any national, social revolution; politically we have the effect of pushing the nonaligned Asian and African countries into the Red Chinese sphere.

Please keep up your dissent.

SYBIL WEIR.

EDMONDS, WASH.,

August 12, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: Please be advised your stand on "aid" and Asia greatly appreciated. Good thing someone tries to correct things.

GRANT RILEY.

P.S.—I have heard many favorable comments on your efforts on this as well as the oil lobby.

WOODINVILLE, WASH.,

August 9, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please accept my thanks for the way that you voted on the recent Vietnam legislation. I am fully aware that I am probably in the minority on this issue, but it is extremely pleasant to know that there is at least one U.S. Senator who is seriously concerned with preventing the outbreak of a third world war.

I hope your vote will help to influence some of your colleagues.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. BROUSSARD.

FEDERAL WAY, WASH.,

August 11, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is the first time in my 63 years that I have written to a Congressman. I'm not proud of this and men-

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

19833

tion it only to emphasize the esteem in which I hold your actions and record in Congress.

I certainly do not know if you are always right, but right or wrong, at least you do not imitate a sheep. In fact, you remind me of those 12 "willful Senators" of the World War I era. Borah, Norris, and others. Perhaps I admire you because I suppose that I am an isolationist. I don't know whether or not you are, but I really became enthused today in listening to an interview (over radio) in which you stated that we are sometimes the aggressor and also squander our money throughout the world.

I would like it if you were a Senator from my State. I hope providence will give you a long, and I am sure a useful life.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD C. NIMRICK.

WASHINGTON COURT HOUSE, OHIO,
August 13, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: I want to thank you for your words and vote on the war in Vietnam.

Unless our country can develop an intelligent and strong opposition, I despair of democratic government.

Thank you and may your courage increase.

Sincerely yours,

WILBUR W. KAMP.

P.S.—Sorry my Senators couldn't vote with you.

REDDING, CALIF.,
August 11, 1964.

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

DEAR Mr. MORSE: I wish to express my agreement with and appreciation of your opposition to President Johnson's recent action in bombing North Vietnam. I believe it was a grave abuse of power, and in the long run can have only tragic results.

It was encouraging that you pointed out the moral significance of the action, for surely war is immoral and we must be held accountable for the havoc and death that we have imposed upon a helpless people with our backing of South Vietnam.

It is sad that there are so few in our Government that are capable of reasoned and independent action, and I hope that you will still find the courage to speak out for peace and right. I am sure that there are many who are grateful to you as I am.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs. GRACE SMITH.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
August 14, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

Senator WAYNE MORSE: Your fighting ability to expose the South Vietnam brush fire war is appreciated by the people who think.

One million dollars a day could buy a lot of rice and still build friendly relations with peoples of the world.

International trade with all nations is the only way to maintain the peace of the world. Any other way is death for all.

Yours truly,

MONTELL T. KINSTAD.

SAN ANSELMO, CALIF.,
August 10, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I express to you my unbounded approval and admiration of your voting against the President's emergency resolution re southeast Asia and hearty agreement that the resolution is "a predated declaration of war."

I believe that U.S. intervention in South Vietnam should cease, not be increased.

From reading the "Memo on Vietnam" by D. McReynolds and A. J. Muste, published by the War Resisters League, 5 Beekman Street, N.Y., I cannot but feel that the U.S. policy there has been one of utter folly and futility, both politically and militarily. There is good reason to suppose that the Indochinese states could, if they were left to be neutral and independent, could do the same thing in regard to China as Yugoslavia, Albania, and Rumania have done in relation to U.S.S.R. Chinese domination over Indochina is not inevitable but it is made more certain by the intransigence of current American policy.

China will accept neutral or independent Communist states to her south, but she will not tolerate an American base on her borders, as she demonstrated at great cost to everyone in Korea.

It is my earnest hope that all peace minded and liberal people and organization will speak out now, uncompromisingly, for the immediate end of the war in South Vietnam and demand support of plans toward the neutralization of the Indochinese states, ending all attempts to draw them into our pattern of military alliances.

Most respectfully yours,

ROSALIND WATKIN.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
August 14, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I commend you for your dissenting vote on the fight-if-we-must resolution introduced by President Johnson.

I agree with you on the Vietnam situation. I only regret that our Congress has so few clear thinking statesmen as yourself and Senator ERNEST GRUENING.

Respectfully,

Mrs. RAE COHN.

WOODSTOCK, N.Y.,
August 14, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE B. MORSE,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Enclosed is a copy of a letter I sent to the New York Times. I thought it might be of interest to you. If you, or perhaps Senator GRUENING, should by any chance wish to make use of it, you are free to do so.

Sincerely,

EDWARD SCHINDELER.
WOODSTOCK, N.Y.,
August 11, 1964.

"THE EDITOR,
"The New York Times,
"New York, N.Y.

"DEAR SIR: In the wake of last week's crisis in southeast Asia, some things were done and some things were said that in their political and moral significance may well prove to be of greater and more lasting importance than the event which evoked them, serious and ugly though this was in itself. First in point of time and weightiness was the passage of the resolution giving the President practically blanket power to escalate the Vietnam conflict by taking whatever military action he may personally deem warranted by events or conditions. By this action the Congress surrendered by an almost unanimous vote the power specifically vested in itself in article 8, to 'declare war'; and, in the parlance of the time, to 'grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water'—or, in effect, to regulate whatever belligerent action the time and place would justify or require, in the judgment of the Congress.

"Following the passage of the resolution President Johnson, in expressing his satis-

faction, said: 'I am sure the American people join me in expressing the deepest appreciation to the leaders and members of both parties * * * for their patriotic, resolute and rapid action.' In the total absence of proof, the President at the very least was guilty of overweening conceit in presuming to speak for the American people on so momentous an issue. Merely on the basis of casual talk, this writer is convinced that he is not speaking for himself alone in (a) challenging Mr. Johnson's confident assumption of all but unanimous approval of his own actions and congressional servility, and (b) voicing a strenuous protest both on behalf of dissenting Senators MORSE and GRUENING and those citizens who are in agreement with them, against the gross and libelous implication that they are deficient in patriotism as well as resolution. Far from wanting to bestow praise on Congress for its hasty, if not hysterical, acquiescence on the strength of what Senator MORSE came close to describing as a deliberately U.S.-provoked crisis, we not only deplore the 'rapid' surrender of its much publicized and tirelessly taught function of providing a check and balance to executive power, but see the congressional action as a craven abdication of its moral as well as political responsibility in direct contravention of the unspoken mandate they have from the people to uphold the Constitution and do nothing to weaken or undermine it.

"It remained for one of the more universally respected Senators to supply the clue to the congressional reasoning that led to the precipitant granting of the President's demands. Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN said: 'I am still apprehensive of the outcome of the President's decision, but * * * as a citizen I feel I must support our President whether his decision is right or wrong.'

"This is a restatement in personal terms of Stephen Decatur's 'My country right or wrong.' And since the Decatur dictum is mostly oratorical balderdash because one's country, whether in the abstract sense or in the physical can never be wrong, we are obliged to Senator AIKEN for correctly interpreting Decatur's 'country' to stand for nothing more than the party or President in power, and in doing so, to expose it for the unwarranted submission to temporal political figureheads it apostrophizes by indirection.

"Unfortunately, the Senator did not appear aware of the enormity contained in his words. We take it as axiomatic that a free citizen does not give his conscience in the keeping of another, whether he be an alderman or a President. This would be so even if the President were as towering a figure as Washington or Jefferson or Lincoln, i.e., of a moral and intellectual or humanitarian caliber that has long been absent from the Washington scene. We submit that it is the citizen's civic as well as his moral duty to oppose wrongness on every level. To do otherwise is to become a party and accessory to wrongdoing and result in a culpability that, at this juncture, may range from simple involvement in local or domestic villainy to the heinous crime of abetting a universal atomic holocaust with the destruction for eons to come of such measure of civilization as mankind has achieved to date.

"EARL SCHINDELER."

SOMERSET, N.J.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE:

Please find enclosed clippings which may be of interest for your office file. The Christian Science Monitor's statement that further involvement is "unavoidable" sounds like predestination. Even if our policy in Asia were entirely morally correct it would not change the fact that our course of action is irrational.

August 19

A good military commander does not attack a position which he knows he can't take just because he knows it should be his hill.

What is most disturbing is the apparent lack of any serious advance planning with a presentation of clear-cut realistic alternatives.

As my letter indicates I commend you and Senator ERNEST GRUENING for your courage on this issue.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR L. REUBEN.

PRINCETON, N.J.,
August 17, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just a note to let you know that you have not been speaking to an entirely inattentive audience. For what it is worth, you have my support in your protest against the administration's policies in South Vietnam. I suppose it is too much to hope that American political parties could speak and act sensibly in foreign affairs during an election year, but I think you are to be commended for the effort; and I hope you will keep trying.

I have been out of the country a good portion of the past month and have not seen verbatim copies of your speeches. If you have any reprints available, I would like very much to see them.

Sincerely,

PAUL TILLET.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
August 17, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Thank you very much for your letter of August 13 and for the copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 11, 1964, pages 18426-18452. I was particularly interested in the list of loans appearing at pages 18428 and 18429, all of them for 40 years. It might as well have been 1,000 years, as none of them will ever be repaid. The purposes for which these so-called loans were made are simply incredible. I note that the total of the loans made by the AID during the calendar year 1963, at three-fourths of 1 percent interest (on money borrowed by us at, I suppose, about 3 percent) is \$1,057,925,000. I confidently venture the assertion that most of this money was wasted and am amazed that even the bureaucrats who handle these matters would not have better sense.

Referring to the Vietnam venture, you were quoted recently in some publication as saying that that entire enterprise was not worth the life of one American soldier. I am in complete agreement with that sentiment.

Query: Although the President of the United States is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, does he have the power to send American soldiers to risk their lives in wars between contending political factions in other countries? The Congress is the only agency which has the power to declare war, and it has not done so. Is our interference in South Vietnam anything more than a private enterprise undertaken by Kennedy and now continued, in a greatly amplified form, by Johnson? I hope there will be additional voices raised in the Congress against our interference in a fight between political factions in a tiny country 10,000 miles away in which we have no legitimate interest.

Very truly yours,

WALTER L. NOSSAMAN.

NEWTON HIGHLANDS, MASS.,
August 15, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing this note to express my appreciation and support of your courageous action in speaking and voting against the resolution endorsing the President's recent military action in North Vietnam and any such military actions as he may wish to take at any time in the future.

I know that many more Americans agree with you than are willing to express their agreement, and that most Americans would agree if they were not misinformed by the self-censored media of mass communication. I hope that some future President will make our actions in international affairs conform to our image of ourselves as champions of freedom and decency.

Sincerely,

MARVIN MILLER,

MORRISVILLE, PA.,
August 17, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: For being so consistent in your fight to do what is humanly right, may I commend you. So few have spoken so forthright as you before the U.S. Senate in condemning this insidious war in Vietnam.

What blinds our Congress in endorsing this needless fight that can only lead to total destruction for everyone? Your courage and brilliance and love of human life make you outstanding.

Long life to you and may you be strong to continue to speak for the defenseless people.

Sincerely,

Mrs. CELIA GLANTZ.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
August 17, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: From time to time, your statements in the U.S. Senate in opposition to our Government's policy in the Far East—especially with respect to events in South Vietnam—have been reported in the press.

I find your opposition to the administration's disastrous course very enlightening. It is regrettable that few such voices are to be found in Congress.

I would very much appreciate it if you could send me reprints of your many speeches dealing with this subject.

Sincerely yours,

IRVING HERMAN.

LAKELAND, CALIF.,
August 14, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This note is just to let you know how greatly I and my friends honor you and Senator GRUENING for your continuing and effective opposition to our illegal involvement in South Vietnam. It took courage of a special order to vote "No" on the resolution giving broad powers to President Johnson. I am reminded of Representative Jeannette Rankin who twice said "I cannot vote for war." She gave up her political career in thus voting her conscience. But she will be long remembered.

I do what I can through Woman Strike for Peace, and just yesterday we heard Gail Eaby (of Inglewood, Calif.) telling of her trip to The Hague with the NATO Women's Peace Force, to protest the spreading of nuclear

weapons, through NATO, to West Germany and other nations. We deplore in particular the secrecy currently being imposed—so that details of the atomic agreements cannot be seen even by the Congress, except for members of two committees.

No nuclear weapons to Germany, now or later.

No need for you to reply; your valuable time can be put to better use in carrying on the struggle.

Sincerely,

RUTH P. KOSHUK.

NORTH HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.,
August 14, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: I commend you on your statement on our presence in South Vietnam. Be courageous dear Senator, we are with you.

Thankfully yours,

DAVE RUBIN.

NORTH HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.

DEAR SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: I enjoyed your speech on the Senate floor. Continue your good work. We all are rooting for you.

Thankfully yours,

PAULINE RUBIN.

BREMERTON, WASH.,
August 14, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I fully support your opposition to the escalation of the war in Vietnam.

I feel strongly that U.S. support of Dictator Khanh and his ambitions makes a mockery of America's oft stated "commitment to freedom."

President Johnson may need this incident to help in his campaign and the U.S. Navy may need this incident to justify existence at its present size, but I certainly have no need for more war and I doubt if the peoples of the world need more war.

Thank you,

JAMES F. OGG.

FORT JERVIS, N.Y.,
August 17, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,

DEAR SIR: I wish to express my gratitude to you for your recent stand on the involvement of this country in southeast Asia. As you measured the possible loss of life and all the attendant grief and suffering against the possible gain and found that the lives of our sons was more valuable, you reached, I am sure, the only rational and, therefore, Christian conclusion possible.

I know it took great courage to do what you did. I admire you and respect you and will be eternally grateful for what you did. I also intend to write in your name for President in the next election. And I am telling all my friends what I am going to do.

This brings up another point: The difficulty of writing in a name on the voting machine. I believe this is deliberately made difficult to discourage write-ins, thus retaining greater control of the election by the two major parties. I believe, sir, that the truly worthwhile thing in the Constitution is we can change our form of economic or social life without recourse to violence. It therefore follows that if the individual feels that neither party is giving him a chance to vote for what he wants he can do it anyway. And it should be just as easy to vote for someone, not endorsed by a party as it is to vote for their candidates. Therefore, I believe the present situation as regards to write-ins is both illegal and unconstitutional. It does not give equal opportunity to all candidates and all voters. And every qualified person in this country is a candidate.

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

19835

Write-ins should be encouraged by making it as easy as possible to write in a name. It might even ultimately prevent a revolution. Because I do not believe that we will tolerate forever governments forcibly taking our sons forcibly and unconstitutionally, and sending them to foreign lands, to support governments over which we have no control.

I do not feel that when I pledge allegiance to the flag I give my Government the right to bargain my life and the lives of my sons for the benefit of dictators and governments who can start wars on any pretext and whose policies are not subject to me for approval.

The constitutionality of our present voting machines should be tested. I believe it would be healthier and safer if we, the people, had a better chance to nominate our own candidates, by write-ins.

Once again I wish to congratulate you and express my deepest gratitude to you. I am sure you will be blessed for your courage and integrity.

Sincerely,

GEORGE F. MCCULLOUGH.

SWARTHMORE, PA.,

August 15, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

My DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I strongly support your efforts to bring about a change in policy in regard to Vietnam.

Sincerely yours,

ELIZABETH J. WRAY.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,

August 14, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: Heartfelt thanks to you for opposing the President's shooting war decision—which was not even properly debated in Congress. If the world is saved this time, thanks will go to such as you and Senator GRUENING.

Respectfully,

ELENA VARNECK.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,

August 12, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: While you have consistently shown yourself to be a man of great integrity, it must be especially difficult during this Vietnam affair, when so many, swept up in the cold war hysteria, refuse to let nationalism compromise with reason. Please know that there are many of us who greatly admire your courage and stand by you in the hope that your views, although now in dissent, will eventually prevail.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR MARGOLIS,
JAY RUSKIN.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,

August 15, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: In the face of overwhelming bipartisan support of the President's recent actions in southeast Asia, it is heartening that at least two Senators have the courage to question both the political and military motivations for the attack on North Vietnam and the U.S. foreign policy in southeast Asia.

I have come to distrust official dispatches to the press about the situation in Vietnam as well as most other reportage on the administration's most recent war efforts in South Vietnam. I was particularly disinterested to see how summarily most newspaper dismissed the opposition to the joint resolution granting the President advance approval in all steps deemed necessary by him to "repel any attack on U.S. forces in southeast Asia." The threat to peace in southeast Asia, and indeed in the world, in such an action is

obvious, and the apparently less obvious threat to the system of checks and balances in our Government and likely atrophy of democratic processes resulting from such an action is foreboding for the freedom of this Nation.

