

constitutional maze. Peculiar handling of a frequently implemented power has resulted in a unique body of law. The purpose of this article was merely to point out some of the constitutional ramifications and anomalies incident to the utilization of this unusual legal device. Answers or attitudes about particular problems have been suggested or hinted at along the way. No complete analysis was intended. Even so, selective consideration of the major constitutional problems suggests that some new and deep-cutting changes should be wrought.

Mr. President, one point which deserves further treatment and which has not been discussed to any length so far in this debate is the role of the U.S. Government in the contempt proceedings which would arise under this bill.

As to the contempt proceeding itself, it is generally accepted that in the case of a criminal contempt the Government is the real party in interest, whether it arises out of an action to which the Government was originally a party or one between private litigants. The purpose of the proceeding is to vindicate the court's authority; this is true even though the court may appoint the attorney for the party who sought the relief to prosecute the case and the proceeding be styled as if between the original parties. Normally, the Government may intervene to prosecute the contempt proceedings in its own name. Michaelson against United States ex rel Chicago, St. P., M & O Ry., states that this prosecution is a new and independent proceeding and no part of the original cause. It would seem that ordinarily the character of the original suit, and not that of the contempt proceeding, is controlling on the question of the right to have a jury trial. Hill against United States ex rel Weiner holds specifically that an exception contained in the Clayton Act was designed to limit the jury trial provision to prosecutions for contempt arising out of cases instituted by private litigants. If the original suit is not controlling, a question of the propriety of allowing the Government to intervene arises. Normally, it is said that the Government should not be allowed to intervene in a case in which the intervention will unduly delay or prejudice the adjudication of the rights of the original parties; the right to a trial by jury is a substantial right, which might be said to have accrued to the defendants at this stage of the proceedings.

The last question under this aspect of the problem is whether the Government should be allowed to become a party to the original suit, so as to defeat any future defendant's right to a trial by jury. Section 2403 of the civil code permits the Government to intervene in suits in which the constitutionality of a statute is drawn into question. It may also intervene if it has a "proprietary interest" in the suit. Rule 24(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure grants a permissive right to any party to intervene whenever there is a statute granting that right, or when the parties have a common question of law or fact in two separate claims or defenses. While the United States may prosecute criminal acts which deprive parties of their civil rights under the Civil Rights Act,

there does not seem to be any provision or precedent for enjoining threatened deprivations of the type we are considering, aside from specific statutory provisions. VN

FOREIGN POLICY IN VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in one of its more insipid editorials on foreign policy, the Washington Post yesterday endorsed a continuation of the war in Vietnam as a mistaken commitment that "must be upheld."

What a futile, shaky, and hopeless basis for the expenditure of more money and men in South Vietnam. What makes the Washington Post editorial writers, or Washington policymakers, think the American people are going to support for long a war effort that is merely an upholding of a mistake?

How many Americans are willing to spend and die for that? Not many. It is a degrading and shameful basis for any American policy, much less for a war effort.

This newspaper's endorsement of the present policy in Vietnam ignores the most important consideration: The attitude of the local population toward perpetual fighting and unrest. It may be within the toleration of the American people to continue supporting the South Vietnam Government's war against the rebels. We do not live there. We only send military and aid people over there on a rotation plan.

But the local population has been living in the middle of war ever since the Japanese occupation. How is the American promise of more of the same indefinitely going to build what the Post calls "confidence in non-Communist rule"?

The only hope we can offer to the people of South Vietnam who are not part of the ruling clique that is living so well off the war, is eternal conflict and devastation. The question is not only how long the American people will sustain such a war, but more important, how long will the common people of Vietnam put up with it?

A boy from Oregon who had served over there visited me over the weekend. He pointed out that the article in the U.S. News & World Report written by Mr. Moore that I commented on in one of my speeches some days ago is absolutely correct. He agreed that the mercenary officers of the South Vietnamese Army have an allergy as far as battle fronts are concerned. They live in high luxury in Saigon. They have no desire to fight a war. But as he said, it is the "poor devils" down in the lower echelons that are being pushed into a war in regard to which they have no heart.

The only worse disaster for the United States than the continuation of the status quo in South Vietnam would be expansion of the war into North Vietnam. What a disgusting spectacle the United States is presenting to the world and to our own people with the current meeting in Honolulu which seems to be little more than a war council.

What is being done there is the planning of an American war in Asia, at least against North Vietnam and eventually against China, unless our bidding is fol-

lowed in South Vietnam. It will be interesting to see whether this, too, is going to be McNamara's war, or whether a declaration of war will be asked of Congress.

