

is to encourage further escalation. The amendment lauded the President as a peacemaker even as he committed the country ever more deeply to the conflict that Mansfield once described as an "open-ended" war. The White House, the State Department, and the Pentagon were quick to interpret the amendment as the most generous blank check handed over to them for military purposes in Vietnam since the Senate's Tonkin Gulf resolution of 1964.

The two Senate doves who stood fast and voted their convictions on this historic occasion—which was given only a fraction of the attention it deserved by any objective news standard—made their position as clear as words could make it. "I am voting against the supplemental authorization," Senator Nelson stated, "in order to express my opposition to past escalation of the conflict and the future escalation that is certain to follow. Furthermore, I am voting against it to express my deep regret that we have failed to explore adequately the possibility of reaching the negotiating table by the cessation of bombing for a sufficient time to test the real intent of Hanoi." Senator Morse declared: "These successive military funding bills for the war do not relate so much to supporting the boys

and giving them what they need as they provide funds for new expanded forces to be sent."

In the House approval of the appropriation came by voice vote after it had defeated, 372 to eighteen, an amendment by Representative George Brown of California which was similar to the Clark anti-bombing amendment. In a later statement—expressive of the views of the eighteen Democrats, including himself, who voted for the Brown amendment—Representative Robert Kastenmeier of Wisconsin said he had voted "no" in the voice vote on the appropriation because he could "not support a measure that promises only to continue the present course which will send still more troops to Vietnam, widen the land war in Southeast Asia, and further increase American casualties."

House members who voted for the Brown amendment in addition to the author and Kastenmeier were:

Jonathan B. Bingham, Leonard Farbstein, Benjamin S. Rosenthal, William F. Ryan, and James H. Scheuer, all of New York; Phillip Burton, Don Edwards, Thomas M. Rees, and Edward R. Roybal of California; John Conyers, Jr., and Charles C. Diggs, Jr., of Michigan; Donald M. Fraser of Minnesota; Edith Green of Oregon;

*Shuman, Harry S.*  
*Helstoski, Henry*  
*Walter*

Henry Helstoski of New Jersey; Patsy T. Mink of Hawaii; and Sidney R. Yates of Illinois.

One out of four Americans wants the bombing of North Vietnam stopped. Although this is a minority, it does embrace millions of voters. Except for Senators Nelson and Morse in the Senate and eighteen members of the House, these millions had no Congressional voices courageous enough to cast clear-cut votes against the bombing and other escalation measures which block the road to peace. Once again events have demonstrated that when it comes to making undeclared war—and widening it when it suits him—President Johnson has Congress in the hollow of his hand.

## Democracy Betrayed

If two years from now our Government—with the tacit and sometimes outspoken approval of some segments of the Establishment—is still employing force, deceit, and corruption as tools of U.S. policy, then it will be quite appropriate to celebrate 1969 throughout the land as the 500th anniversary of the birth of Niccolò di Bernardo Machiavelli. For the Florentine statesman and political writer, in his work *The Prince*, sought to justify the use of violence, dishonesty, and corruption in statecraft. His contemporary and model, Cesare Borgia, built his power on such principles, the principles we now practice in modern fashion in Vietnam and in other countries.

The practice of a Machiavellian national policy has been clearly exposed to public view by the latest series of revelations on the Central Intelligence Agency's penetration, over two decades, of nearly every type of free institution operating in this country and abroad. The pumping of many millions of dollars in CIA funds into the nation's academic, cultural, labor, church, and journalistic fields has been so comprehensive that it is becoming increasingly difficult to find organizations completely free of any taint of CIA subsidy.

This frightful and frightening policy the Government pursues—that the end

## Truman's Misgivings over CIA

Former President Harry Truman, who created the Central Intelligence Agency, soon afterward developed the "gravest misgivings" about it, Smith Simpson, a former State Department official, reminds us in his forthcoming book, *Anatomy of the State Department*. Simpson recalls that Mr. Truman wrote in a syndicated newspaper article in late 1953:

"With all the nonsense put on by Communist propaganda . . . in their name-calling assault on the West, the last thing we needed was for the CIA to be seized upon as something akin to a subverting influence in the affairs of other people. . . .

"There are now some searching questions that need to be answered. I . . . would like to see the CIA restored to its original assignment as the intelligence arm of the President, and whatever else it can properly perform in that special field—and that its operational duties be terminated or properly used elsewhere.