Perhaps through some fault of my own I was not able to find in the newspapers the text of your speech opposing our recent actions in southeast Asia. Since I do not have ready access to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am hoping you have copies of your speech available for distribution. References to other registrations of protest by you and Senator GRUENING, of Alaska on the present situation in southeast Asia would be most welcome also, as the coverage of the American press on legislators' views opposing a more aggressive policy in southeast Asia seems to be at best muffled.

Sincerely yours,

LEIF C. W. LANDBERG.

SAN JOSE, CALIF.,

August 11, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In the past few months I have become increasingly concerned over the course of American policy in southeast Asia, and ever increasingly interested and gratified by your continued public questioning of this policy. I have learned, but only from the most indirect sources, certainly not the press, that your speeches before the Senate are well worth the reading, and I should be very grateful if I could somehow lay my hands on any or all of your recent public comments on this subject.

Through the years I have come to rely on you, and recently Senator CLARK, for honest observations on American public policy. I should like to take this opportunity to encourage you to continue to call a spade a spade.

Very sincerely,

CHARLES L. SULLIVAN.

RIDLEY PARK, PA.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I tender my heartfelt thanks for your lonely and courageous stand on the recent events in southeast Asia. It is a frightening thing that only you and Senator GRUENING should be the only Senators with the sanity to oppose these acts of war on the part of the United States of America under the cynical guise of freedom and democracy.

I fear for the future of my country when I compare the deadly parallel of the lack of response of the citizens of the United States with that of Germany in the 1930's. Are we bereft of every constructive emotion and faculty that these events go on, supported by the "liberals" as well as the lunatic fringe?

What has happened to Senator CLARKE who decries the degeneration of Congress into a "dead branch"? Must we have more "Bays of Pigs" while the American public remains blissfully ignorant of the most basic facts.

Or is it more important that President Johnson indulge in the antiquated horse trading and politics of a generation ago while space age realities snuff out humanities?

The God of power has made us not only blind but mad. How far can the end be? How soon will China have the weapons to retaliate in kind? In Poland in 1958 at the Poznan Trade Fair I saw an exhibit of Chinese machine tools that were of very advanced design, so it may be sooner than the American public dreams.

All I can hope is that your tiny minority can grow strong enough to change the suicidal course before we go over the brink.

Most sincerely yours,

W. J. BATCHELDER.

NORTH BERGEN, N.J.

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

DEAR SIR: May I take this opportunity to congratulate you on your recent speech in the Senate which related to the situation in Vietnam.

I am thoroughly in accord with your expressed sentiments regarding our policy toward that unhappy land.

Though at the moment yours is, in the Senate, a minority voice, I feel that your views expressed the deep-felt desires of millions of Americans; in fact I believe yours is the view shared by the majority; firm, honorable negotiations under international law so that there will be a peaceful settlement on a basis of satisfaction of the interests of all parties involved.

Allow me to admire your courageous stand, and my hopes for your success.

Very truly yours,

JOHN SHIPLEY.

ALTADENA, CALIF.,

August 12, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We want you to know how proud we were of you and Senator GRUENING that you voted against the "pre-dated declaration of war" on North Vietnam. We particularly appreciate your statement to the press charging that South Vietnam first attacked North Vietnam islands, while our Navy stood by.

We enclose copies of some other letters which we have written to Members of Congress.

And here are two fliers which were given out (in approximately 5,000 copies each) at a Hiroshima-Vietnam Vigil on Hollywood Boulevard last Saturday evening, August 8. The vigil was sponsored by the Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice, and some 22 peace organizations cooperated to man 12 blocks on both sides of Hollywood (just west of Vine) with placards and leafleters.

Yours with gratitude,

Mr. and Mrs. PAUL ORR.

ST. LOUIS, MO.,

August 14, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The courage you displayed on the floor of the Senate in the discussion of President Johnson's support resolution on Vietnam is rare indeed in present day American political life.

This kind of honest, righteous, individuality is the highest form of patriotism, in the best traditions of Americanism.

Sincerely,

DORIS BOLEF.

MIDDLETOWN, CONN.,

August 16, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to express my gratitude to you for your courageous and rational stand on the war in Vietnam, and especially for your excellent speech against the August 5 resolution.

It is indeed disheartening to see that you and Senator GRUENING are the only Members of the Senate to have voted against the resolution. Equally depressing is it to see the lack of public protest against so blatant an act of aggression as the U.S. bombarding of North Vietnam.

We can only hope that the people of our country will rouse themselves to their necessary responsibilities before it is too late. Your outspokenness on this issue is hopefully a step in that direction. So few people in positions of national influence have the guts to talk up. That is why I write to you, something I have never done before; to say that, in my opinion, your position on South Vietnam is the only honest, human, and sensible way of looking at it. With the current, willful misrepresentation of the facts by the press, administration, etc., it is difficult to see how the citizens of this country will ever

19836

August 19

learn enough to make them realize what is going on.

You have been the true representative of the American people whether they know it or not. Please continue.

Sincerely yours,

LINDA RUDICH.

NEWCASTLE, CALIF.,
August 16, 1964.

Senator MORSE.

DEAR SIR: I do want to thank you from the bottom of my heart for your views on the Vietnam crisis. I've declared ever since our boys were sent there, they had no business there. Neither had our ships to be where they were. It was an invitation for incidents to create war. I'm so glad you said so; I only wish you were our President for all your life. You would save our boys' lives and parents' heartbreak.

I'm 81 years old and have four wonderful grandsons who deserve to keep their lives. Do help us and thank you.

EDITH LIVINGSTON.

SKOKIE, ILL.,
August 15, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: May we express our great admiration for your thoughtful and courageous speeches in the Senate concerning our policy in Vietnam. Certainly events of the past 10 days have proven the wisdom of your remarks.

It is our fond hope that not only will your efforts in behalf of peace continue, but that you will win many other Members of your body to your position.

With all good wishes.

Respectfully yours,

Mr. and Mrs. BORIS H. BRALL.

FAIRFIELD, CONN.,
August 17, 1964.

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

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to commend you (as well as Senator EARNEST GRUNING, to whom I am sending a similar letter) for voting against the resolution that was passed in the Senate on August 7, giving the President carte blanche in southeast Asia.

In my opinion this resolution—

1. Is a dangerous precedent because it is a predated declaration of war, which is unconstitutional. The power it gives to the President will, until it is revoked, pass to all succeeding Presidents, including Senator GOLDWATER, in the event that he is elected to that office.

2. Is, I gravely suspect, a prelection move, to disprove Senator GOLDWATER's criticisms of the administration's foreign policies.

3. Can be used to extend the war in Vietnam. It appears that only those Vietnamese are supporting the war who are (a) benefiting financially from U.S. intervention; (b) are not subject to napalm bombs made in the United States and dropped by U.S. planes, piloted by U.S. Air Force personnel.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES D. CAIRNS.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
August 10, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am in agreement with your position on the recent crisis in Vietnam. Not only do I hold the United States as the original provoker in the North Vietnam crisis but the unwanted intruder in the South Vietnam conflict also. To me, the foreign policy of the United States is objectionable in all of southeast Asia as well

as in most all of its foreign policies all over the globe.

Specifically, in this communication, I plan to give evidence on why our action in Vietnam is objectionable, proof of this evidence in a somewhat novel fashion, and a solution to the existing problems in Vietnam. This procedure could also be applied to the rest of our existing foreign policy but, for a more persuasive argument, I will consider only the Vietnam issue.

Thank you for taking time to read the enclosed essay.

Respectfully yours,

EDWIN M. FALK.

SEATTLE, WASH.

DEAR SENATOR: I approve of your stand on the Vietnam issue. Once again you have shown the courage of your convictions. Which in my opinion are in the best interest of the people of the United States and the world.

I only wish we had more men like you representing us in the Government. Hoping you will continue to speak out as you have done in the past.

I remain,

Respectfully yours,

Mr. E. L. HEALEY.

SEAL BEACH, CALIF.,
April 14, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My appreciation for your opposition to the resolution giving the President unlimited power to institute war without the approval of Congress.

It is my impression that there are many more people throughout the country, than Washington and the press would have us believe, who are against the provocative part we are playing in the Vietnam affair and are appreciative of your dissent against such action.

It was the great dissenters who carved their niche of fame in our country's history, and not those who merely gave routine rubberstamp approval to acts of extremism. I am tempted to move to Oregon so that I might have the honor and privilege of voting for you.

Very respectfully yours,

H. A. LAMONT, M.D.

DETROIT, MICH.,
August 15, 1964.

U.S. Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon.

SIX: I wrote a boiling hot letter to President Johnson, on his hot war in Asiatic jungles.

He is trying to do what the British and French tried to do for 200 years—take military control over yellow and Hindu races, plus also the Arab races.

This long display of force has cost Britain her place in the world, as she is now little more than a third-class nation.

And, of course, Hitler tried to copy England and he has put Germany into military slavery that will be there for a long time to come. Johnson reminds me of a foreman branding cattle, he thinks he can put his brand on certain yellow men and that's it. And maybe this schoolboy Mr. Rusk thinks also, but it is not as simple as he and his theory leads him to believe.

I guess you saw that article in U.S. News & World Report by the longtime reporter, and asked positive questions—his only answer was we are there to win. To win what, a big bag of mosquitoes? If our country wants to go nuts why not go with GOLDWATER; he will do a finished job, why pussyfoot around with Johnson.

The main trouble, he has been in Government many years to long. Three-quarters of his time has been in Government.

There are many bullies all over the country who say we are coward if we don't stick it out.

But they are not in danger of getting over there.

How many Negroes has Johnson been able to get over there? I have seen no pictures of Negroes over there.

But it's the southern Senators who are the real big warmongers—their votes have been putting arms into most every small country on the face of the earth.

Then we send our white American boys over to get shot.

As bad as GOLDWATER may be I'll not vote for Johnson, he of course has no sons in danger.

In these wars it's always the case "let George do it."

And Governor Wallace seems to be a warmonger, he didn't talk against, he follows the warmongers of the South.

Both Johnson and GOLDWATER are a couple of first-class slickers; there really is no good choice.

Yours,

A LONG TIME VOTER.

PACOIMA, CALIF.,
August 14, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Bravo. Your stand on Vietnam is wonderful and the only answer to ending that horrible war.

I stand firmly behind you 100 percent.

Yours respectfully,

MICHAEL MARGULIES.

FRIENDS COMMITTEE ON
NATIONAL LEGISLATION,
Washington, D.C., August 17, 1964.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Friends Committee on National Legislation warmly applauded your reassurances to Congress that "the United States intends no rashness (in southeast Asia) and seeks no wider war." The world at large is undoubtedly grateful.

We wish to express deep concern, however, over our understanding that, in case of attack, the captains of the individual carriers in the 7th Fleet have been given authority to retaliate immediately against North Vietnamese bases, without consulting Washington first.

This is too heavy a responsibility to place upon men at the center of an action where confusion tends to be inevitable and rashness may ensue. The week of August 2 was a pointed reminder of how difficult it is to understand the motivations and actions of another land. Additional decisions to retaliate against land bases would seriously undermine U.S. efforts to build a world of law and order. They could bring us all a step nearer to World War III.

Therefore our organization would welcome reassurances that we have been guilty of misinterpreting—both the comments on the interview with Captain Daniels, as carried in the August 11 New York Times (see enclosure, page 9), and subsequent seemingly confirming conversations with Pentagon officials.

Sincerely,

FRANCES E. NEELY.

CAMDEN, N.J.,
August 16, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your courageous efforts to keep our country out of war, have been deeply appreciated. War should become obsolete and I trust more progress will

be made in solving world turmoil intelligently and peacefully. Thank you for all you have done.

Gratefully,
 BERTHA JAMISON,
 LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

WHITE HOUSE,
 Washington, D.C.

YOUR HONOR SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: We congratulate you for voting "No" on South Vietnam.

Thank you very much.
 HELEN DEUTCH,
 Housewife.
 SAN YSIDRO, CALIF.,
 August 15, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: I want to thank you from the bottom of my heart for your sane and valliant stand during the recent North Vietnam bombings.

Whatever the political, ideological or strategical circumstances involved, you were the most prominent man who kept sane and did not hysterically scream for blood as so many others did. Your posture was that of a man bound to the concepts of civilization as opposed to the human degeneration of which most of the world's history consists.

In the world it is not entirely possible to live without violence, but we must always strive to avoid becoming hysterical just because somebody broke one rule of our way to play the game.

The United States has now a history of many wars, interventions, and general meddling. Some justified and most, sadly to say, not. In 1911 the U.S. Navy bombarded Vera Cruz in Mexico. It started because a few American sailors were roughed up in Tampico.

In the past the United States managed to assume the stance of a peaceful nation because it had meek neighbors. In Europe, for example, the case was different. Deep, ugly nationality hatred (similar to our civil rights problem) was used by the interested rulers to conduct war after war. The United States had few neighbors and a vast wilderness separated the bordering countries. But now the world has become small—Thailand and Honduras, Madagascar, and Afghanistan are our neighbors now. This has increased the possibility for friction a hundredfold.

And friction there will be—in Indonesia, Thailand, Burma, India, Iran, Greece, Spain, Mozambique, Angola, South Africa, Rhodesia, Tanganyika, Congo, Morocco, Venezuela, Chile, Brazil, Nicaragua, Dominican Republic, Haiti, Guatemala, Bolivia, and several others.

During and after our lifetime there will be violent struggles in those and possible other countries. I am looking at it as a pathologist of history and not as an ideologist. And the United States will be involved. I am looking at it with horror.

One certain effect will be the complete "psychological exhaustion" of the United States (as Erich Fromm puts it). American nerves are frayed as is—the struggle of survival in the working life is still a big item, then the monsters of technology: motor noise, air pollution, insecticides, TV (the breeding ground for the wave of future neurotics), racial problems, the urban and rural slums, mass transportations.

I am seriously suggesting that we should have a Federal organism that studies the psychological effects of all political, economical and technological problems affecting Americans. This organism should then also issue advice to the different parts of the Federal Government as to how to maintain psychological strength and health. As you know, North Vietnamese General Giap has declared: "The United States has all resources for winning the Vietnam conflict except the psychological resources."

You see the current signs of political ex-

tremsim in the United States—those are to some extent pathological symptoms. When you observe the individuals who lean toward extremism, you will come to the conclusion that under the ideology there are serious mental and psychological problems which are aggravated, activated by the "psychological war" between the United States and the forces of international Marxism and also by fanatical nationalism in underdeveloped countries.

Therefore men like you are valuable because they keep the stability and sanity (which was the one resource the Romans in their pre-Christian era did not lack—except of their crude ways of diversions—but then look at TV).

Yours truly,
 JOHN RASPEY.

SANTA MONICA, CALIF.,
 August 10, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations for your forceful, outright condemnation of our war escalating policy in North Vietnam.

Do continue your courageous stand and do all in your power to expose the constant flow of lies from every source, including Washington.

Even though you are a lonely voice of truth in the wilderness of lies—it is indeed a bright glow and a warm one you shed.

Thanks and bless you.
 Mrs. PEGGY FOX.

GARRISON, MONT.,
 August 13, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: I feel I must commend you for your negative vote against the resolution backing the President's actions during the recent crisis in Vietnam. Defending our ships and bases is one thing, but a "retaliatory" strike such as the world has just witnessed is another, and I fail to see how the incident has enhanced our position in southeast Asia or, indeed, anyplace else in the world.

Though not of your State, I would be proud to have a Senator representing me who has the moral courage to vote against something he does not believe in, even though he may be consequently singled out and probably condemned by many. The Senate and the American people would be in a far better position, if there were more who had felt as you, and voted against the resolution.

Yours very truly,
 Mrs. DONALD HEROUX.

BALTIMORE, Md.,
 August 16, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am in complete agreement with your views concerning Vietnam. Believe the problem of Vietnam should be resolved by the Vietnamese people with the aid of the United Nations.

VIOLA M. DAMMANN.
 SONOMA, CALIF.,
 August 16, 1964.

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

I concur with your negative vote re the Vietnam resolution passed by Senate.

ELLIOTT JACOBS.
 MIDDLEFIELD, CONN.,
 August 15, 1964.

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

Bravo for your intelligent stand re recent resolution on Tonkin Gulf affair. You and Senator Gruening bear the responsibility of sane men in an insane world. The responsi-

bility is all the greater for the odds against you. Don't falter. Best wishes.

LOUIS ZEMEL.