An attack on North Vietnam cannot by any stretch of the imagination be regarded as a defensive measure by the United States. And it no longer can be considered a defensive measure in the South Vietnamese civil war. The Government of South Vietnam is being threatened by its own people, and they are fighting with weapons and materials they are capturing from government forces or making on the spot.

The military jargon about interdiction of Communist supply lines is essentially a "cover story." If there is in fact an attack upon North Vietnam it will not have a military purpose, but a political purpose: to induce Ho Chi Minh to stop giving leadership and advice to the rebels. What the Honolulu conference is doing is making plans, virtually in public, for a bombardment of North Vietnam. Undoubtedly the information being given out about this planning is designed to intimidate the Asian Communists and perhaps cause them to retreat before the mere threat of attack.

But if the threat alone fails, the publicity itself will have created heavy pressure on this country. Having discussed so openly and at such high levels a possible attack upon North Vietnam, the American military commanders and their chief, Secretary McNamara, will feel even more obliged to carry out the attack than before the Honolulu meeting.

That is the danger of what is going on there.

But there are many other dangers. The planning of a unilateral war in South Vietnam is bad enough, without our planning a unilateral aggression against North Vietnam. Bombardment by air and sea is pure and simple aggression. Of all the fatuousness that has gone into American policy in that part of the world, the most fatuous contention yet made is that air and sea bombardment, without the participation of troops, is not an aggression. That is pure nonsense. It is worse than that. It is lying to the American people.

One may as well say that the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor and the Philippines on December 7, 1941, was not aggression against the United States because no Japanese troops were landed then, either. Clearly, what the Japanese had in mind was merely to intimidate the United States to keep out of her way as she conducted her unilateral, self-serving policy in Asia, and perhaps, to "interdict" by knocking out the Pacific Fleet of the United States.

So Pearl Harbor was a nice, neat air attack, with no messy ground fighting. How similar to what the American military is discussing for North Vietnam. And the consequences could be similarly disastrous for American people, too, unless they demand that their military and political leadership come back into the framework of American moral and legal standards. One does not have to extend the parallel with Pearl Harbor very far to know that international outlaws have a way of coming to a bad end, both for themselves and their countries.

11976

What is being done in Honolulu is outlawry. It must be stopped by the American people before it is too late.

In the one enlightenment of the editorial section of the Washington Post, one finds today that Walter Lippmann is again calling for the only legal and responsible handling of our policy in Vietnam. It is that we legitimize our presence in southeast Asia.

We must do that either through the United Nations or through an international conference that will give the United States legal standing in Asia and that will give its people some hope of a future other than perpetual war.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Lippmann article be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

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

[From the Washington Post]
THE ASIAN BALANCE OF POWER
(By Walter Lippmann)

The death of Nehru has come at a time of great uncertainty and change in the Asian balance of power. It compounds the uncertainty. For what happens in India, or more exactly in the Indian subcontinent which includes Pakistan, will affect the future of Asia as a whole.

At the worst, India will, as so often in the past, become fragmented. Nehru was not only a national hero but also, as the direct heir of Mahatma Gandhi, an anointed man. Lacking such a ruler there could be a great disorder among the many tribes, clans, castes, and sects which comprise Indian society.

At the best, which we may dare to think is possible, India under Nehru's successor will not only consolidate itself but will also go on with the task which Nehru had just begun before his death, of making peace with Pakistan, turning what is hostile co-existence into some kind of collaboration.

The inherent strength of India-Pakistan cannot be measured in terms of army divisions, tanks, and air squadrons. The crucial fact about the great subcontinent is that it has shown itself highly immune to the kind of pressure and propaganda and infiltration which has been causing so much of southeast Asia to crumble.

If India is to be conquered by China, it will have to be by direct and overt military aggression, by the kind of aggression which is unmistakable and is indubitably a *casus belli* under international law and the Charter of the United Nations. This point is critically important in any evaluation of our own foreign policy in Asia. For it would justify, it seems to me, a firm commitment to go to the defense of India-Pakistan if the Chinese attacked them.

The other strong position in South Asia is held by the United States, and it consists of our sea and air forces. The presence of these forces in the South Pacific and, increasingly, in the Indian Ocean is our real contribution to the eventual stabilization of southern Asia and of the islands of the South Pacific. In the foreseeable future China is quite incapable of challenging this great force, and the central business of a serious assessment and planning of U.S. policy is to come to an understanding of the nature of our own power.