"We have grown up as a nation, respected for our free institutions and for our ability to maintain a free and open society. There is something about the way the CIA has been functioning that is casting a shadow over our historic position and I feel that we need to correct it."

justifies the means—has boomeranged. Our credibility in the eyes of other countries and peoples has been severely damaged by the CIA's infiltration of our institutions. More than ever before, American delegates—whether students, professors, labor leaders, lawyers, or churchmen—to international conferences will be viewed with suspicion as possible hirelings of the U.S. espionage apparatus.

The damage done to free institutions in this country may be even greater. The CIA web of propaganda and intrigue—spun with the generalized approval of four Presidents, the blank check endorsement of Congress, the acceptance and sometimes connivance of foundations and organizations headed by eminently respectable persons—demonstrates how cold war values threaten to transform a country founded in liberty into an authoritarian state.

There is "an alarming trend in this country toward the use of police-state tactics," Senator Gaylord Nelson, Wisconsin Democrat, told his colleagues. He cited CIA subsidies, wiretapping and eavesdropping by Government agencies, and the financing of supposedly legitimate books by the U.S. Information Agency among examples of "un-American practices."

If there is to be a halt to the process by which the Government and some of our institutions are being subverted to practices which mirror the Communist tactics we condemn, the first step must be a thorough-going Congressional inquiry into the CIA's activities and the relationship of the executive and legislative branches to this dangerously powerful agency. To press for such an inquiry may be futile in view of the disposition of the Administration and many Congressional leaders to whitewash the CIA. But the citizen who truly cares about the survival of the American venture in democracy should demand of his Congressman, his Senator, and the White House that the inquiry be initiated.

What would follow such an exploration, it is hoped, is new legislation specifically limiting the CIA to the gathering and evaluation of intelligence. President Truman, under whose Administration the CIA was established, warned after he left office that the agency's growing power must be



Herb Lubner in The Washington Post  
The Student Prince

curbed. (See box on Page 6.)

President Johnson, it is reported, ordered an end to secret subsidies by the CIA to private organizations—after *Ramparts'* recent revelations regarding the National Student Association hit the headlines. A next logical step would be for the President and Congress to initiate a policy of *openly declared and openly administered* aid to U.S. groups and individuals representing democratic ideals overseas. Private foundations should be encouraged to provide their own funds for similar activities and to make full disclosure of these activities.

Apart from the question of morality involved in the secret practices that have been disclosed, the Government, and many cooperating members of the Establishment, have demonstrated an abysmal lack of common sense. They should have foreseen that their secret operations inevitably would be exposed to world-wide condemnation.

We cannot play international games, said Walter Lippmann, as if we were a totalitarian society. "The American way of life," he added, "does not prepare our people for continual deception. We had better make up our minds to play the game from the American strength and not from American weakness, and to stamp out lying as a public policy."

In the struggle for men's minds we

have been caught cheating, and it is in the cheating and not the exposure of it that we betray our ideals. The country has a choice between the philosophy of the Machiavellians and the beliefs of those deeply concerned citizens who know that if we continue to justify ruthless means because of our professed ends, eventually democracy will be destroyed. Destroyed not by Communism but by the witless and reckless policies of the Government itself and the acquiescence of the uninformed and the unconcerned.

## Negroes and Jews

Eleven out of one hundred Americans are Negroes and about three out of one hundred are Jews. In his struggle for civil rights and equality of opportunity the minority Negro often has had the support of the minority Jew. They have worked together, along with Catholic and Protestant civil rights advocates, in hundreds of campaigns designed to give the Negro the first class citizenship he has been so long denied.

There has been some friction, at times, between Negroes and Jews. Occasionally this has broken into the open but more frequently it has seethed below the surface.

Misunderstandings between Negroes and Jews, or among other elements of our pluralistic society, are best brought out into the open and discussed. For that reason, the disagreement that has developed over a series of articles appearing in *Liberator*, a Negro monthly, could prove to have positive value. It may help clear the air of some of the misunderstandings that have been developing between Negroes and Jews.

The *Liberator* series, "Semitism in the Black Ghetto," written by Eddie Ellis and published last year, charged that Negroes in Harlem were exploited by merchants and landlords; most of the exploiters, the author wrote, were Jewish. He also claimed that "Zionists" dominated Negro colleges and Negro organizations and manipulated the civil rights movement.

Author James Baldwin and actor and playwright Ossie Davis, both Negroes, have now resigned from *Liberator's* advisory board in protest against