SANTA ANA, CALIF.,
 August 10, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: I read with interest in our paper of yours and Senator ERNEST GRUENING of Alaska casting the only dissenting votes on the emergency resolution approving all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression in Vietnam and I want to congratulate you men in that you not only stood for what you believed in the face of criticism but you believe what millions of other red-blooded Americans believe that we have no real reason to be in Vietnam.

We do not want any nation attacking our ships nor any part of our Armed Forces when they are attending to their own business and on our own property, but if Russia or any other country were as close to our shores like in Cuba for instance, we would be nervous but I have yet to find one who has been in Vietnam, as my son was for 6 months, who thinks South Vietnam wants our help or protection. They apparently do not know which side they are on or do they care.

My son, who is a navigator in the Air Force told us of old men whom he would meet on the streets of Saigon who would turn around and spit at him after he had passed. The French gave up trying to keep them in tow long ago, why should we keep our young men there to be killed one at a time and now perhaps by the hundreds.

Thank you Senator. I only wish our California Senators had the same foresight.

From one whose grandfather died to help the slaves free and whose ancestors helped to carve out America from the beginning,

Sincerely,
 HARRY L. DADY.

SAN FERNANDO, CALIF.,
 August 10, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you, thank you for your integrity, courage and common sense in speaking against and voting against, the war in Vietnam.

It was like a cool breeze on a hot summer day—hearing you speak on TV against the bombing of the coast of North Vietnam.

Sincerely,
 JOHN M. WEATHERWAX.

WASHINGTON, D.C.
 August 10, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: As one of the millions of Americans who believe in peace, justice, and right, I applaud your stand on civil rights, on southeast Asia in particular and your position on economic and world affairs in general.

I think you are the greatest statesman America has today. Continue to fight on and may God bless you with long life, good health, courage and vision.

Respectfully yours,
 HOWARD S. PARKS.

AKRON, OHIO,
 August 9, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Although I am not one of your constituents, I should like to compliment you on your courageous vote

19838

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 19

against the resolution concerning President Johnson's politically inspired aggression against North Vietnam.

I have frequently noted that your unpopular positions on key issues express my own thoughts, and I am gratified that there is such a person as yourself in a high position with the courage to voice such convictions.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN F. SIMPSON.

APTOS, CALIF.,

August 9, 1964.

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

DEAR MR. MORSE: We wish to express our gratitude for your solitary voice of reason, and for your courage in speaking out consistently on the terrible injustice of our southeast Asia policy. When will statesmen learn? Surely the example of the French debacle in Indochina should teach us a lesson. We can only hope that the reason for the action Lyndon Johnson has taken is expedient to the November election and that he will follow a more reasonable approach after he wins.

But, because of Senator GOLDWATER and such reasonless colleagues as you have, we cannot help but fear for our country, and, indeed, for our world.

Please, please continue at least one voice of reason.

Very truly yours,

IRENE and JOHN GARRISON.

ENGLEWOOD CLIFFS, N.J.,

August 13, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is to express my admiration of you and the Senator from Alaska for your opposing vote on Mr. Johnson's action in Vietnam. Two honorable men out of 90 in the Senate and only two honorable men out of the whole Congress of the United States I would say that is a very good sample of the honorable humans in this so-called free world—two out of about every 525. My hopes were dashed when not one nay vote was cast by the congressional ladies. Now I know that I would not vote for a woman candidate.

Why don't you run independently for President? It would save humanity from the insanity of these power and trigger-happy demagogues. No one that I know has anything good to say about either Johnson or GOLDWATER and they claim they will not vote for either one. It has come to a sad state of affairs when one has no choice but the lesser of two evils and it is questionable whether one is less than the other.

If you would make the sacrifice and run, you would have a chance of a landslide. People in general are disgusted with the lies and propaganda that they are fed. I will say this for Mr. Khrushchev: I have yet to catch him in a lie. Whenever he has described a situation and Washington has denied it, I found upon checking that Khrushchev was telling the truth. The foreign news versus the U.S. news has the same comparison; seek elsewhere if one wants the facts.

I hope and pray that you will run independently against these men, even though it is asking a great sacrifice on your part. I wish you everything of the best and the guidance of providence.

Sincerely yours,

HELEN CRISTANELLI.

HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.,

August 14, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: Please accept my sincere thanks for your courageous stand against our policy in Vietnam. I hope you will continue to speak up for what is

right. All my best wishes to you and please go on with your work. All sane people are behind you.

Respectfully yours,

MRS. D. JACOBSON.

NASHVILLE, TENN.,

August 11, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This card is an expression of my support for and approval of your recent statements in criticism of the U.S. current stand in Vietnam (your article in the Progressive was most enlightening), and of your views concerning aid to certain "gunboat allies," re the Foreign Assistance Act. That the act's authorization could not be held below \$3 billion is regrettable. Perhaps needless to say, I oppose the currently discussed "Dirksen rider" designed to hobble reapportionment; in its current wording, I question whether such legislation would hold in the courts.

Sincerely,

ROBERT T. KNUFF.

MALIBU, CALIF.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your stand on U.S. bombing of North Vietnam is appreciated. Please keep speaking out. I only wish I could vote for you.

Sincerely,

PETER OKON.

MORRISTOWN, PA.,

August 15, 1964.

DEAR SIR: May I state my complete concurrence of your views of our Government's foreign policy?

You are indeed a standout among those high priced oafs in the Senate. If we don't get more like you then our country is headed "down the drain."

Congratulations, sir.

PENNSYLVANIA VOTER.

MALIBU, CALIF.,

August 11, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to endorse, as a private citizen, your recent actions and remarks in regard to the "situation" in South Vietnam. Events seem to bear out your contention that the United States does not belong in Vietnam.

MARIE FAY.

SANTA MARIA, CALIF.,

August 11, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your sane position on the Vietnam situation. Please don't give up your struggle to prevent our complete embroilment in war.

Sincerely,

VITA MONKS.

MALIBU, CALIF.,

August 12, 1964.

I would like to express my sincere admiration and appreciation of your courageous and outspoken denunciation of our (the United States) position in the Vietnam crisis.

Mrs. DORIS W. STARRELS.

MALIBU, CALIF.,

August 11, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please keep urging us (the United States) to get out of Vietnam. Thank you for your stand. Urge the whole thing to be put in the U.N. We're behind you.

WINONA SCHLIKS.

MALIBU, CALIF.,

August 13, 1964.

DEAR SIR: We wish to express our admiration of your recent actions in opposing almost singlehandedly the use of military methods in the attempt to solve our problems in Vietnam.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. EASTMAN N. JACOBS.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,

August 8, 1964.

DEAR MR. MORSE: As a relatively new, not proud American—I praise your stand for "peace" which is unpopular in America. They are too busy here murdering young people who believe everyone has the right to vote or worried about keeping property rights up at the cost of human life if necessary (someone else's). Keep up your stand on the Vietnam issue.

ALEXIS THOMPSON.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,

August 9, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you so much for your words for peace and in defense of a future for America in a thermonuclear world. You speak for the majority of Americans and the finest of American tradition when you oppose these adventurous plans by a military minded government.

Truthfully,

PHILIP L. JOHNSON.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,

August 14, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Often I disagree with your ideas, but as to foreign aid, the U.S. Government being a hypocrite and why are we in Vietnam, I agree. I'm glad a few of you have a mind of your own and use it.

LILLIAN SPIERING.

TACOMA, WASH.,

August 11, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is to commend you for your courage to express yourself as opposed to further military buildup in Vietnam. All the Americans are not for such a move even though the press and radio would have us believe it. Fighting does not preserve freedom as witness the condition in South Korea today. We have a U.N. where such matters as Vietnam should be settled. If Red China were given a seat there it would help.

Sincerely,

EVELYN FISHER.

ST. PAUL, MINN.

SIR: I hope you will continue to present the truth on U.S. foreign policy.

Sincerely,

NED O'NEILL.

OSCODA, MICH.

DEAR SIR: I have been reading with interest your efforts toward peace. May God bless you.

Sincerely,

M. EVANS.

HAYWARD, CALIF.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like copies of your speeches on Vietnam which I understand you have given on the Senate floor since June or so.

Has anyone answered your charges?

Thank you.

Mrs. ILENE WEINREB.

SAN RAFAEL, CALIF.,

August 10, 1964.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for arguing against the recent bill to fall behind the President in his Vietnam policies. I believe I am for him, but this blind follow the leader is not healthy for anyone.

Yours very truly,

RICHARD J. WETHUN.

BERKELEY YOUNG DEMOCRATIC CLUB,
Berkeley, Calif., August 13, 1964.

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

SENATOR MORSE: I want to commend you for your valiant stand on the issues involved around the Vietnam situation. As in the

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

19839

past, you have shown your forthright determination not to allow the United States to cross the brink into a final, fatal war. The day may yet come when America's people will realize the seriousness of our intervention in Vietnam and will demand that our young men leave foreign soil and come back here where the job of defending democracy is needed in Mississippi and Alabama more than in Laos or Vietnam.

Sincerely,

TED COHEN,
President,
Berkeley Young Democrats.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
August 15, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to extend my praise and admiration to you for your outspoken stand against U.S. aggression in southeast Asia. Your's must be an extremely frustrating job * * * to speak to 535 "educated" men in the U.S. Senate and find your words landing on empty soil. If you could name one or two Senators you feel might be possibly approaching an understanding of the situation as it is, I would try to write them, and have my friends also, to encourage them to follow your example. Sometimes encouragement, even if from a nobody as myself, is all that is needed.

Sincerely,

MISS MARJORIE KURSELLA.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
August 13, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to let you know of my wholehearted support of your position on the Vietnam issue.

Although your position in the Senate appears to be a rather lonely one, I am sure your courage has given strength to people all over the country, who, like myself, desire peace and an end to the senseless fighting in Vietnam. Your stand has made it possible for me, and I am sure, many others, to feel greater resolve to try to do what we can to bring peace to that area.

Again, let me thank you for your courageous leadership at this time. I am also writing a similar letter to Senator GRUENING.

Sincerely,

RICHARD FISCH, M.D.
LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
August 9, 1964.

SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your defense for society. All our people who believe in it are thanking you.

JACQUELINE REDESOND.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO,
Chicago, Ill., August 14, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Allow me to congratulate you for your negative vote on the recent congressional resolution on southeast Asia.

Even if one leaves out of account the merits or demerits of the U.S. program in Vietnam, the underlying constitutional issue is, in my opinion, so serious as to require the most determined effort to inform the public about it.

I believe that the intent of the U.S. Constitution was that the ultimate power to commit the Nation to war reside in the Congress.

Doubtless, the executive has great constitutional powers in the direction of foreign policy; but it was surely not intended that the Congress be a mere rubber stamp in great decisions of war or peace. In the technological context of the 18th century, it was enough to reserve to the Congress the power to "declare war," or to "grant letters of marque and

reprisal." In the present context, the President, as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, has acquired the power of committing the country irrevocably to war. Events now move so fast that Congress can never be presented with a real choice on the matter. Congress has thus lost one of its most vital functions to the executive branch.

This development seems in some respects inevitable, an adaptation of the national polity to an entirely unforeseen situation. Yet Congress must not give in too easily. Particularly, it must not further the demise of its constitutional powers in this sphere by giving the President vague advance sanctions for warlike acts in situations such as the present one in southeast Asia.

With highest regards, I am

Yours very truly,

PHILIP KUHN,
Assistant Professor of History.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
Cambridge, Mass., August 15, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your words of sense on the U.S. posture in Vietnam are rare, refreshing, and will be, I hope, heard by Democratic voters. (I despair of Republicans giving an ear to them, I'm afraid.) Democratic voters ought, don't you think, to guard against supporting administration moves which out-Goldwater Goldwater.

Sincerely yours,

LAURENCE H. SCOTT,
Teaching Fellow, Department of Slavic
Languages and Literatures and
Resident Tutor in Lowell House.

NORTHRIDGE, CALIF.,
August 17, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: May I take this opportunity to congratulate you for your courage in speaking out against our actions in North Vietnam last week?

It is to be hoped that many of your colleagues will be inspired by your most commendable stand against our Government's dangerous and provocative bombing missions.

Very respectfully,

CATHERINE M. BLUMBERG.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.,
July 13, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: Heard your recent speech on TV—amen. I think you are right.

Please lend your support to keeping McCarran-Walter immigration law on the books.

Keep up your good work. There are too many rubberstamps in our Congress.

Sincerely,

L. M. HANDBY.

EAST SIDE DEMOCRATIC CLUB,
Los Angeles, Calif., August 13, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We, the members of the East Side Democratic Club, wish to express our commendation and gratitude for your's and your colleague, the Honorable Senator GRUENING's, principled efforts in the U.S. Senate in criticizing and calling the attention of the American people to the unwise and perilous course being conducted by the administration and the Pentagon in southeast Asia.

Together with millions of other Americans we are deeply concerned over the threat of a major war with its implications of nuclear devastation erupting as a consequence of the administration's expansion of the Vietnamese war to the entire southeast Asian region. We feel that you and those of your colleagues who are in accord with your position

on this issue are not only upholding the prestige and honor of our Nation but are also defending the survival of mankind.

Be assured that you have our wholehearted support in your demand that the U.S. military operation in Vietnam and Laos be halted, and the conflict be settled peacefully in accordance with our obligations and declared policy of peace by resort to the United Nations, or by a conference of all nations concerned.

Cordially yours,

FRANK A. KONDRAY,
First Vice President.

P.S.—Enclosed is a copy of a resolution on the southeast Asia crisis, adopted by our membership on August 12, and forwarded to the President.

Copy of the resolution was also forwarded to the Democratic National Convention.

EAST SIDE DEMOCRATIC CLUB,
Los Angeles, Calif.

RESOLUTION ON THE CRISIS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA AND ITS EFFECT ON DEMOCRATIC PARTY PROSPECTS IN THE NATIONAL ELECTIONS
(Addressed to the President, the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson.)

Whereas in this nuclear age of weapons capable of total destruction, mankind and civilization face the greatest peril to their existence ever known. Aware of this overwhelming calamity, the most universal demand for peace in history insists that the use of military force to settle international disputes be abandoned in favor of negotiations. Accordingly, prime responsibility rests with the heads of states, particularly the United States, to whom the world looks for initiatives to avoid armed conflict;

Whereas it is the declared official policy of the U.S. Government to strive toward easing world tensions and to promote world peace, which policy of peace, Mr. President, you have publicly affirmed;

Whereas there is at present a war in southeast Asia, in which the administration is heavily committed, and which has reached a dangerously critical stage, so much so as to endanger international peace. Recently our military forces took actions to spread this war over a wider area in that region. This development has greatly disturbed the people of the world and of our Nation; and

Whereas the Democratic administration is justifiably recognized as being dedicated to a greater degree than a Republican one, to the social needs and welfare of the general electorate. And this liberal record and program has created a favorable image of the Democratic Party to the majority of the same electorate. Pursuit of the present administration policy in southeast Asia could substantially negate this favorable attitude, and thereby impair chances of success for Democratic candidates in the 1964 national election. The reason being that there is a growing conviction that the administration is yielding to pressure of Republican reaction for more drastic military action in that area. The resultant uneasiness could induce voters to reason that, with both parties posing an equal danger of a major war, there is no electoral choice on the transcendent issue of peace or war. Assuredly, Mr. President, the choice of the American electorate is for a candidate who promotes peace over one who would expand war; Therefore, it is

Resolved by the members of the East Side Democratic Club, Los Angeles, That we, as Democrats, are committed to the reelection of a liberal Democratic administration over Republican reaction. However, we maintain that this possibility must not be impaired by placing the survival of mankind on the scales against political expediency. As an alternative to the futile military solution of this crisis, we urge that, as members of the United Nations, having signed its charter, we fulfill our obligations to it and to peace by bringing

19840

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 19

this southeast Asian threat to international peace before that body, or, to participate with all other nations concerned in a conference to negotiate an honorable and peaceful end to this tragic and potentially dangerous war.

Approved by the East Side Democratic Club, August 12, 1964.

FRANK A. KONDRAY,
First Vice President.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
August 13, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: We wish to thank you for your stand on Vietnam in March, and again for your recent vote on the resolution. You are one of the few Senators with the foresight to see that a world war is not the answer to our problems, and the willingness to say so.

You have taken an unpopular stand. However, we believe most of the other Senators are failing to take a careful realistic look at the problems that face our Nation and the world today. Reports are that the Senate was all but empty during the presentation of your statement. This is very discouraging. It would seem that most of the Senators intend to follow Presidential policies rather than listen to the wishes and needs of the people.