The essential problem arises from the fact that our forces are infinitely more destructive than any other forces in the region, including the Chinese forces. The American power is so overwhelming that it cannot be used at will. It cannot be used, for example, as fellow travelers of Senator Goldwater have been proposing, to intimidate

North Vietnam and China by bombing them "coolly yet massively," while we "stop our ears to a fearful worldwide clamor until the job is done."

This is as foolish as it is immoral. It is foolish because for the United States to intervene with such savage cruelty in an Asian country would be to show a wanton disrespect for the opinion of mankind. Such disrespect does not go unpunished because we stop our ears. It would be our day of infamy if we used our superior power to "destroy the entire military, industrial and economic infrastructure" of a country with which we are not at war. This would be the way to destroy our influence in Asia, not to preserve and consolidate the American presence in the Pacific and in Asia.

The fundamental principle to which we must subject ourselves is that American sea and air power can be used only if and when the United States is acting, as it did in the Korean war, under an international sanction. What we do not have and what we need now in southeast Asia is a treaty guaranteeing the independence of the countries of southeast Asia, a treaty which is signed and ratified by all the great powers that are concerned—namely, China, the Soviet Union, India, and Pakistan, the United States, Britain, and France.

The foreboding that we are on the verge of being expelled from Asia and the western Pacific is quite unreal. American sea and air power command the whole Pacific Ocean, and there is no serious rival sea and air power on these waters, as there was when Japan had a great navy. Our problem in the Pacific is not how to make our power credible, how to make ourselves feared, perhaps by coolly yet massively destroying a country. Our problem is to legitimize our presence in Asia and in the Pacific as the possessor of this monopoly of enormous force.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record in my remarks an article published in the Manchester Guardian of May 28, 1964, entitled "The 20 Years' War," written by David Holden. There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Manchester Guardian Weekly,
May 28, 1964]
THE 20 YEARS' WAR
(By David Holden)

In 10 days in South Vietnam I have talked to dozens of people—Vietnamese, Americans, British, French, and others—and except in General Nguyen Khan and a few members of his government who must needs put the best face on things I have nowhere met more than anxious hope or desperate determination about the outcome of the present struggle against Communist subversion and the attacks of the Vietcong. Of optimism there is none and of confidence little; of black pessimism a great deal.

In theory, the chance of victory is still there. But it needs an even bigger effort than the United States has made so far, and a far greater and more imaginative effort from the Vietnamese leaders to turn it into reality. Any comparison with the Malayan emergency—which was never very valid anyway—has long ago been left behind.

There were never more than 10,000 hard-core Communist guerrillas in Malaya, yet for the best part of 12 years they tied up 60,000 to 80,000 British and other troops and as many police and special reservists in a ratio of 1 guerrilla to 12 or more of the security forces. In Vietnam there are 25,000 to 30,000 "hard-hats," as the Americans call them, and pathfinders who are ready to turn out for the Vietcong. Against them are more than 200,000 regular soldiers of the Vietnamese Army,

with 16,000 American "advisers" and another 200,000 men in various auxiliary forces—a ratio of 1 to less than 4.

In Malaya the Communists were all Chinese, easily recognizable, and easily divided from the Malayan peasant base. In Vietnam the Communists and their supporters are Vietnamese and can easily vanish into any village. And, of course, in Malaya there was no open frontier beyond which the Communists could take refuge or across which they could receive supplies and reinforcements.

To the Americans and to the present and previous Vietnamese Governments, the open borders and the resulting infiltration of Communist Vietminh from the north, have always seemed the crucial weakness of the south's position. It is pretty widely agreed, for instance, that from 1959 to 1963 at least 12,000 hard-core fighters and instructors moved in from the north. The pattern of subversion and guerrilla warfare suggests strong central control from north of the border and the repeated capture of Chinese, Russian, and Czech weapons by the Government forces reveals plainly enough the source of material support for the Vietcong.

But this is only part of the story. The rest lies with history. With the inadequate administrative legacy of the French, with the arbitrary dictatorship of the Ngo Dinh Diem regime. With the failure of the Vietminh—in breach of the 1954 Geneva agreements—to withdraw all their units from the south, leaving many behind to organize the new underground movement. And with the failure of the Americans and the Vietnamese Government to realize, until too late, what sort of a war was being forced upon them.

The Vietnamese Army has been trained to fight a soldier's war, like the French Army before it, when its opponents are fighting a revolutionary war. The big battalions have rarely been able to bring the other side to battle, because the enemy is not concerned with killing soldiers so much as with paralyzing institutions and undermining popular confidence.