We feel that all who take the courageous stand against the threatened holocaust of a new world war need praise and support from the public. Those who, like Senators KUCHEL and SALINGER, voted in support of the resolution allowing the President to take warlike actions, must be told that this is not in the best interests of our country. We enclose for your information a copy of a letter we have sent to both California Senators.

The knowledge that people such as you are fighting to bring about a better world is encouraging. We know that as time progresses we can continue to advance toward this better world, with your help.

Cordially,

JOHN R. JENNINGS,
FRANCIS J. WALCOTT.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
August 12, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: We wish you to know that we are not in agreement with your vote on the resolution approving the President's power to wage undeclared war.

There were two Senators opposing this resolution, which would weaken the Senate control over declaration of war in favor of action by the President alone, in starting action which could result in all-out war. As a result of such an action as in Vietnam, San Francisco could be among the first to suffer the holocaust. It is an uneasy feeling to fear a world war coming and realize that one man in this country has the power to stimulate it into existence. The knowledge that only two men spoke out against this is very disturbing. Surely, discussion of issues in question, before the United Nations is far more appropriate at this time.

We believe that Congressmen are there to represent the will of the people. Among the many people to whom we have talked, very few are in favor of the warlike action in Vietnam, and none in favor of the possible all-out war. We also believe that as Congressmen are to represent the people, they should be participating in congressional duties full time, and on the floor during important debates such as this one.

We wish to record our opposition to this method of dealing with any problems, and again state our belief controversies should be dealt with by the United Nations. Further, for a more lasting gain, negotiations should be started toward establishing trade with the Socialist countries. This would bring us rapidly closer to a true and lasting peace.

Yours very truly,

JOHN R. JENNINGS,
FRANCIS J. WALCOTT.

RIVERDALE, N.Y.,
August 14, 1964.

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

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: I am writing to tell you that I applaud the statements of Senator WAYNE MORSE that we may be as much at fault in the incidents which have recently taken place in the Gulf of Tonkin, and with him, urge you to see that the war is not carried by us into territory that will cause retaliation by the Chinese and so create a situation in which war could be set off in yet another part of the Middle East.

I would also urge that the United States be willing to meet again at Geneva to see that peaceful settlements in this part of the world could be found.

Copies of this letter are being sent to Senator WAYNE MORSE and to my Senators, JACOB JAVITS and KENNETH KEATING.

ADELE R. MEYER.

MODESTO, CALIF.,
August 12, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It was with heartfelt thanks that we noted your vote on the recent congressional support of President Johnson's actions in southeast Asia. As Quakers we have a high regard for unanimity, but we are well aware that truth often stands alone, shunned by the raucous cries of the multitude. Sir, persist in the best lights God has given you.

Our best religious insights tell us that war and violence never achieve good ends, though it does, at times, seem to bring some resolutions in man's affairs. Truly, the ends never justify the means when viewed dispassionately in the wider reaches of time and space.

As rationalists and humanitarians there are reasons enough to question the attitudes and acts of our national leaders in this and other areas of world conflict. If the United States is to continue its leadership of the free world, we desperately need a sober and mature voice; for we are dealing in areas where mankind is at stake.

Once again, may we thank you for your good services to our Nation as well as the world.

Sincerely,

RUDY POTOCHNIK,
Acting Clerk, Delta Monthly Meeting of
the Religious Society of Friends.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
August 12, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: Once again, I wish to commend you on your very courageous stand on Vietnam.

It is very good to hear a sane and considered voice at a time when the hasty action of our country might very well lead to a world war.

Please do continue your lone fight.

Respectfully yours,

MARGARET G. GINSBURG.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS,
CHICAGO, ILL.,
August 14, 1964.

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

SIR: Forty-four members of the faculty of the University of Illinois, Chicago Undergraduate Division, have endorsed the enclosed petition which calls upon the U.S. Government:

— Not to enlarge the scope of the war in Vietnam;

— To begin immediate negotiations to bring about a reasonable settlement;

— To seek the neutralization of the area in order to maintain peace there in the future.

A copy of the petition is enclosed and the names of those endorsing it. We speak for ourselves and not for the university.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM D. GRAMPP,
Professor of Economics.

THE PETITION

We, 5,000 American college and university educators, urge a neutralized Vietnam.

It would end the terror and suffering of this war-ravaged land.

It would end the continuing loss of American and Vietnamese lives.

It would be preferable to deeper involvement or irresponsible pullout.

We, therefore, appeal to you, Mr. President, not to enlarge the scope of the war, but instead to work for a neutralized North and South Vietnam, as separate, federated, or reunified states, protected by international guarantees and peacekeeping forces against all outside interferences.

In recognition of the imminent danger of the war in Vietnam escalating into a direct conflict between the United States and Communist China, we, the undersigned faculty members of the University of Illinois in Chicago endorse the above statement and urge immediate negotiations to bring about a settlement of the Vietnam war through neutralization of southeast Asia.

THE PETITIONERS

William D. Grampp, professor of economics.
Oscar Miller, assistant professor of economics.

John McNee, Jr., professor of art.
Daniel K. Andrews, assistant professor of accounting.

Willis C. Jackman, assistant professor of English.

Louis Chandler, associate professor of physics.

Ted R. Jackson, assistant professor of speech.

F. C. Smith, instructor of history.
Twiley W. Barker, associate professor of political science.

Elaine Z. Herzog, instructor of chemistry.
Nancy A. Tomasek, instructor of French.

Charles P. Warren, instructor of anthropology.

Lawrence Lipkin, assistant professor of accounting.

Joan Chillag, instructor of English.
Lloyd C. Englebrecht, instructor of library administration.

James B. Stronks, associate professor of English.

Nan E. McGehee, assistant professor of psychology.

R. R. Page, instructor of philosophy.
Robert E. Gallagher, associate professor of English.

Irving M. Miller, instructor of English.
Dolores L. Keranen, instructor of English.

Moreen C. Jordan, associate professor of English.

Robert W. Nickle, associate professor of art.

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

19841

R. D. Kozlow, instructor of library administration.

M. J. Klatt, assistant professor of library administration.

Donald P. Dimmitt, instructor of art.

Sabine A Casten, instructor of chemistry.

F. P. Wiesinger, associate professor of engineering.

B. R. Kogan, associate professor of English.

J. N. Pappademos, assistant professor of physics.

R. H. Krupp, lecturer, physics.

Herman B. Weissman, associate professor of physics.

Don A. Masterton, associate professor of art.

Robert K. Adams, instructor of architecture.

Martin Hurtig, assistant professor of art.

John E. Walley, professor of art.

Henry M. Pitts, assistant professor of psychology.

Donald Hanson, associate professor of architecture.

Herbert J. Curtis, associate professor of mathematics.

Ronald J. Matlon, instructor of speech.

Theodore V. Kundrat, instructor of speech.

James A. Bond, assistant professor of biology.

Roger Whitmer, lecturer, architecture.

Canio Radlce, professor of art.

AUGUST 13, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: This letter is to express strong support of the position you have taken in regard to the U.S. involvement in southeast Asia and also of the constructive criticism that you have made of the American foreign aid program. Of course, your position on these two issues finds its basic justification in the vital interests of the American people. However, I believe that this type of loyal opposition is a great contribution to the present administration, and I nominate you and Senator GRUENING as the truest Democrats of the year. May the party soon catch up with you.

Sincerely,

LEWIS M. LATANÉ.

BALTIMORE, MD.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
August 11, 1964.

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

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: I would like to tender my thanks, to you, for the fine job you have done for our country since the death of our beloved John F. Kennedy. Especially in the civil rights field. Although I have usually voted the Democratic ticket I have never actively worked for Democrats during campaigns, but this year I feel so strongly that you are the man we desperately need during the coming crucial years that I plan to call my local Democratic club and do whatever I can to help you and your party get into office. However, I would like to urge you to endorse Senator MORSE in his policy toward Vietnam. I believe that the United States has a great chance to become a world leader and to spread democracy around the earth but we must be above reproach in our dealings with all countries and eschew aggression and domination without understanding. I hope my letter is only one among many you get asking you to listen to Senator MORSE's proposals and to act as swiftly as possible on them.

Thank you for your kind attention,

Yours truly,

JEAN MITCHELL.

No. 163—35

LANCASTER, CALIF.,

August 12, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE: I wish to join the thousands of decent-minded Americans who are praising you for your outstanding integrity in refusing to endorse the President's resolution asking congressional approval of the present war policy in southeast Asia.

How disheartening and shameful that all, with exception of you and Senator GRUENING, wish to continue the brutal, useless war against innocent people who want only to establish peace in their countries and get on with the business of establishing a stable government capable of serving all the people's needs.

How long will it take the policymakers of the United States to learn they cannot ever win this war or any other with the aim of destroying communism. In fact, the present policy only strengthens the Communist cause everywhere on earth. Every day more Americans are being sacrificed in this war of aggression and thousands more of the resisting Vietnamese are being slaughtered.

Your contribution in the August issue of the Progressive is priceless and should get into the hands of every American. Too bad that it cannot be circulated by the millions. I would like to help do it.

Sincerely,

RUTH CAMERON.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,

August 12, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I know you have already spoken out on the NATO-NLF proposal to Congress. This note is only to encourage you or anyone else to continue to ask for open hearings and debate against President Johnson's message of June 30. The whole idea is frightening and so few people are really aware of it.

Sincerely,

FLORENCE KATZ.

AUGUST 11, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing this letter to you to commend you on your clear thinking and courage in expressing it in relation to the terrible and threatening situation in southeast Asia.

Every thoughtful person will agree that your recommendations must be followed if civilization and mankind is to survive this and later generations.

I cannot fail to mention to you the significance that your comments in the newspapers had on a considerable number of people.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER BRIEHL,
Lieutenant Colonel, MC; USAAF, In-
active.

AUGUST 11, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In the last few hours, I have seen you twice on my television screen emphatically opposing President Johnson's current Vietnam policy and action.

I congratulate you on what must be a brave stand and send my earnest plea that you will have the strength and courage to say again and again what you know is right—a conviction which must be shared by a considerable number of people throughout the world. Of course it is better to try to negotiate settlements for peace at the conference table—preferably at the U.N.—than to initiate militarism which may lead us over

the brink into nuclear war. To a reasonably sane person, the question hardly seems to warrant further discussion.

Please, Senator MORSE, do your very best for my children and for children throughout this sad world.

Your very sincerely,

Mrs. MARGARET S. BOWEN.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.,

August 12, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It is a little late to be thanking you for your stand on Vietnam, but months go by before I catch up with things. I am so very grateful to you for expressing my ideas on the situation in that far country that even now I must tell you so. More power to you.

Sincerely,

EIKA HERZ.

LA VERNE, CALIF.,

August 13, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: For your stand of statesmanship against the vote to give the President unconditional power in southeast Asia, I want to commend you.

May the time come when all nations, great and small, will resort to conference with the United Nations.

Some of us (maybe more than anybody realizes) do not like the brinkmanship approach by either party and certainly not with a flavor of partisanship.

Yours sincerely,

A. R. COFFMAN.

CARRIE C. COFFMAN.

ENDLESS STRUGGLE IN VIETNAM COSTS THE UNITED STATES \$2 MILLION A DAY—CALLS FOR WAR AGAINST THE COMMUNISTS LOUDER EVERY DAY

WASHINGTON.—The war in Vietnam costs the United States \$2 million a day; there will soon be 20,000 American soldiers in this southeast Asian state risking their lives 20,000 kilometers away from their homes; up to 1963 Washington sent \$2½ billion to Vietnam; during the last 3 years 262 Americans have been killed, 17 have been lost, and 2,000 have been wounded.

The American Government declares that she limits her role in Vietnam to supporting an independent state, threatened by communist aggression and infiltration. Critics of the U.S.A. point out that the government of Diem was forced on Vietnam by the machinations of Washington and its Secret Service, and Senator MIKE MANSFIELD has pointed out that since 1955 nothing has been done to solve the inland problems of Vietnam. And also in Laos, Washington has helped to support the corrupt regime of Gen. Phoumi Nosavan.

But these critics of the American policy in southeast Asia are a very small minority. The great majority does not realize that America is often supporting dubious, reactionary, often corrupt, leaders of undeveloped countries. In doing so she, viz. the United States of America, is herself making the feeding ground for communism, and thereby the cause of a resulting lack of enthusiasm of the people in fighting against the Red infiltrations.

Most of these critics in the United States of America itself repeat what GOLDWATER has said, and advocate strict measures against the Communists, even an open war. Talks, neutralization, international treaties, and guarantees are looked upon as synonyms for capitulation.

In spite of hard facts these parties maintain that the Communists are the only ones

19842

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 19

to blame, and that America is only striving to secure freedom and independence of South Vietnam and its neighbors.

But the questions at stake are not at all so simple, because communism spreads in countries where the leaders' policy is not socially progressive, nor based on the will of the people, but on the contrary is only supported by the dollars of the American CIA, used only to enrich the leaders themselves.

(Translation of an article in Haarlem's daily paper on Tuesday, Aug. 11, 1964.)

(Translated by Mrs. L. E. Lindeman-Davies, Westerhoutpark 34, Haarlem, Netherlands.)

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
August 13, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are again moved to write to you congratulating you on your courageous stand on the subject of our involvement in South Vietnam.

We cannot believe that there aren't other men who feel as you do, but are too cowardly to express themselves the way you do. That makes your stand all the more heroic and honest.

How could we possibly be exporting democracy when we have so many fences to repair right here at home?

We are proud of you and embrace you as the type of American that we admire. Would that there were more like you in the greatest deliberative body in the world today.

Cordially yours,

MAX POSCHIN.
ELEANOR POSCHIN.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 10, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wanted to thank you for your speech regarding Vietnam. I think that it is a shame that more Senators do not have your integrity and spirit.

I hope that you will continue to exercise your independence in the defense of a realistic and honest foreign policy.

Sincerely,

THOMAS CONNOR.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.,
August 12, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: I would like to express my appreciation of and support for your determined stand against continued U.S. intervention in North and South Vietnam and Laos. Although the texts of your speeches in Congress are not usually reported in detail by the newspapers, I gather that you oppose such intervention both on legal and moral grounds. It is very difficult for the average citizen to form a clear conception of what is happening in southeast Asia, but your statements seem to me to echo what many Americans must suspect—certainly what I suspect—about the faultiness of our policies in that area.

I urge you to continue to speak out against military intervention by the United States in violation of treaties, the charter of the United Nations, and the dictates of a humane conscience. I hope you will support and help to initiate a foreign policy aimed at defeating communism by alleviating the conditions of poverty and hunger which nourish it, in southeast Asia and elsewhere.

Yours very truly,

JAMES A. CLARK.

SEATTLE, WASH.,
August 13, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your stand in the Vietnam affair deserves the citizens' support.

It is less than 200 years since our Revolution and the word "Hessian" still has a bad meaning. But that is what we act like in Vietnam.

It is less than 25 years since Russia attacked Finland. Few Americans then or now would accept the explanation from Moscow

that the Karelian isthmus was necessary for their defense. But you hear such an excuse from Washington to explain Vietnam.

It is encouraging to find someone in the capital who will stand up to the Knight-Errant diplomacy of the State Department and do something about keeping peace and worldwide order.

J. B. WALL.

HEMET, CALIF.,
August 13, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please do all you can to open hearings and debate on the proposed agreement to release nuclear weapons information to NATO countries. You are very wise in your understanding of the true situation. Do continue to speak out. Also, blessings on you for your courage in exposing the true situation in Vietnam.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. JEAN ZWICKEL.
SCARSDALE, N.Y.,
August 14, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I should like to express my hearty approval of your stand on the war in South Vietnam. It seems a pity that more Congressmen cannot view their actions objectively, but we have been swept out so far on a wave of hatred that it is difficult for them to face the truth. Therefore you should be the more commended for taking this unpopular stand rather than a characteristic one.

Your restrictions on the foreign aid bill showed the same wide understanding. I regret that more of them did not pass.

Though yours way seems to be a voice crying in the wilderness I hope that eventually it will be heard and heeded by the whole country.

Sincerely,

SUSAN COLLINS.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
August 12, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to express the thanks of my family and myself to you for your brave and stalwart position on the Vietnam problem.

Even though you are very much in the minority, your courageous statements give all thinking Americans some hope. Please keep up the wonderful work.

Sincerely yours,

HELEN RUBENSTEIN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I support your stand on the Vietnam situation. I have also written my Senators, informing them of my attitude, and asking them to support you and Senator GRUENING.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ELAINE HYMAN.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 6, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: I thank you from the bottom of my heart for the sane head and sane vote you exhibited today on the Vietnam resolution.

You are not alone despite your courageous lone vote. Many of us agree with you that this is a United Nations matter. The new events only confirm this the more.

I am writing to President Johnson and my two Senators to tell them of my agreement with you and that I have so written you. Many many thanks again.

Very sincerely,

Miss GERTRUDE ETTENSON.

AUGUST 13, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are so thankful you were courageous and spoke truth to the Government and hellbent for Vietnam Senate warriors re illegality, immorality in situations in East.

We have written telegrams, night letters, special delivery letters to agree with you to President, Senators and State Department with scant replies. The President's secretaries (unlike President Kennedy's) merely sending them to State Department, ignore what you write, sending a polite non-committal letter saying nothing, enclosing news from Vietnam (mimeo) they sent a year ago. What can a citizen do? Again with profound admiration.

Respectfully,

ARTHUR AND ETHEL COLLINS.

PASADENA, CALIF.,
August 11, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you very much for opposing the recent militant U.S. action in Tonkin Gulf. I, too, believe that the United States should leave Vietnam. I urge that we negotiate the problem of Vietnam in a conference set up by the United Nations. Secretary General U Thant's proposal to reconvene the Geneva Conference, with the peacekeeping machinery of the U.N. would serve this purpose, I believe.

I am glad that you speak out firmly even on issues that are unpopular. May you continue to press for peace instead of war in southeast Asia. Thank you again.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. NANCY E. BENSON.

SEATTLE, WASH.,
August 12, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I thought you might find of interest the enclosed items. One is a reply from the Defense Department to a letter which I sent Senator MAGNUSON about month ago. He forwarded it on to me. As you can see, it says absolutely nothing. In answer to this, I have sent the three-page letter a copy of which is enclosed. You are welcome to insert this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—as I am sure that Senator MAGNUSON will not do so.

In addition—although you may have seen these before—I am enclosing "Vietnam—Symptom of a World Malaise" by David Arnold, who served as a USIA officer in the Mekong Delta area for 14 months; until he resigned in disgust. He holds a Ph.D. in linguistics from Harvard. The other article is by Bronson Clark, former director of the American Friends Service Committee relief programs in Morocco and western Algeria. His striking parallel between the French in Algeria and the Americans in South Vietnam is well made.

I work in the peace education program of the American Friends Service Committee. While I have not had time to check out this idea with the people above me who will have to give the go-ahead, I have been formulating the idea for a workshop-symposium on Vietnam which could be held in Seattle. Would there be any possibility of obtaining your services as panelist and guest speaker for such an affair in September? If so, what would be the best dates for you? We, of course, would pay travel expenses and an honorarium. I would envision this as a major attempt at involving mass media personnel, with the focus on stimulating responsibility in the press. Also, because of the distinguished Far East Department at the University of Washington, we would be able to draw heavily upon their resources.

1964

I am on the steering committee for an ad hoc group formed at the time of the crisis to sponsor leafleting and demonstrations opposing extension of the war and calling for withdrawal of American troops. We are going to attempt to move in as many ways as possible to focus public attention on this situation; visibly showing our opposition to present policy. The workshop I mentioned, which AFSC could possibly sponsor, would augment this other type of activity.

Lastly, I want to commend you for the fine presentations you have been making in the Senate of the case against U.S. involvement in Vietnam. We receive the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD daily, so I have been keeping track of all the dialog. We would welcome 500 of any of your speeches on the subject which have been made within the last month; the more recent, the better. We will be glad to reimburse you for the printing cost.

Sincerely,

CRAIG CAMPBELL

SEATTLE, WASH.,
August 11, 1964.HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: I appreciate very much your letter of August 4 with the enclosed reply from the Assistant Secretary of Defense on the subject of U.S. policy in Vietnam. I certainly did not expect my opinions to go quite so far. Unfortunately, however, this reply neatly avoided answering any of my main points. This avoidance of discussing openly the history and nature of the situation in South Vietnam is characteristic not only of the Defense Department, but of the administration and the mass media as well.

There is such a gulf—between the “official” bureaucratic point of view toward operations such as our involvement in South Vietnam—as witnessed by the reply from the Defense Department to my letter—and the actual, personal level effect of such operations on the population as a whole, so as to make discussion almost pointless.

There are a number of irrefutable facts concerning South Vietnam which are relevant to any discussion of our present policy there. One is that France colonized the area, built the cities, affected the culture—and yet was not able to retain Indochina. Another is that the United States declined to sign the 1954 Geneva agreements which partitioned the country. This does not give us the right to flagrantly violate these agreements, which forbid the introduction of soldiers of any nation (except specified numbers from France) into the area; which forbid the use of jet aircraft in the area; which called for elections in 2 years to unify North and South Vietnam. In violation of these agreements (Stevenson's U.N. speech notwithstanding) we have introduced 15,000 “advisers” (soldiers) into the area; have constructed a huge jet base; and have supported three dictators in a row. Diem, the first one, was schooled in America and installed largely at the insistence of Dulles. There is considerable evidence that he was removed with the active assistance of the CIA for three main reasons: He had made recent peace “feelers” to North Vietnam; he was unwilling to push the war as hard as U.S. advisers wanted him to; and his nepotism and internal repression was becoming an embarrassment to the United States. This theory is widely held among correspondents and diplomats.

Since then, we have seen two dictators who seem to possess even less popularity than Diem. What, then, do we mean when we speak of the “Government of South Vietnam”? Walter Lippmann wrote in the Washington Post of April 21, 1964, that no more than 30 percent of the people support the Saigon government, and that the govern-

ment controls no more than 25 percent of the land area of the country. The “Vietcong” not only control but administer (schools, hospitals, local governments) the rest of the country.

The plain and simple fact—supported by almost all journalists who are covering this area—is that the United States is fighting a war against almost the entire peasant population of South Vietnam; and is, by virtue of its methods, driving most of the rest of the people into active opposition also.

You do not win friends by spraying vast areas with chemicals which kill crops and cattle, defoliate trees, and in some instances, cause death to humans. You do not win over the population by razing whole villages with napalm bombs and artillery.

SEATTLE TIMES, MARCH 21, 1964, A.P. DISPATCH

“Included in American military aid is napalm, liquid-petroleum jelly which explodes across villages in a rush of fiery death. A newer weapon here is a phosphorus explosive fired from artillery and fighter bombers. This erupts in a white cloud, burning through everything it touches. With explosives such as these, civilians are bound to be hurt. Americans and Vietnamese argue that they have no choice but to use the explosives. The spectacle of children lying nearly dead with napalm burns was revolting to Vietnamese and Americans entering a village on the Cambodian border after it had been under air attack by Government planes Thursday.”

There have been numerous stories and photographs published internationally showing American “advisers” standing by while Vietcong prisoners are beaten and tortured. Life magazine printed several about a month ago showing bound prisoners being subjected to water poured down their nostrils.

Is this what we call bringing “freedom to South Vietnam”?

Do we really think we can win over the population by forcing entire villages to move into virtual concentration camps, euphemistically termed “strategic hamlets”? Bronson Clark, former director of the American Friends Service Committee relief program in Morocco and Western Algeria from 1961 to 1963, wrote an interesting article in the July 15, 1964 issue of Friends Journal which compares Vietnam with Algeria. He draws a remarkable parallel between the methods employed by the French with their “regroupment camps” and the Americans with “strategic hamlets.” He also finds it “curious and perhaps frightening to realize that in the United States we have a lemminglike attitude toward the actions of our Government in the Far East, although the wire services report that we are engaged in ‘earthscorching’ practices in which, after burning villages, destroying livestock and rice stores, and stripping and killing all foliage, we regroup any civilians who survive into what the Pentagon now has the audacity to call ‘new life hamlets.’ It seems frightening, I say, to realize that there has been almost no outcry on the part of the organized church against these acts committed in our name and in our behalf.”

I am appalled to consider the possibility that politically the administration can do nothing at present to alter the present course of events in South Vietnam. It appalls me even more to see that Johnson is seemingly pandering to the Goldwaterites by “getting tough.” The vast amount of support Goldwater commands is all the more reason for bringing these issues out in the open; away from the emotional cries for “unity” and the misleading black-and-white descriptions of the situation.

The true nature of the conflict in Vietnam cannot be understood without reference to the history, geography, and culture of the area. It is simply fallacious and misleading

to assume that the present situation is a result of infiltration from North Vietnam. The Mekong Delta area, south of Saigon and 500 miles from North Vietnam, was the center of resistance to the French more than 15 years ago and is the center of resistance to the U.S.-supported government today.

I would like to close by recording my opposition to the recent strikes in North Vietnam. The nature of the targets chosen strongly suggests that an excuse was manufactured to give us the “legal” right to destroy these bases; which were obviously preselected. Senator Morse rightly charges that our ships were probably backing up South Vietnamese boats which earlier attacked North Vietnamese island ports. (This also mentioned by James Reston, columnist.) General Khanh's air force general, in an interview about 3 weeks ago, revealed (to the consternation of the American “adviser” present) that they had been carrying out sabotage and air drops in North Vietnam for the last 3 years.

There has also been evidence lately that Khanh fears a coup; that hints of such a happening have come from high up in his own regime. This would be very significant in explaining his attempt to divert attention—at least world attention—from his own precarious situation.

History will record this war as one fought by the United States with an overwhelming technical superiority in weapons against a peasant population indigenous to the area. It will be recorded as the testing ground for new methods of counterinsurgency, or killing people. And it will also be recorded as a war which we lost—as did the French 10 years before us—unable to force our view of the correct society onto the population.

I would welcome any evidence from responsible, independent sources—not the Defense Department or the CIA, with their vested interests—to refute any claims I have made herein.

I am enclosing the article by Bronson Clark which I mentioned earlier. Also, I am enclosing an article by David Arnold, who served in South Vietnam for 14 months with the USIA office on the Mekong Delta area, and who resigned from Government service in protest. He holds a Ph. D. from Harvard and is now executive assistant at the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation in Princeton, N.J.

Sincerely,

CRAIG CAMPBELL

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
June 30, 1964.HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: I am replying to your June 2 referral to the Department of Defense of a letter to you from Mr. Craig Campbell.

Both the President and Secretary McNamara believe that the problems of southeast Asia require periodic meetings between American key officials in Washington and in the Far East having responsibility for these problems. These face-to-face exchanges, at Saigon and at Honolulu, have provided the Secretary of Defense, General Taylor, and other officials with an opportunity to review the counterinsurgency operations of the South Vietnamese, to review our programs of assistance to Vietnam, and to consider what additional actions, if any, are required from the United States to make more effective the activities of the South Vietnamese in countering guerrilla operations.

Mr. Campbell raised the question of the chance of success of our policies in Vietnam. I believe that the Government of Vietnam must overcome many formidable obstacles before the Communist insurgency will be suppressed. Events leading to the over-

19844

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 19

throw of the Diem regime and the subsequent disruption in administrative and military operations caused initially a setback in the war against the Vietcong terrorists. Since the advent of the Khanh government early this year, however, there has been a marked recovery in both the military and civilian spheres. As Secretary McNamara testified recently before Congress:

"It is clear, I think, that the road ahead will be long and hard there. We have said that before, I want to repeat it again today. But it is not the tradition of this country to back off when the going gets tough. I am sure all of you would agree with that. We don't propose to back off now. I am convinced and our senior military and political officials are convinced—that includes the Ambassador in Saigon and the Commander of the U.S. military assistance in Saigon—that persistent execution of the plans of the Khanh government, plans with which we agree, will lead to success. We propose to achieve that."

I appreciate Mr. Campbell's interest in Vietnam and trust that the above will serve to answer the points raised in his letter.

Sincerely,

PETER LUBERT,
Deputy Assistant Secretary.

[From Fellowship, May 1964]

VIETNAM: SYMPTOM OF A WORLD MALAISE

(By David Arnold)

(In May 1963, David Arnold, who had been serving in South Vietnam for the past 14 months with the USA office on the Mekong Delta area, resigned from government service in protest. Assigned to the branch public officer in Can Tho, he was responsible for explaining U.S. policy and goals to the Vietnamese in that area. Dr. Arnold, who holds a Ph. D. from Harvard in linguistics, is now executive assistant at the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation in Princeton, N.J.)

It would be easy to blame the French for Vietnam. For the hundred years or so preceding 1940, it was their country, part—along with Cambodia and Laos—of their colony of Indochina. The germs of the present situation were loosed by them; they have thrived beautifully under our care.

We became involved in Vietnam during World War II. The Japanese had occupied the country with little resistance from the French. Though they were unable to exploit the vast wealth of raw materials, these resources were denied the West. In the early years of the war, we could only harass the Japanese. When our OSS infiltrated Vietnam to develop guerrilla forces capable of operating behind Japanese lines, they found an already well-developed resistance group calling themselves nationalists. Their Vietnamese title was Viet Minh, abbreviations for League for the Revolution and Independence of Vietnam. Their leader was one Ho Chi Minh, who had been trained as a Communist in his youth. The Viet Minh impressed us with their organization and determination to defeat the Japanese; we supplied them and worked with them for the duration of the war.

With Japanese defeat imminent, President Roosevelt made plans for the future of Indochina. He recognized the strength of nationalist forces at work and proposed, at the Cairo and Teheran conferences in December 1943 and January 1944, that Indochina be placed under an international trusteeship as a final step toward complete independence. But Roosevelt's hope for a trusteeship over Indochina died with him. Key policymaking personnel in the Truman administration were concerned with what they saw as the more pressing problems of Europe. In 1946, France reasserted her claim over her former colonies with scarcely a protest from us.

The Viet Minh, however, had other ideas. They had rallied the support of the peasants to fight the Japanese and now had their backing to demand independence from the French. France appeared at first to meet the Viet Minh demands. In return for political, military, and economic concessions, she agreed to recognize the Republic of Vietnam "as a free state, having its own government, parliament, army, and treasury, belonging to the Indochinese Federation and the French Union." However, a few months later, she reneged on her promises and prepared to reoccupy the country.

The Viet Minh turned to us, as their allies of the war, for support. We were unwilling and unprepared to anger France—we refused. They then turned to Russia. She, too, was more concerned with events in Europe, and also turned them down. Ho Chi Minh asked France for further negotiations—his pleas were ignored. French forces reentered Vietnam, armed largely with American lend-lease weapons. The Viet Minh went underground, pledging guerrilla warfare until their demands were met.

At the end of the war in 1946 the Viet Minh had been relatively moderate and friendly to the West. French military reoccupation of the country produced a Viet Minh thoroughly hostile to the West and completely Communist oriented. Although Russia continued her unwillingness to aid them, by 1949 a newly Communist China recognized a way to fulfill both her ideological convictions and her ancient imperial designs on southeast Asia. Vietnam had once been under Chinese rule for a period of 1,000 years, and China offered her support to the Viet Minh with a long eye to the future.

The ensuing Indochinese War was a shock to the French. Chinese training and supplies for the Viet Minh were seemingly endless. Prepared for pitched battles, the French were ill-equipped for guerrilla warfare. Their tanks mired in the rice fields, and their slow moving convoys were easily ambushed along jungle roads. They received no support from the Vietnamese peasants, whose appetite for independence had been well developed by Ho Chi Minh.

SUPPORT GOES TO FRANCE

As an ally, we supplied the French with equipment and supplies. Our aid averaged \$500 million annually through 1953. This proved of little help, for the French were fast losing. By the time the Eisenhower administration took office, a detached observer might have been able to see that we were committed to a hopeless situation. Yet, we either had no detached observers, or they did not have the ears of our new administrators—we did not change our policy. Instead we put more effort into making the old policy produce better results. Fiscal 1954 aid was increased to \$885 million; we promised \$1.133 billion for fiscal 1955.

The French did not last until 1955. In the spring of 1954, the bloody battle of Dien Bien Phu intervened. A strategic French fortress in the northern plains fell to the Communists—this was the final crushing blow. France called for a truce. Russia, China, the United States, Britain, and France sat down at the conference table in Geneva. Vietnam was divided at the 17th parallel; Viet Minh troops were to withdraw to the north, French troops to the south. The accords prohibited the introduction of new military equipment or personnel into either sector, except as replacements for existing equipment and personnel. Neither zone was to join any military alliance or permit the establishment of foreign bases. The country was to be reunified through general elections scheduled for July 1956. The United States refused to sign the accords, but stated that we took note of the agreements and "would refrain from the threat of the use of force to disturb them."

For this interim period, Ho Chi Minh headed a Democratic Republic of North Vietnam. The French supported a South Vietnamese Government headed by the former Emperor Bao Dai. Although we and other Western powers recognized South Vietnam as an independent state, the Bao Dai government was little more than a thin facade for continued French presence. The French controlled the army, the administration, and much of the economy.