This elementary fact does not seem to have been properly grasped by the Americans until some 2 years ago, when it led to the strategic hamlet program, designed to bring security and administration to a countryside by then in chaos. But it was not then, and I think still is not now, fully understood by the Vietnamese leaders, who still sometimes seem to think that winning territory is more important than winning people. In fact, without the latter the former is meaningless.

Nor do the Americans follow through by withholding support from some of the more wasteful forms of military operation. Napalm and high explosive, for instance, are still being used by American aircraft in full-scale assaults on supposed Vietcong strongholds. These sometimes flatten whole settlements and kill hundreds of people, whose bodies may then appear (on the flimsiest evidence) in the published lists of Vietcong casualties.

The villagers can scarcely be blamed thereafter if they prefer the Vietcong's usually selective killing and intimidation to this sort of wholesale slaughter. Yet the Americans are in the difficult position of often having their advice rejected or ignored, while still being blamed whenever anything goes wrong.

Like the British in the Persian Gulf, they suffer all the odium of colonialism with little of its real authority. Ultimately, however, their biggest difficulty is simply that they are foreigners, and the North Vietnamese, whatever unpleasant things they may bring in their train, are not. To ask the Americans to win the confidence of the Vietnamese peasants where the South Vietnamese leaders themselves have failed, is simply crying for the moon.

As, blamed, reproached, and frustrated at every turn, and anxious also to prove to the Chinese that her power is no "paper tiger," the temptation to seek

victory at all costs by throwing in fighting troops and carrying the war to the north, must be tremendous. But the dangers are tremendous, too: a clear breach of the Geneva agreements, an acknowledgment of political bankruptcy, a major diplomatic defeat, and a real risk of war with China. And in the end this course would surely be self-defeating, whether China entered the war or not; for even after Hanoi had been bombed and Dien Bien Phu recaptured the Vietcong and the Vietminh would still be there. The military solution would remain as mythical as ever, and the political solution would have retreated into infinity.

The only alternative short of withdrawal seems to be a slow crawl toward stability within South Vietnam. A piecemeal recovery of people and territory, village by village, providing security and administration simultaneously, and demonstrating through at least local self-government that the Communists do not have all the answers. This implies a resolute (and very un-American) refusal to believe in any quick solution. Indeed, if the Malayan experience is any guide, no one should think of success in less than 10 to 20 years.

But there is the most savage dilemma of all. As a wise, old Vietnamese observed when I put this to him: "If you prolong the war, you will lose it." After 20 years of fighting already, this may well be true; and it reduces the chance of victory to no more than a glint in Washington's eye.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mr. Holden, a leading British correspondent, has been for some time in North Vietnam and also in Malaysia. He writes, in this article on South Vietnam, about the hopelessness of the situation if we follow the course of action that the United States is presently following.

Mr. President, at the close of my remarks today I ask unanimous consent that certain correspondence which I have received in support of the position that I have taken for weeks on the floor of the Senate against this U.S. illegal war in South Vietnam be printed in the RECORD. Also, I ask that a recent column by Jack Anderson dealing with the basic lack of will on the part of the South Vietnamese to fight be inserted in the RECORD. He points out how our military pay and aid is really corrupting men in the South Vietnam army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. (See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to reiterate something which I believe is particularly appropriate, in view of the fact that American warmongers are meeting in Honolulu, planning their various schemes and programs of indirection for getting around the Constitution of the United States and making war without a declaration of war.

It is particularly fitting that once more on the floor of the Senate I offer again the substitute proposal which I have offered for many weeks in connection with McNamara's war in South Vietnam.

I repeat my challenge to Mr. McNamara or Mr. Rusk or to anyone else in the administration to come forward with a single principle of international law which justifies American unilateral military action in South Vietnam.

The sad, ugly fact is that the United States is standing today outside the framework of international law. The sad, shocking fact is that the United States today stands before the world in violation of the United Nations Charter.

The sad fact is that the United States today, with its illegal course of action in South Vietnam, is becoming an outlaw nation with respect to international law.

Mr. President, we ought to be big enough to recognize our mistake. We ought to seek, as Walter Lippmann points out in his column this morning, international approval of a course of action in Asia by keeping peace in southeast Asia under the United Nations Charter, procedures. The rule of law not the rule of American military might should be used to meet the crisis in Asia.

I call upon our Ambassador to the United Nations to start his long march back into the area of international statesmanship. Adlai Stevenson, when he made his sad and shocking speech before the Security Council a few days ago, in which, in effect, he beat his breast and said to the world that we intend to do what we want to do in South Vietnam, turned himself into a humpty-dumpty.

Adlai Stevenson knows that all the king's horses and all the king's men cannot put a fallen egg back together again, even though it is an egghead.

Mr. President, the fact remains that the United States is following a course of action in South Vietnam which violates the Geneva accords of 1954.

My country, the United States, in open violation of the Geneva accords of 1954, has the audacity to try to alibi to the American people and to the people of the world that we are justified in our action because North Vietnam and Red China are violating the Geneva accords of 1954. So they are. I have no doubt about it. I have no doubt about North Vietnam and Laos and Red China violating the Geneva accords of 1954 which, I repeat, the United States never signed, and which, by reason of pressure by John Foster Dulles, South Vietnam did not sign. We seek to alibi justification for murdering American boys in South Vietnam on the ground that North Vietnam and other countries are violating the Geneva accords of 1954. In the absence of a declaration of war, the killing of every American boy means, in my judgment, a murder. I am opposed to it. I would rather walk out of the Senate than give support to this illegal course of action of the United States in South Vietnam. Our top warmongers in Honolulu are trying to find some way of alibiing a way in which they can present a case for escalating the war in southeast Asia.

What we ought to be calling for is United Nations consideration of the violation of the Geneva accords, before the Security Council of the United Nations.

I suspect that Red Russia would veto it. Let us prove to the world who it is that, in the last analysis, is seeking war, not peace.

Of course, Red Russia welcomes our weakening ourselves and our losing world prestige, which we are rapidly losing because of this illegal and unconstitutional course of action in South Vietnam.

I want to put Red Russia on the spot

up to its signature under the U.N. Charter. I have quoted in past speeches, and incorporate in my speech today by reference, articles 33, 37, and 51 of the U.N. Charter, which we are not following by not bringing our complaint as to the violation of the Geneva accords of 1954 to the United Nations for determination.

If and when Red Russia—if she does—and we shall not know until we try to find out—vetoes the proposal to have the Security Council take jurisdiction, the next step for the United States to take would be to ask for the calling of an extraordinary meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations. There let the nations of the world exercise what jurisdiction they have through the procedures of the General Assembly of the United Nations in trying to bring the war in southeast Asia under the canopy of the United Nations, as we support similar peacekeeping procedures of the United Nations, at the moment I speak, in the Congo, in the Middle East, and on Cyprus.

I wish to forewarn the American people, once more from my desk, that we are at a crossroads in American foreign policy. We have run out on our moral and spiritual obligations that we owe to peace. We are not trying to keep the peace. We are making war. We should give support to a United Nations peacekeeping corps in South Vietnam. As I have said many times, and repeat today, I would support a substantial number of American military personnel to help make up that peacekeeping corps, but it would not be a fighting corps; it would not be a killing corps; it would not be a warmaking corps; but it would be a peacekeeping corps. There is quite a difference between supporting a peacekeeping corps and the course of action we are following today. The United Nations Charter calls for such a function on the part of the members of the United Nations.

I ask Senators to read again the Lippmann article of today and to read again the Lippmann article of the other day, which I placed in the RECORD. There is no answer to the principle that Lippmann lays down. The sad thing is that the United States is compromising its principles in the field of international obligation as a signatory to the United Nations Charter.

I say to the warmongers meeting in Honolulu that I know what their position is, because they have expressed it many times in this country, and they do not make it any better by the coverup from Honolulu. The responsibility for following peaceful procedures rests squarely at the White House.

I continue to pray to my God that the President will see his responsibility before it is too late and that an international conference will be called, and called quickly, under the aegis and auspices of the United Nations, to see what can be done to bring the killing to an end and to bring stability in Laos, stability in North Vietnam, stability in South Vietnam, and stability in Cambodia. We cannot plan to escalate this war into North Vietnam without leading to the total annihilation of the South Vietnamese people.

It is interesting to see the hedging in all the statements that Rusk and McNamara have made to date concerning the possibility of expanding and escalating the war across the borders of North Vietnam into Laos and possibly elsewhere. That adds up to one ugly word—aggression. My voice will be raised in a plea, up to the last moment, to stop my country from becoming an aggressor nation in Asia.

As I said the other day—and I repeat it—if our country makes the horrendous mistake of deciding on a course of war, and formally declares war, we must all rally behind our country until that war is successfully prosecuted—if we can successfully prosecute it. But as individual Senators, we have a responsibility to try to prevent our country from going into an unnecessary war. We have a responsibility, under our oaths as individual Senators, in accordance with our sights, to raise our voices in a plea for peace, not war, because I am satisfied that nothing can be gained through war, but that much will be lost.