BAO DAI LASTS A YEAR

This French-sponsored government lasted a little over a year. We had had our Korea, and the cornerstone of our foreign policy was now containment. We decided that continued French presence in South Vietnam would be a difficult obstacle to our plans for checking further Communist advances in Asia. We set about taking a more active role in the future of South Vietnam. An ardent anti-Communist Vietnamese nationalist by the name of Ngo Dinh Diem had been invited back from exile to serve as Premier of the Bao Dai government. He soon caught our eye as a possible alternative to Bao Dai himself. With a promise of massive American aid, he successfully persuaded the Emperor to hold a popular referendum on the future form of the government of South Vietnam. This referendum, held in October 1955, produced an announced 98 percent majority in favor of a Republic headed by Ngo Dinh Diem. Bao Dai left in exile for the French Riviera—the French had been pushed aside. We began developing South Vietnam into what we called "a bastion of the free world."

Considering the conditions that existed in South Vietnam in 1955, it is a wonder that we even thought we could succeed. The war had left roads and railroads destroyed, communications disrupted. Vietnamese industry and most natural resources were located in the north. Many Viet Minh had not withdrawn to the north, but had gone underground in the south, retaining the loyalty of peasants. The population of North Vietnam was 18 million and that of the South only 14 million. Even had President Diem been as genuinely popular as he claimed to be, it was clear that just by weight of numbers the Communists would win the nationwide elections scheduled for 1956 by the Geneva accords.

NO ELECTIONS FOR DIEM—OR US

Therefore we backed Diem's refusal to follow the accords. We agreed with him that genuinely free elections could not be held in a Communist North Vietnam, but said nothing about whether genuinely free elections could be held in the south.

There were no nationwide elections. Our aid poured in. Diem had quashed dissident Buddhist sects challenging his authority to speak for the country, and he now rebuilt the power of his government into rural areas which the French, even at the height of their power, had never reached. He made beginnings in land reform and redeveloped large areas of swamp lands in which to settle the nearly 1 million refugees who had fled the north.

But for a government supported by the greatest democracy in the world, the Republic of South Vietnam was proving to be amazingly undemocratic. Ngo Dinh Diem called himself a President. He was an autocrat ruling from a palace, refused to share powers of decision outside his own family. He tolerated no opposition. No one unfriendly to Diem managed to hold a seat in his Chamber of Deputies. The country's population was 70 percent Buddhist, but positions of responsibility were given only to members of the Roman Catholic Church, to which the Ngo family had belonged for over three centuries.

1964

19845

None of this bothered us too much. We made it clear by word and action that as long as Diem continued to be anti-Communist, we would back him in whatever he did. The tragedy, however, was that Americans in positions of responsibility never knew exactly what he did. Of the more than 500 American diplomatic, military, and aid personnel in South Vietnam, no more than 50 lived and worked outside the capital city. We gathered our information on the political and military situation from Saigon sources, who carefully filtered out disquieting news from the provinces. If lower-level American officials in the field submitted reports of growing unrest among the peasants of South Vietnam, the reports never managed to reach Washington.

TROUBLE IN THE NEWS

In 1960, the American people were suddenly told that there was trouble in Vietnam again. The news may have been sudden, the trouble was not. Guerrillas had started reappearing in 1958, capitalizing on a feeling of political and social impotence among the peasants. They urged the peasants to resist the authority of their government and demand reunification with their brethren in the north. They promised the peasants a voice in a government that gave equal consideration to all its citizens and gave no preference to one group over another. Many of these so-called Vietcong were former Viet Minh who had never left the south. Others had infiltrated along the celebrated Ho Chi Minh trail through Laos. Many were new recruits. They were all well received by the peasants.

Diem's reaction to the increasing subversion was a further tightening of the reins of government. As the guerrillas won more peasants, Diem became more authoritarian. Any Vietnamese who spoke up in public against the increasing repressive acts of his government was jailed. Any Americans who felt our mission in Vietnam might be jeopardized by a blind allegiance to a government that was violating what we considered to be the basic rights of all individuals everywhere were called defeatists—ignored, or sometimes transferred.

During this period, our Embassy was approached by several anti-Communist but dissident Vietnamese groups asking support to overthrow the Diem government. Many commanded widespread backing among the military and the intelligentsia. We ignored their petitions.

By the fall of 1960, the Communists had gained control of large sections of the Vietnamese countryside. Six days after the election of President Kennedy, one of the groups that had approached us earlier for support attempted a coup. They were crushed. We dismissed the affair as an isolated incident, not in the least symptomatic of conditions in the country. We found out several months later that the young military officers behind the coup had thought, with the election of President Kennedy, that we would now be more sympathetic to their cause.

By spring 1961, our new administration did recognize that there were problems in Vietnam. Vietnamese hopes rose as President Kennedy assigned a new Ambassador, Frederick Nolting, and sent Vice President Johnson on a factfinding tour in May. Johnson's trip was followed by a study mission headed by Gen. Maxwell Taylor. By fall we had prepared what we called a "new policy" for South Vietnam.

It was not a new policy. We were only trying harder to make the old policy work. We continued to back Ngo Dinh Diem, our new administration said, because there was no other alternative. (This we said, of course, about Chiang Kai-shek before we lost mainland China, about Batista before we lost Cuba, and about Rhee before he was overthrown.) We did, however, recognize

the need for making the Diem government more palatable to the Vietnamese people, and we were planning to press for political and social reforms in return for massive buildup in economic and military aid.

During the winter of 1961-62, we sent millions of dollars of equipment and supplies and 12,000 military and civilian advisers to South Vietnam. I was one of the civilians. The focus of our civilian efforts was the strategic hamlet program. Following the British success in Malaya in the mid-fifties, we were planning to help the Vietnamese Government regroup its peasant population in fortified villages. These strategic hamlets, as we called them in Vietnam, would theoretically protect the peasants from Vietcong propaganda and terrorism and would cut the guerrillas off from food and information sources. We then planned to convince the Vietnamese Government to introduce democratic forms of self-government into the strategic hamlets, with the hope that, given an increased sense of individual responsibility, the peasant might come to respect his government.

NEW POLICY ALSO FAILS

I was in South Vietnam for 14 months. Within 6 months it was obvious to those of us in the field that, for all of the talk of "cautious optimism" and "qualified success" among Americans in Saigon and the State Department, our new policy was working no better than the old.

Both Americans and Vietnamese were taking the strategic hamlet program seriously and were hailing it as the turning point in the struggle against Vietcong. I visited strategic hamlets in the Mekong Delta every day and saw differently. Fortified villages in Malaya probably did win the war. The British, through means never revealed to Parliament, managed to separate the Communist from the non-Communist before enclosing the village with a wall. The Vietnamese did not. Anyone could live in the strategic hamlet if he said he wanted to or could be forced to. In Malaya the walls were 12 feet high, the gates were closed at sundown, and anyone found outside the walls was shot on the spot, no questions asked. In the Delta some walls managed to rise to 3 feet, and for the peasants who couldn't be bothered with stepping over them, the gates were always open. In Malaya, the inhabitants were kept armed, to ward off guerrilla attacks. In South Vietnam, weapons were kept locked in the hamlet chief's office and distributed in emergencies. Emergencies managed to come too fast for effective distribution. In Malaya, the Communists were effectively cut off from the peasants. In Vietnam, the flow of propaganda, terror, food and information continued unhindered.

We were preening ourselves over the beginnings of democratic self-government we had introduced into the strategic hamlets. The Vietnamese were sharing our public enthusiasm by announcing that a long-sought social revolution had taken hold of their country. Hamlet residents were now given an opportunity to elect their own leaders and to vote themselves on possible self-help programs funded by the United States. I asked a close Vietnamese friend of mine in the government whether the peasants were in fact being given this opportunity. "Of course not," he answered. "The day before the election, the district chief instructs the peasants in what choices they are to make. Then, the following day, when you Americans are there, the peasants know exactly how to vote." "Have the peasants ever made up their own minds?" I asked. He was surprised that I would ask such a ridiculous question.

Militarily, we claimed to have turned the tide against the Communists. We were proudly reporting "mopping up" operations on the Voice of America with statistics kindly supplied us by the Vietnamese Government

information service, listing 200 Vietcong killed and one Government soldier wounded. Yet, even with such a high mortality rate among the Communists, within 18 months 10,000 Vietcong regulars managed to swell to 25,000.

The Communists were exploiting the situation beautifully. We were the successors to the French, they said, moving our men and equipment into the country to destroy Vietnamese independence and convert the country into a colony of Western imperialism. They revived Ho Chi Minh's cry of the Indochinese war for freedom from the Western colonialists. They portrayed Diem as a puppet of the West, who had no concern for the interest of his countrymen. They made no move, however, to topple the government, for they were convinced that it would fall by itself.

The horror of the situation came not from what the Vietnamese were doing, but from what Americans thought they were doing. As the New York Times had consistently pointed out, there was little relationship between what we lower echelon people were seeing and reporting from the field, and what the highest American officials in Saigon were reporting back to Washington. The State Department now blames the Central Intelligence Agency for stopping the flow of realistic information to Washington, but there was a ban on negative reporting throughout the entire American Mission in Saigon until only recently.

DIEM LOSES WHILE HE WINS

All of us, I am sure, the Ambassador included, knew at least unconsciously that we were winning no war, that Diem was winning no support of his people, and that there was no prospect of victory over the Communists with our present policy. If it was to be "sink or swim with Ngo Dinh Diem," we all knew that we were sinking. But those who had to take responsibility for our actions no longer dared to reverse themselves. They had spent too many billions, been in Vietnam too many years, and lost too many men to admit that it had been in vain. To protect themselves, they could accept only those facts that would support the only policy they thought possible.

When I left Vietnam, most of us in the field knew what would happen next. It is true that we had not known that the violent protest would be led first by Buddhists. We had guessed the young military or the students. Our top officials saw nothing coming. Over the summer, as the Buddhists revolt grew, our Americans in Saigon seemed to become more blind, and more willing and even eager to accept official Vietnamese pronouncements that the anti-Government demonstrations were Communist-directed. When Ngo Dinh Nhu, President Diem's brother, used his CIA-sponsored special forces to sack the pagodas on the night of August 21, I thought the end of any American influence in South Vietnam was in sight. The Vietnamese people had called upon us to help them, and we were silent. American-made rifles clubbed the Buddhist nuns and priests into submission, and American-made trucks hauled them to prison and torture. Our money was supporting a government hated by the whole country. How could we not expect that this hate would turn toward us?

In September, 1 month after the arrival of Ambassador Lodge, Washington recalled our head CIA representative in South Vietnam, a man personally committed to Ngo Dinh Nhu. It was only a matter of weeks after he left that the first successful coup against Ngo Dinh Diem came. I do not know if we took the initiative with the Vietnamese generals, or whether they came to us first for support. This perhaps does not matter. The military could not have succeeded without us. As our money, our equipment, and

our supplies had been used by Diem to maintain power, so they were used to overthrow him. The Diem government was American-sponsored. Its successors have been American-sponsored. Whether the Vietnamese people want an American-sponsored government has apparently not yet occurred to our policymakers.

The two post-Diem military governments have proved to be no solution. Vietcong terrorism increases, their hold on the countryside tightens, and even Saigon now begins to show signs of panic.

At this point there appear to be five possible directions the Vietnam situation could take.

PROPOSAL NO. 1: BUILD UP KHANH

The first, which we have proposed, involves building up the present military strong man, General Khanh, as the popular leader we once thought Diem to be. For this, even if Khanh had the potential, it is too late. The Vietnamese people will not give us another opportunity to show them what "democracy" can do for their country.

The second, another of our proposals, would be to complete American military withdrawal from the country by the end of 1965, allowing the South Vietnamese to take sole responsibility for the war. This would be the cruelest of all possible solutions. The current war is almost completely the product of our own policies. We must stay at least long enough to help the Vietnamese people fashion a more constructive policy.

The third possibility is also our proposal—to carry the war to North Vietnam, giving the North Vietnamese, we have said, "some of their own medicine." But as Secretary of State Rusk has pointed out, the trouble is in South Vietnam. Extending hostilities will not eliminate them.

A fourth recommendation has come from the North Vietnamese and the Communist Chinese, with a call for a Geneva Conference to negotiate a ceasefire and a neutralization of South Vietnam. We answer that this would lead to an eventual takeover by North Vietnam.

The final proposal has been offered by General de Gaulle. After establishing a ceasefire, the Geneva Conference would negotiate reunification of the south with the north and neutralization of the entire country. We answer that North Vietnam is already too dominated by Communist China to be effectively neutral in the cold war.

Any decision as to the direction of Vietnam must obviously take into account the feelings of the Vietnamese people. As all peoples, they want peace. As the people of a divided country, they want reunification. As the pawns once of colonialism and now of communism, they want an opportunity to work out their own destiny.

The nation, the group of nations, the international organization that could guarantee a reunified and peaceful Vietnam, freed from the pressures of the cold war, would have the support of all Vietnamese—in the north, in the south, or in exile.

[From Fellowship, May 1964]

THE BACKGROUND

(By David Arnold)

(Mr. Arnold's paper and contributions by three other specialists on Vietnam: Jerrold Schecter, Helen Lamb, and Helen Mears, were considered on February 28, 29, 1964, at Shadowcliff, national headquarters of the Fellowship of Reconciliation at Nyack, N.Y. Executives from the following peace organizations were also present: National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, Turn Toward Peace, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, the American Friends Service Committee, the War Resisters League, the Methodist Board of Social Concerns, Friends Committee for National Legislation, Friends Peace Committee, Committee for

Nonviolent Action, National Service Board for Religious Objectors, Promoting Enduring Peace, Mennonite Central Committee, and Committee for World Development and World Disarmament.)

Leaders of 14 organizations devoted to peaceful solutions to world conflict spent a weekend recently focusing on the festered sore in southeast Asia known as Vietnam. Four specialists provided background details and overall summaries of the Vietnam situation, among them David Arnold, who supplied this key article.

Vietnam, partitioned as cruelly and illogically as Germany and Korea—is a stage for big-power plays locked in dubious battle. It soon became apparent to the conferees that no lasting solution to Vietnam exists apart from a radical examination of the whole world situation.

Within the large frame of a triple revolution of human rights, technology, and weapons, the drama of southeast Asia is being played out by three great powers—the United States, China, and the U.S.S.R.—and a host of figures representing nationalist and independent movements. That the nostrums and long-range prescriptions are having little effect in the cure of the running sore of Vietnam is in itself evidence of the general malaise of world society.

As affairs stand in mid-1964, only five principal courses are possible in South Vietnam for the United States (elaborated somewhat by David Arnold in his article): (1) Shoring up the present regime; (2) withdrawal; (3) carrying the war to North Vietnam; (4) negotiation; and (5) neutralization.

All but the latter two carry with them the ever-present possibility of escalation into major war. Yet beginnings can and must be made in Vietnam lest its local troubles spread to epidemic proportions. Among the irreducible conditions for enough stability for a new start are these:

A Geneva Conference similar to the one on Cambodia in 1954 with China as participant, directed first of all to negotiate a ceasefire agreement in Vietnam.

Resumption of trade between South and North Vietnam.

A strict embargo on all arms to Vietnam.

Internationally supervised elections in both countries.

The neutralization of the whole Indochina peninsula.

Immediate questions of U.N. auspices, of who should participate in the conference, of the responsibility of powers not native to the region, of the introduction of basic land reform, of the form of a reunited Vietnam, and other economic or political realities of the area are too complex to be dealt with here. All must, in any case, await the stop of a fratricidal, enormously costly war that daily becomes more purposeless, more inconclusive.

Vietnam is not just a trouble spot. It is the most visible and virulent local eruption of deep world sickness. Weaponry, atomic and otherwise, in its advanced state of revolution, is delicate enough to be touched off by such a trigger. Technology, in its rapid spread of cybernetic controls and exploding unemployment, threatens all the old concepts of land, livelihood, markets, and resources. And the revolution in human rights is heavily felt in every corner of southeast Asia today.

The Fellowship of Reconciliation (and to some extent the groups listed who participated in the conference on Vietnam) is deeply committed to the whole concept of a world at peace. But it realizes that short-term and piecemeal approaches are often irrelevant and sometimes even backward steps, when not seen in the genuinely revolutionary and apocalyptic vision of the actual shape of a world at peace. Studies and papers dealing with such a world are now

in process of preparation and production. For more information on the program and the philosophy of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, write Box 271, Nyack, N.Y.