No one knows at this hour where an expansion of the war in South Vietnam will lead, so far as future events around the world are concerned. Do we want to continue what we are doing at this hour—undermining and undercutting the United Nations? We have a clear moral obligation to try to make the United Nations work, and we are not trying. To the contrary, acting in Asia outside the framework of the United Nations, without ever having filed a complaint before the United Nations vis-a-vis North Vietnam, Red China, Laos, and Cambodia, we are in no position to allege that we stand for peace at this hour, for we do not. At this hour the United States is writing a sorry and sad chapter on warmaking in southeast Asia.

I close with a prayerful plea on my lips: It is important that the United States exhaust every possible procedure available to it to try to settle the war in Asia by resorting to the peaceful procedures of the United Nations Charter, not by continuing to ignore them. So I ask my President: "When will your voice be raised in support of resorting to the procedures of the United Nations as the most honorable recourse for this Republic to follow in seeking to end war in Asia within the framework of international law?"

EXHIBIT 1

MAY 27, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Let me add this to the pile of letters you will receive in support of your position on Vietnam. Please continue to fight for a sane approach to this problem. It is hard to believe that some Americans call for use of tactical nuclear weapons. The United States has no business in Vietnam, and what's more, southeast Asia is not worth fighting for. Your suggestion to pull out and use the machinery of the United Nations is the only solution. Americans must accept the fact that the United States cannot "liberate" anyone, much less people in this part of the world who have no inkling of democracy. If democracy is to win in southeast Asia, it must be won by the people themselves in their hearts.

I object, however, to your attacks on Secretaries Rusk and McNamara. You know who is responsible for our foreign policy. Your indirect approach is only confusing an already confused public. The President cannot pick the middle ground on every issue that crosses his desk. Three Presidents have already tried to half-fight and half-negotiate in southeast Asia to no avail. Keep pushing for your solution, but carry it to the White House. If it fails today, try again after the November elections. And Senator, ask this one question of the "hawks": What happens after we drive off the Vietcong, Pathet Lao, etc., from southeast Asia? Will there be a millennium of peace and democracy? Will democracy be instantaneous? Will America pull back its troops and money?

Please save some energy, Senator, for defeating the omnibus bill for the District of Columbia. I know you will. I know the usual course of correspondence to Congressmen, but in your case and because I am not a constituent (although a great admirer) of yours, I hope this will be fuel to add to your fire. Keep it up.

Sincerely,

ROBERT A. GIANNASI.

MAY 26, 1964.

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

MY DEAR SENATOR: We had occasion to watch and listen to the "Meet the Press" last Sunday and I must commend you for the tremendous verbal and clear explanation of our troubles in Asia. You were quite forceful.

It is literally an undeclared war and only Congress has that authority to declare it and not by back door methods.

Furthermore, it's a matter for the United Nations in every conceivable way. We either make the United Nations a "living force for peace" or else let's get out of it. I'm beginning to believe that our unilateral action there and at times elsewhere in the world, is a slap at the United Nations and looks like we're acting like "bullies" because we're strong.

Because of our military strength we should show more "humility" and cooperation with United States; even if we have to take up the "tab," at least we have the sanction of the United Nations members.

With best wishes to your health,

Very truly yours,

GEORGE M. BURKHART.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., May 25, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Let me express to you my deep appreciation for the courageous and enlightened stand you took on the TV program "Face the Nation" in regard to foreign policy and civil rights.

Your righteous views have my enthusiastic support.

Only recently I wrote a letter to Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, expressing my gratitude for the peace establishing activities of the United Nations in various parts of the world, and urging the United Nations to intervene in and stop the senseless war in South Vietnam. There is no excuse to delaying such action any further.

In these troublesome times, while the civil rights bill is before the U.S. Senate for deliberation, I recommend that the press, the movie industry, the theater, and the public media of television and radio contribute to a growing understanding between the white man and the Negro by enhancing in their articles, shows, and programs, the moral and spiritual qualities of both American citizens, thus fostering friendly feelings, good will, respect, and compassion.

I further recommend that the best and most convincing TV plays, dealing with the harmonious intercourse of both races, be transmitted by satellite to other nations in order to promote peace and moral progress. If the U.S. Congress succeeds in passing just and equitable civil rights laws, this will be a shining example for South Africa and further the improvement of race relations in that country.