[From Friends Journal, July 15, 1964]

ALGERIA AND VIETNAM: TELLTALE OF DISASTER (By Bronson P. Clark)

Quaker workers in Algeria regard as commonplace the numerous stories of atrocities which grew out of the 8-year Algerian struggle for independence. A tree was pointed out to me where women were hung by their arms until they would tell where their sons were hidden. I was shown the cistern in which 20 or 25 men were jammed for special punishment, as well as the single water tap for an entire regroupment camp, where the water was shut off for 18 days during one period of repression.

These and similar stories grew out of the efforts by the French to pacify the civilian population. Despite the creation of thousands of regroupment camps in which millions of Algerians were imprisoned, and in spite of massive military superiority, the French could not succeed.

It was on a day when I stood in a small western Algerian town on the edge of the Sahara, talking with the mayor, that the similarity between the efforts of the French in Algeria and of the American Government in South Vietnam struck me as a parallel. I had just read in the New York Times of the machinegunning of water buffalo in South Vietnam when the Algerian mayor pointed out that during the war the camels had been machinegunned by the French in an effort to deprive the guerrillas operating in the desert area of their usefulness.

As the months have gone by, the parallel has become more and more striking. During the Diem era, the U.S. Government announced that 8,000 strategic hamlets, financed by the United States, would be built in South Vietnam. The reason given for regrouping civilian populations into camps (for the most part forcibly) is that it prevents the guerrilla, operating in the countryside, from terrorizing the peasants into providing support. The same argument had been used in Algeria, but the fact of the matter was that the French soldiers could not determine whether an Algerian peasant was simply an innocent farmer or was in fact a peasant fighter or sympathizer. Since they were not able to trust anyone, their idea was to move everyone behind barbed wire and then to declare that anyone found outside was obviously hostile.

In the kind of bush and guerrilla warfare going on in South Vietnam, where Americans finance and direct the overall operation, our military face a similar problem. But foreign correspondents have made it clear to us that the governments which we have financed and supported do not have the support of local peasants, and that repressive tactics similar to those in Algeria have (as in the Algerian case) sealed the hostility of the peasants against the Saigon Government and the U.S.-financed army. The continued regrouping of large numbers of Vietnamese into camps, with the frequent burning of their former homes, will serve only to create additional support for the Vietcong. The torture of dragging prisoners through muddy paddy fields behind vehicles (as depicted in the New York Times of May 23) is only one example of the atrocities which will alienate what peasant support is left.

At the time of some of the Algerian atrocities there were protests by the Catholic Church in France against the harsh practices of the French Army. There were also demonstrations of civil disobedience by French draftees, particularly with respect to the Algerian war. It is curious and perhaps frightening to realize that in the United States we have a leming-like attitude to-

1964

19847

ward the actions of our Government in the Far East, although the wire services report that we are engaged in "earthscorching" practices in which, after burning villages, destroying livestock and rice stores, and stripping and killing all foliage, we regroup any civilians who survive into what the Pentagon now has the audacity to call "new life hamlets." It seem frightening, I say, to realize that there has been almost no outcry on the part of the organized church against these acts committed in our name and in our behalf.

One might wonder why the American Government persists so vigorously in prosecuting a war which most thoughtful observers agree cannot be resolved militarily, but (as Walter Lippmann often has pointed out) must ultimately be negotiated into a political settlement in which the Vietcong or Communists are given a recognized status. At the least, the issue should be brought before the United Nations. American reluctance to do this can be understood only if one glances back in the broadest possible sweep of understanding at the American position in the Far East during the last 25 years.

Those of us who were in Quaker service in China in the middle forties recall how amazed the American public was when the American Government intervened so aggressively in the Chinese Civil War. The U.S. Air Force flew Chiang Kai-shek's troops from west China, where they had been pushed by the Japanese, to the eastern cities of China, to forestall those cities' being occupied by nearby Chinese Communist troops. After the surrender of the Japanese at the end of the Second World War, United States Marines were used to hold Chinese railway lines for the Nationalists in an effort to keep the lines from falling into the hands of the Chinese Communists.

We set up a military advisory group in China to equip and train Chiang Kai-shek's troops in a new war to kill Chinese Communists. Everyone knows we were ultimately defeated when Chiang was forced to retreat to Formosa. For some people it has been an inexplicable situation that in the Far East we have tenaciously tied ourselves to a sterile and bankrupt policy which has blocked China's admission to the world community, prevented our citizens from traveling to China, and prohibited cultural and scientific interchange and world trade with a fifth of the human race. Our Government will punish any American journalist who attempts to report to us directly from China.

Those Americans who did not realize the enormous extent of our involvement in the Chinese Civil War cannot understand our continuing involvement in the growing war in southeast Asia. The fact is that the Pentagon has not forgotten its defeat at the hands of the Chinese Communists and regards its maneuvers in South Vietnam and its increasing military adventures in Laos as pre-jockeying and eventually coming to grips with what the Pentagon regards as the principal target or enemy: Communist China.

It is difficult for the American people or the Congress to play a very significant role, as little is known about the Far East. Most of our high schools have no courses whatever on Far Eastern history, and only a handful of colleges give a major in Far Eastern affairs. Only occasionally is there a student of Far Eastern languages.

Our general ignorance of Asian language, race, religion, history, and geography prevents us from making an impact upon our Congressmen, whose main concerns continue to be, on the one hand, a wide-eyed, childlike version of bogeyman communism, and, on the other, anxiety that the military contracts dealt out by the Pentagon go to their constituents. The pressure on Congress is enormous to continue military programs and to maintain supply depots, navy yards, obsolete

tank manufacturing plants, etc. A recent 2-day visit to Washington, during which I had a series of interviews on South Vietnam with Pentagon and State Department personnel, convinced me that the Congress had declared its last war. From now on, our military adventures will begin as the White House (using a combination of Pentagon-CIA-State Department advice) sees fit to begin them.

While similarities with Algeria have been pointed out, they can be carried only so far. One of the differences is that France was strained to the limit economically by her military adventures abroad. Also, the liberal tradition within the French political stream created a tension within her community which predisposed the French people to withdrawing from the Algerian venture. These two factors do not exist for us in southeast Asia. We are wealthy, strong, and arrogant. We are not predisposed to withdraw, having not yet reached the political maturity to realize that there are many kinds of communism, some of which provide quite an adequate way of life for some peoples; nor have we the sophistication to realize that it is not given to the United States—particularly majority white Americans—to dictate to small brown people of another religion and another language how they shall think and feel and to what loyalties they shall respond.

Rather than present our military face to these people in Asia, we should—as Supreme Court Justice Douglas long ago pointed out—endorse with enthusiasm their attempts to break with their feudal past and to shake off their enormous poverty, and should join side by side with them in building a new society in which they might share in some measure such standards of food, health, and education as we have in America.

If thoughtful and religious people in America do not soon impinge upon our Government's fatal and immoral policy, we shall be led further into a series of events beyond our control which we shall not be able to stop. China cannot long permit our continued intervention without weighing direct intervention herself. Who dares forecast after that? I await with anxiety the awakening of America's conscience.

DAYTON, OHIO,
 August 13, 1964.

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

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to express my appreciation for your stand on the Vietnam crisis. I am horrified at the extent this "war" has gone and how little the American (U.S.) people know about it.

I had written to the President about my concern before—several times before his talk of August 6. I was hopeful he would approach the Vietnam issue from a conciliatory angle—directly opposite to what I understand Mr. GOLDWATER takes. But this hope was shattered August 6. I note in a report in our newspaper that you still stand firm in the belief which I hold also (if I interpret this correctly). Where do we (U.S.) go from here?

Sincerely yours,

JOE M. DEXTER.

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA,
 August 8, 1964.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
 U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I wish to extend to you and to Senator MORSE a vote of confidence and appreciation for your long and continued stand on the southeast Asia situation. The conventional press has not recorded your remarks on the floor of the Senate; however, through subscribing to several liberal publications, I had been aware of your sane and sensible stand. I have long felt that we had no business whatsoever in

southeast Asia; that the countries in that area are capable of self-determination and self-government; and that we have problems within the borders of our own country which should be resolved before sticking our nose into other people's business.

Please keep up the good fight. The intelligent people of this country will applaud and the vacuum heads will jeer.

Sincerely yours,
 PETER W. LANNEN.

MELBOURNE, AUSTRALIA,
 August 8, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: From faraway Australia, I would like to congratulate you on your lone stand against the recent military action in the Gulf of Tonkin and the coast of North Vietnam.

When a war hysteria grips a people it is very hard to hear the quieter voice of sanity. Amid all the dark news of last week your vote and protest were a most encouraging and hopeful light.

Will the U.S. administration realize in time that you cannot capture men's hearts and minds by shooting their brothers?

Haven't the peoples of Asia the right to expect something better from the world's richest Nation than bombs and bloodshed?

Your courageous protest served the cause of America and world peace well.

Yours sincerely,
 VINCENT MATTHEW.

HARPURSVILLE, N.Y.,
 August 13, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to commend you in your attempts to get our troops withdrawn from Vietnam.

So many of us, especially the young people, feel so helpless to do anything to stop the futile loss of men, the outpouring of our money and our disgraceful actions there, both political and military.

I hope that these silent despairing citizens may voice their ideas and help you to save our men.

Yours truly,
 GENEVIEVE KARR HAMLIN.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
 August 11, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
 Senate of the United States,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to express my extreme concern over the situation in Vietnam and the position which our Government has taken and continues to take with regard to it. In addition, I want to say that I appreciate your position particularly on the vote taken in the Senate Friday in which you did not support the President's military action.

I urge you to continue to press for our withdrawal from Vietnam. Time has become of the essence.

Sincerely yours,
 DEBORAH A. JACKSON.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
 August 11, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
 Senate of the United States,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As a longtime admirer of your great State of Oregon, I was pleased to discover that Oregon has a Senator whose integrity matches her beauty.

I thank you for the courageous stand on the war in Vietnam, and for your efforts to end hypocrisy in our foreign aid program.

I also urge you to work for full implementation of the new civil rights law, and for protection of civil rights workers and Negroes in the South.

I sincerely hope that you and Senator GRUENING will keep up the struggle. Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

DONALD JOHNS.

POINT ARENA, CALIF.,
August 10, 1964.

DEAR SIR: I wish to thank you for your opposition to President Johnson's action in Vietnam, and to say I firmly support the reasons for your stand, and your whole position in regard to the war in Vietnam.

I am a schoolteacher in rural northern California.

Yours sincerely,

MRS. ROSALIE BORTHWICK.

AUGUST 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am a student at the University of Washington and a registered voter of King County, Wash. I have followed your calm dissent with the majority views regarding Vietnam for the past year with amazement.

Last fall I prepared a research speech for a class on the conditions in South Vietnam, I used such sources as the New Republic and the Nation—even Dean Rusk's speeches. Sir, you are absolutely correct regarding our deplorable role in that country. Why are our violations of the Geneva Agreements of 1954 and international custom regarding the use of chemical warfare completely ignored in this country?

You have been dispassionate, reasoned, and courageous in expressing your views. We are in a minority regarding this matter; I hope that somehow you can continue to express what you know and feel to be true. I also hope the people of Oregon recognize your worth.

Sincerely,

Mrs. JO SENTERS.

BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF.,
August 13, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The coverage and wisdom you displayed during the recent clash with North Vietnam is deeply admired and appreciated, by me, my family, and all of our friends.

We are in complete accord with your views, and fully realize the strength of character and depth of conviction that you so ably expressed during this crisis.

Our humble thanks to you for bolstering our belief that truth will always prevail in the person of men like yourself.

Respectfully,

Mrs. JAMES J. BROWN.

AUGUST 10, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: By reputation, you should be able to cancel out Senator GOLDWATER all by yourself.

MILTON R. SCHEIERN.

LIVINGSTON, N.J.,
August 15, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have just taken the time to read both sides of the issue of the attack in the Gulf of Tonkin. I have now made up my mind.

I wish to congratulate you and Senator GRUENING (Alaska) for your courage and vision in voting against the President's action. What makes me feel sad about our country is that you and GRUENING are the only two in the Senate and the House who saw the issue so clearly.

What is wrong with our country? Is President Johnson so sensitive of GOLDWATER? We now know unfortunately that the despotic South Vietnam regime (democratic?) could fabricate a war similar to the battleship Maine incident. It is odd but most history does repeat itself.

Keep up the good work. Don't loose heart. Even though we are a very small minority, "we shall overcome."
Respectfully,

LEON M. MOSNER.

VENICE, CALIF.,
October 12, 1961.

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

HONORABLE SIR: Your stand against our undeclared war in southeast Asia is well taken because:

(1) We cannot win the way we are going.
(2) We are being drawn into a war with China, on their terms, in their front yard, 6,000 miles from home.

Their plan is to eat into southeast Asia slowly, so we will not go all out while they do not have the atomic bomb. That way they win.

What should we do?

(1) Pull out slowly (4 months) and suck them in.

(2) Tell them to get out of Vietnam and all other territory not Chinese, including India. They would declare war then.

(3) Warn them to get out in 3 months.

(4) Declare war and after warning them to evacuate noncombatants we bomb their cities and communications.

(5) No American soldiers used ever.

What do we accomplish by this provided we can convince our people and the world that it is our duty to stop them?

(1) We set them back 10 years and make it probable that their people will revolt.

(2) If they get the atomic bomb in that time prepare to suffer defeat in Asia, temporarily; draw back to the Philippines from where we would continue the bombing until they are destroyed as a power.

If the yellow peril is real the above will be necessary for our survival.

What are the chances of our getting allies, or at least approval from NATO and Russia? Slim, I'd say, until we turn the tide.

How would our people react? Support—if we make clear our plan to keep our soldiers out. Cancel the draft and reduce all Armed Forces except air.

The alternative to some successful plan to stop the Chinese is to train our grandsons to pull a rickshaw.

A. E. BURTON.

SAN BERNARDINO, CALIF.,
August 13, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: The enclosed editorial spurred me to write you in commendation for your stand on Vietnam. I go much further in my support for you than the editorial, and I should have written you much sooner. You and the Senator from Alaska and Walter Lippmann are the only ones making sense regarding the situation.

It would indeed be folly—disastrous folly—to become involved in war on the Chinese mainland. We have gone far in that direction. In the morning's paper Mr. Lippmann writes, just as you have said:

"We must make our readiness to negotiate an accommodation as credible as we make our readiness to retaliate against aggression."

Very sincerely and cordially,

Mrs. OBED E. SMELSER,

Independent voter—as yet favoring President Johnson.

[From the San Bernardino (Calif.) Daily Sun,
Aug. 13, 1964]

DEFENDING A NAY-SAYER

A reader inquires: "Why does not someone shove a gag down Senator WAYNE MORSE's throat?"

Obviously our subscriber is vexed over the Oregon Senator's persistent dissent to the joint resolution on southeast Asia. Or, maybe this reader is aggravated with WAYNE LYMAN MORSE's selection of foreign aid legislation as his prime target for criticism.

The reader's question is not difficult to answer.

Senator MORSE, because of the freedom our constitutional government provides, has a right to speak his mind. And he does. Nonetheless, Oregon voters must be happily satisfied with their Senator's performance. Otherwise they would never return him to the Senate.

Objectively, WAYNE MORSE possesses a razor-keen intellect. His whiplash of scorn is respected. Few colleagues can equal his oratory. He usually speaks with considerable substance. What Senator can compete as a debater with MORSE's shrewdness, agility, overpowering logic, and seemingly inexhaustibility? He is categorized as the Senate's ablest expert on labor law. He ranks among the best as a constitutionalist.

We concur that Senator MORSE, at times is almost intolerable in the self-righteous conviction with which he pursues his goals. We dislike the manner in which he often seems to impute sinister motives to those colleagues who disagree with him. Yet, we do not minimize his capacities as a legal and legislative scholar. To be respected is MORSE's standing as a leading Democratic liberal.

True, the Democrats certainly have found MORSE no more tractable than the Republicans did. His conversion to the Democrats actually seems to have sharpened his combativeness.

Although we often disagree with Senator MORSE's verbal utterances on the critical issues of our time, like Voltaire we will defend to the death his right to speak his mind. We admire his forthrightness in this age of conformity.

ASKOV, MINN.,
August 14, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: I admire your courage tremendously on your stand on Vietnam. I wrote the President, MCCARTHY, HUMPHREY, and BLATNIK a letter of protest on their stand the following "I protest vigorously your stand on Vietnam. We have no legal or moral business there. We're deliberately lied to that they attacked us, later it comes out we attacked them. Same as U-2 incident. We're becoming known as the country with the gun and napalm bombs all over the world. We're playing with dynamite. Sometimes those things backfire."