Last but not least, I recommend that each public school, from kindergarten to university, introduce a special course on "The Moral Duties of the Individual," given by teachers of highest moral integrity, with a view to raising law-abiding citizens and wiping out crime. This basic moral school education is indispensable in view of the fact that many parents are neglecting their duty to give their children a sound moral education, and many children are deprived of the blessings of a church Sunday school.

With my best wishes, I am,

Very sincerely,

LILY F. ZELL.

MAY 24, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE: I have just listened to you being interviewed on our present policy in southeast Asia. I am 100 percent in accord with your thinking. I thank God for you and men like you who have the guts to speak up and give the people facts. Honestly and truth will never be defeated.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE M. SPARKS,
Pomona, Calif.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., May 25, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I heard your Sunday telecast in which you questioned the constitutionality of our sending troops to Vietnam.

From what I have read, I have for some time felt as you do. The question is what is the most effective step a citizen can take to express his views where it may do some good. I am certain that not only the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is aware of your point of view, but also the entire Senate.

So far as I know, I have recourse only to my district's Congressman and Senator KUCHEL. Have you any other suggestions?

Yours sincerely,

WILLIAM C. WAGNER.

STOCKTON, CALIF., May 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: In regard to the program "Face the Nation" when you were interviewed on Sunday, May 24, 1964, Mrs. Batt and I agree with you that the United States has no business in Vietnam fighting a war by ourselves. We feel the U.N. should send a peacekeeping force there. Keep up the good work. We also favor your stand on civil rights, that it is about time the Negro is given his constitutional rights. It's about time the American Negro is treated as a first-class citizen.

Sincerely,

PETER E. BATT,
PAULINE BATT.

MAY 24, 1964.

Mr. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I just heard your talk on "Face the Nation" and I think you were glorious. Your view coincides with mine on this matter perfectly. I think it would be a good thing if someone like you would stump the country and wake the people up to what is going on as there seems to be an apathy on the part of the people on this whole thing. They are spending billions of dollars on this

1964

cold war which should be used for the benefit of poor people instead of armament. It seems to me if communism is good for these people you can't stop it anyway and if it isn't, it won't succeed. I am glad that at last someone is coming out against this whole program.

Yours sincerely,

W. MINCHERHONT.
SANTA MONICA, CALIF.

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

May 25, 1964.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Congratulations from a Californian who wishes you were from this State, but who considers it lucky that you are in the Senate no matter what State you are from.

I wish I could vote for you. I wish I could be of some help to you. However, you seem to get along fine, and I hope you stay in the Senate forever. The greatest embarrassment in my life is that in a country as big and as rich as this one is, there are only you and a couple of others in the whole Senate who are brave enough, smart enough, and humane enough to speak and act intelligently.

Thank you very much for serving in the Senate. The next time you are campaigning, my husband and I wish to contribute to your campaign. Please keep our address and let us know where your campaign headquarters will be in Oregon.

Sincerely,

Mrs. MEGAN CLARK.

PHOENIX, ARIZ., May 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Have just watched, as I always do, "Face the Nation." Thank you for giving voice to the opinions I have long held, both as to our southeastern policy, and the civil rights issue. I firmly believe in every word you uttered. I am glad there is one American in public life with the wisdom to form such opinions, and the strength to express them. Keep up the good work. My son was a casualty of World War II. I believe the United Nations is the hope of the world. But how can it function if the world's most powerful Nation wages war on its own initiative?

God bless you, Senator.

Yours truly,

FRANCES DLX.

May 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: I heard your talk on the radio program, "Face the Nation." I agree with you in what you said Sunday evening, May 24, 1964. Thank you. The United Nations is our only hope.

THOMAS A. FRANCIS.

P.S.—May God bless and protect you in a special way.

May 24, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: Your recent interview on the CBS television program revealed your outstanding faith and knowledge of the American people. I want to add my support to your views regarding the mess in South Vietnam. I also hope that the United Nations will be able to restore peace. This war is dirty and will lead to the use of atomic weapons unless something is done. I hope that we can avoid this escalation of the conflict.

Once again I am proud of your stand and hope we can have other Senators with your courage and ability. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

HARLEY L. ROSS.

ANAHEIM, CALIF.

May 24, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: Three cheers for your stand vis-a-vis our insane foreign policy in southeast Asia. Mr. Stevenson's address before the U.N., last week, was a national disgrace. What a flagrant disregard for truth. What blatant propaganda. Since Caryl Chessman's execution, since Dallas, I have never been so ashamed of my country.

If we cannot count on rationality or protest from the Stevensons, Rusks, and McNamaras, who must we turn to for sane leadership? I hope the death of President Kennedy isn't going to cost us more than we are now realizing.