More power to you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. JORGON JORGEASIA.

CALHAN, COLO.,
August 12, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: I would like to express my view on the stand you have taken on the resolution that was voted upon by the U.S. Senate a few days ago.

My hat is off to a man like you, Senator. Not a "yes" man, but a man that will stand before 190 million Americans and tell them what he thinks of the whole dirty mess in Vietnam. Also, my hat is off to Senator GRUENING when he argued before the Senate that Vietnam is not worth the life of a single American boy.

The more I look at things in our country, the more I think that the men of both Senate, and House of Representatives want to keep their hands clean. Yes, Mr. President, you are the boss. Have it your way. Elec-

1964

tion is coming soon, if anything goes wrong, our hands are clean.

Here is hoping we had more men like Senator ERNEST GRUENING, and you, Senator MORSE.

Very truly yours,

JOHN ROSKOS.

DEWEY, OKLA.,
August 11, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to thank you for your continuing opposition to the administration's Vietnam policy, and in particular your recent vote against putting the leashes of the dogs of war in President Johnson's hands.

It's all too easy to get disgusted with every facet of American politics—but when I hear of you and Senator GRUENING, I believe there are at least two honest men in Washington. Don't lose heart—Wilson once said something to the effect that it often got very lonely in Washington, far from the voice of the Nation. I hope that someday that voice is heard—and when it is perhaps you and Senator GRUENING will not be voting in the minority.

Carry on, there are quite a few of us counting on you.

Sincerely,

JOHN KELLY KARASEK.

AUGUST 11, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: With regard to the situation in southeast Asia, our foreign policy and your recent statements: you are obviously one of the very few people in public office who is not driven by greed, vanity, and self-interest. You should know that other people do recognize your consistent pursuit of the truth—the simple facts—in a situation which may be purposefully confused. To me your honesty and fearlessness are supremely admirable. It is truly heartening to see that you have not been seduced or deluded by nationalism or any devious dogma and that you do not cling to archaic myths for emotional support. I may be attributing too much virtue to you but you do appear to be a man of principle, truly concerned with human welfare and justice.

Keep it up for the sake of all of us.

IRA Z. SCHILLER.

DIMONDALE, MICH.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I applaud your recent performance in regard to our country's behavior in Vietnam. It occurs to me that anticommunism often becomes so intense that all sense of objectivity is lost and the result is undemocratic and totalitarian, completely disregarding the needs or desires of people. If this is extremism in the defense of liberty, its bad.

Very truly yours,

DANIEL R. BROWN.

P.S.—I urge you to oppose any effort by Congress to deny the Federal courts jurisdiction in State apportionment (legislative) cases.

D.B.

CROSSVILLE, TENN.,
August 14, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: When the drums of war beat, few refuse to march to that beat.

You are one of the few men in our Government, to speak against our military involvement in Asia.

In my opinion your stand is a rational one, among irrational.

I hope you will continue to speak out.

Sincerely,

VAUGHN H. KERLEY.

No. 163—36

PASADENA, CALIF.,
August 12, 1964.

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

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I admire your stalwart adherence to your principles. It is probably the hardest thing in the world to stand up and be counted when 98 of your colleagues are against you, as you did on the occasion of the Vietnam resolution.

I believe that the Vietnamese and all other southeast Asian problems should be settled through negotiation.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. BETTY BAITAL.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
August 9, 1964.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR,
THE REGISTER-GUARD,
Eugene, Oreg.

DEAR EDITOR: I congratulate the city of Eugene and the State of Oregon for sending Senator WAYNE MORSE to Washington.

I sometimes think there are three grades of Senators: (1) Those who represent their home States, (2) those who represent our whole country, and (3) a top few who represent the people of the world. In Senator MORSE's strong, steady stand and voting for Vietnam I am sure he represents the majority of the people of the world. He puts life before politics. He leads on the road to peace.

HELEN RAND MILLER.

MADISON, WISC.,
August 12, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to write you a short letter, to commend you for voting against the resolution backing the President's actions in the Gulf of Tonkin and to tell you of my admiration for your statements on the entire southeast Asian situation. You and a handful of other Senators (GRUENING, MANSFIELD, etc.) seem to be voices crying in the wilderness, but I urge you to cry louder. We need more men who will attempt to assess situations with some sort of objectivity rather than with emotionalism. It seems most necessary that the American people be made aware of the double standard under which our foreign policy seems to operate: if we do something (use napalm bombs, do aerial reconnaissance, operate fleets off foreign shores) it's to "defend democracy" and if anyone else does it, they're up to no good. The illogic of it all is never even hinted at in the mass news media.

Please keep making speeches. But what can I do to see that these speeches, ignored by most of the press, are given wider coverage?

Sincerely,

Mrs. WALTER GRENGG.

LINCOLN PARK, MICH.,
August 10, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I must express my gratitude, as an American, for your courageous stand on the Vietnam question. No one else dared express their misgivings, or ask the natural question: Were our vessels aiding the South Vietnamese forces in their raids on the northern portion of that country?

Although you may not be correct (I think you are), you deserve a united tribute from the citizens of this country.

I hope that you continue to serve America in the way you have in the past. My only regret is that there is no one in my State of Michigan to aid you in your struggle to sustain freedom of expression.

Respectfully yours,

ANTHONY J. PAPALAS.

LA PUENTE, CALIF.,
August 10, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you and may you be richly blessed for your determined position regarding our country's presence and actions in and about Vietnam.

I could not agree more, but opinions like these are not very popular—it would seem that peacemaking and the seeking of moral justice are unfashionable if not downright questionable these days.

Ignorance, stupidity, and the quest for the almighty dollar bill have allowed fear, hate, and distrust to permeate America like dry-rot—and I, in turn, am frightened by what I see.

But then a moment such as last week comes along and I see a man like you have the courage to speak for what he believes and for what I believe—never minding the consequences—and I was so grateful I cried.

Since 1952 I have been an admirer and champion of yours. You always have a friend in California.

Most sincere thanks and best wishes for a long and rewarding career.

Mrs. PATRICIA PHILLIPS.

LA CRESCENTA.

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

SENATOR MORSE: I want to praise you for giving full coverage to Senator WAYNE MORSE on Vietnam: this is all the more praiseworthy as I am sure that his remarks were not in full accord with your editorial policy.

This is in the best tradition of journalism; the people should be given both sides on important matters.

It is high time that we got rid of John Foster Dulles' ukase, "Foreign policy is not debatable." Why not?

It makes no sense if we can discuss the shortcomings of the post office but not matters involving life and death.

ROBERT SHILLAKER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
August 12, 1964.

Re Vietnam resolution.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I congratulate you for your position, the only valid one in my opinion, on the "blank check" Vietnam resolution recently passed by Congress.

In time the correctness of your opposition will be demonstrated. Your almost solo stand showed courage and individuality in the highest quality of statesmanship.

Keep up the fight because its right.

Sincerely,

SEYMOUR MANDEL.

The Senate proceedings of today will be continued in the next issue of the RECORD.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 19, 1964:

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

John A. Schnittker, of Kansas, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Leonard W. Moyers, Athens.
Reginald Richardson, Greensboro.
Evelyn B. Andrews, Louisville.
Ora C. Cark, Munford.
Robert A. Bryant, Replap.
Gail P. Mosley, Stapleton.

19850

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 19, 1964

ALASKA

George S. Schwamm, Anchorage.
James E. Webb, Copper Center.
Maxine M. Millard, Glennallen.
Edith M. Arnold, Nome.
Durwood F. Huls, Valdez.

CALIFORNIA

Patrick H. McMahon, Cathedral City.
John H. Kirk, Coalinga.
Guy J. Collette, El Segundo.
Michael T. Lane, Lawndale.
Rex Huddleston, Live Oak.
R. Ollie Mapes, McClellan Air Force Base.
Gene W. Wooten, Olivehurst.
F. Culver Parker, Palm Springs.
William J. Wilson, Poyay.
Charles M. Long, Reedley.
William F. Goward, San Leandro.
Raymond W. Wood, Sequoia National Park.
Lloyd C. Perkins, Soda Springs.
Lawrence R. Unser, Springville.
Barbara L. Tudor, Tecopa.

DELAWARE

George E. West, Selbyville.

FLORIDA

Edward A. Williams, Jr., Bonifay.
Robert A. Ballard, Goulds.
Evangel B. Cooksey, Lamont.
Richard T. Maltinos, Oldsmar.
Irene C. Collins, Satsuma.
Alton V. Cain, Shallmar.
Leonard F. Stansel, Wellborn.

GEORGIA

R. Guy Thomas, Milan.
Ouida J. Clements, Morgan.
Charles L. Ricks, Soperton.

IDAHO

Eugene L. Nelson, Council.

ILLINOIS

Stanley J. Jalovec, Argo.
Wilma K. Voll, Groveland.

INDIANA

James E. Ross, Crawfordsville.
Catherine L. Bradfield, Donaldson.
Robert C. Crouse, Monticello.
Omer C. Bixel, Plymouth.
George W. Brook, Remington.
Ralph R. Seavers, Upland.
Charles D. Prickett, Wolf Lake.
Glenn Walters, Wyatt.

IOWA

William H. Krueger, Arnolds Park.
Laura L. Knapp, Dolliver.
David M. Anderson, Forest City.
Robert J. Neal, Marble Rock.
Harvey C. Young, New Market.
William A. Fisher, Swisher.
Eugene J. Doyle, Williams.

KENTUCKY

Stanley W. Gosney, De Mossville.
Helen D. Wolford, Phelps.

LOUISIANA

Cleo H. Gaines, Olla.
Homer E. Adams, Rodessa.

MAINE

Russell J. Bryant, Belfast.
Albert L. Marcoux, Burnham.
Eldred F. Huntley, East Machias.
William L. Kinch, Livermore Falls.
Francis J. Brougham, North Jay.
F. Dale Speed, Princeton.
Ralph A. Dunton, New Sharon.
John J. McAuliffe, Rockland.

MARYLAND

James J. O'Rourke, Barton.
Genevieve M. Coale, Churchville.
William B. Orndorff, Cumberland.
Tilghman H. Williams, Goldsboro.
Clyde J. Embert, Jr., Greensboro.
Margaret C. Wallace, Sherwood.
Anna E. Brooks, Woolford.

MASSACHUSETTS

Owen J. Justin, Amesbury.
William H. Hodsdon, East Dennis.

Elizabeth A. Stanton, Fitchburg.
Armand A. Desjardins, Gilbertville.
Bernard E. Hickey, Griswoldville.
James F. Higgins, Hingham.
Paul H. Benolt, Southbridge.
Lillian M. Dziembowski, South Grafton.

MICHIGAN

James B. Koyno, Bellaire.
Reo A. Goff, Dimondale.
Lena L. Bryan, Douglas.
Earl A. Rosler, Eagle.
Frederick W. Ahola, Houghton.
Richard K. Boomer, Lakeview.
Berniece C. Hill, Lansing.
John O. Boynton, St. Ignace.

MINNESOTA

Fred J. Kronbusch, Altura.
Lawrence J. Mahan, Brandon.
Violet L. Howard, Lyle.
Matt J. Pecarina, Parkville.
Lee W. Davis, Vergas.

MISSISSIPPI

John E. Millender, Okolona.
Percy P. Pounders, Jr., Olive Branch.

MISSOURI

James G. Curry, Jr., Bucklin.
Erwin M. Otte, Chesterfield.
Hubert J. Ortwerth, Florissant.
Harold F. Taylor, Jenesburg.
William E. Jones, Neosho.
W. Pleas Wilson, Paris.
John Hoehor, Savannah.

MONTANA

Teddy R. Andrew, Columbia Falls.
Eugene Kennedy, Manhattan.
Sarah M. Riley, West Yellowstone.

NEBRASKA

Howard W. Knutzen, Cedar Bluffs.
Clifford L. Fauquier, Central City.
Leo D. Coslett, Mead.
Lowell D. Hanson, Osceola.
Harland W. Burger, Plymouth.
Arthur W. Hovey, Trenton.
Edwin S. Pavlik, Verdigre.

NEVADA

Carroll W. Baber, East Ely.
Elfrieda C. Franck, Stewart.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Alton G. Desnoyer, Claremont.
Lucille L. LaRose, New Castle.

NEW JERSEY

Sylvio E. Bertagni, Allentown.
Claude R. Foyer, Belvidere.
Norman H. Levbarg, Lakewood.
Robert N. Bailey, Mays Landing.
William E. Nagle, Vernon.
Harold F. Burd, Jr., Washington.

NORTH CAROLINA

Thelma B. Yelverton, Fountain.
Willard W. Reavys, Hamptonville.
David E. Yeomans, Harkers Island.
Charles R. Cowan, Mount Mourne.
Charles E. Morrison, Raeford.
Sidney Hoffer, Washington.

NORTH DAKOTA

Florian P. Weinmann, Harvey.

OHIO

E. Wayne Blake, Belmont.
Donald J. Nagy, Brilliant.
Gayle A. Bowman, Bryan.
Michael J. Lotko, Jr., Elyria.
Donald R. Pettay, Freeport.
Roger R. Miller, Fresno.
Emmett J. Hagans, Gambier.
Irvn E. Barcus, Sr., Johnstown.
James E. Stewart, Leetonia.
Edward H. Shrodes, Martins Ferry.
Russell H. White, St. Clairsville.
Vernon A. Bonar, Shadyside.
Don F. Shuler, Troy.
Mary E. Darrow, Unionville.

OKLAHOMA

Cora H. Gossmann, Arapahoe.
Margaret C. Hill, Coalgate.

Carl B. Grimes, Elmer.
William M. Lindsey, Elmore City.
Edna L. McNatt, Foss.
Lloyd J. Carey, Grove.
Robert L. Stangl, Sparks.

OREGON

Marjorie E. Leach, Bonneville.

PENNSYLVANIA

Charles H. Heffner, Arendtsville.
George M. Guswiler, Mechanicsburg.
Robert P. DeLotto, New Kensington.
Ned M. Hartsell, Oil City.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Edwin C. McCants, Anderson.
DeWitt T. Branham, Jr., Lugoff.
Edwin L. Platts, Ridge Spring.
Otis P. Smith, St. Stephen.
Warren L. Walkup, Timmons ville.
Frank W. Nabors, Union.
William R. Busbee, Wagener.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Theron C. Halsted, Centerville.
Clair C. Simmons, Elk Point.
Edna I. Bingham, Hot Springs.
John C. Travis, Mound City.

TENNESSEE

Robert H. Easterly, Cleveland.
William B. Milstead, Hornsby.
Edward P. Peeler, Jr., Stanton.
James H. Miller, Surgolnsville.
Thomas B. Ferguson, Western State Hospital.

TEXAS

T. A. Warner, Bellevue.
Ernest H. Davis, Deweyville.
William L. Warren, Paint Rock.
Arthur C. Wendel, Richmond.
John M. Tidwell, Roanoke.
Virgie M. Holmes, Tolar.

UTAH

Wesley M. Farrer, Beaver.
Joseph L. Larsen, Huntington.

VERMONT

Mary J. Reagan, Moretown.
Richard H. Pittsley, South Barre.
Dorothy D. Beauchamp, South Woodbury.
William E. Flower, Woodstock.

VIRGINIA

Ralph S. Coffman, Mount Sidney.
James B. Sult, Mount Vernon.
J. White Marcum, Rose Hill.
Emmett F. Good, Stanley.

WASHINGTON

Melvin F. Thompson, Brinnon.
Carroll C. Emry, Buckley.
Homer V. Gage, Hoquiam.
Fae B. Trantham, Humptulips.
William H. Stiles, Jr., Longview.
Howard E. Burnett, Okanogan.
Richard B. Green, South Bend.
Elver R. Buckley, Wilbur.

WEST VIRGINIA

Maurice B. Morrison, Charlton Heights.
Q. Darrell Thompson, Coal City.
Robert M. Campbell, Grantsville.
Harper H. Galford, Green Bank.
Lee B. Coleman, Lost Creek.
Dual L. Hill, Princeton.

WISCONSIN

Ione R. Marshall, Argonne.
Allan R. Peterson, Elk Mound.
Clarence E. Meinhardt, Greenwood.
Donald S. Weindenfelder, Hollandale.
Roy H. Kreger, Lomira.
John E. Jacob, Lone Rock.
Thomas N. Hayden, Marshfield.
Richard W. Beranek, New Berlin.
James E. Wyse, Princeton.
Elaine E. Ouellette, Townsend.
Oscar L. Dingman, Troy Center.

WYOMING

Virginia L. Gregory, Hanna.