Shades of the Welmar Republic.

EDWARD F. NASH,
Los Angeles, Calif.

P.S.—Your appearance on "Face the Nation" (May 24) was most inspiring.

CHATTANOOGA, TENN., May 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Permit me to congratulate you having the courage to speak out, and frankly, about the present foreign policy as it concerns South Vietnam. The question is being frequently advanced as to whether the administration really has any desire to bring the war in that unhappy country to a close. Of course, you should be aware that your questioning attitude to this situation may well cost your seat in the Senate. Just how many other Senators, other than Senator FULBRIGHT, would have the courage and honesty to assume the position that you have in open criticism of this wholly useless war?

We do not have to surrender one iota of our interest and honor in order to bring peace in all southeast Asia; we have absolutely no moral right to force any form of government upon that land or that people or any other land or any other people, that the people concerned do not wish to have; we do not have any moral right either to force any religion upon the people there or any other place or country that the people of that country do not wish to have. I realize that it is harsh but it is all too true that America is reflecting the ugly shadow of Hitler across the whole world. A long delayed reaction of disgust and remorse is slowly taking form here at home.

There is absolutely no indication that a change in political control in Washington would generate a sense of responsibility in our dealings with other countries; but it is entirely possible that the Congress may have to assert its authority over control of the "silent government"; that is the CIA, in order for us to live at peace with any government.

Respectfully,

C. C. OAKES.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
May 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Democrat of Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: After seeing and hearing you on TV today in "Face the Nation" I am compelled to let you know how appreciative I

am of your foreign policy views, and I sincerely hope that you will speak many times on TV to the people.

It has long been my thinking that we should not be in Asia fighting this useless war which will never end, but I never knew until hearing you that there were legal reasons as well as moral reasons we should not be there.

Hoping that you will continue your fight in this regard, knowing that all of the people are with you, I am

Yours respectfully,

Mrs. MARGARET S. BARRETT.

P.S.—You are my choice for Vice President.

MAY 26, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We applaud the stand taken by you and Senator GRUENING on Vietnam, also on Cuba and Laos. Our foreign policy leaves much to be desired. The more our Government talks peace the more it prepares for war and sends American boys off to do the killing and to be killed.

We believe nations must select their own governments and not have them forced upon them by outside interests. We believe only the people can decide their own destiny. We cannot police the whole world and threaten the world with extinction if it is composed of peoples and nations who want a different way of life than our own. The U.N. exists to settle differences, to promote peace. Why is the United States so reluctant to bring these matters before that body of nations?

Mr. and Mrs. CURCIO.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., May 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you, sir, for your outspoken opposition to our Government's dangerous foreign policy. Not only is it dangerous but so immoral. My heart goes out to those poor little people who are suffering so terribly as a result of our policy.

It's like a breath of fresh air to hear you and Senator FULBRIGHT and others speak out against this dangerous and immoral policy.

May I have some copies of your speeches?
Deepest regards.

Mrs. BILLIE SCOTT.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
May 23, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your recent statement that the newspapers are not telling the American people the situation in Vietnam is, unhappily, but too true. Suppression by the press and other mass media of the discussion of the policy of the United States in Vietnam which has gone on in the Senate is a grave state of things, especially the blackout of your speeches and those of Senator GRUENING. I urge you to take every means to tell the people the facts and to rouse their opposition to the present dangerous and irresponsible involvement.

Yours truly,

JULIET GREEN.

SAN JOSE, CALIF.,
May 23, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your opposition to the Vietnam war. I hope that that area can be neutralized with the help of the United Nations.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE L. COLLINS.

11980

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

June 2

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,

May 26, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Bravo. Bravo. Bravo. I refer to your courageous stand on the Vietnam situation. Sometimes it may seem futile, but you are making a considerable dent on public opinion.

Sometimes I get so disgusted with our foreign policy in southeast Asia I honestly want to leave the country, but when I read your words I decide to stay. I could move to Oregon instead. It must be full of sane, wise people, to elect the likes of you.

Sincerely,

MARGARET BATES.

BRONX, N.Y., May 25, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Despite the irresponsible lack of reporting by the New York press, some aspects of your views of the tragic political and military developments in and among the states of Indochina have come through. The superficial reporting makes them sound wonderful, and when occasionally your ideas are reported in some depth they are absolutely brilliant. I hope that you and your several colleagues in the Senate will continue to present your strongly reasoned views on the failure of American policy in southeast Asia to achieve a responsible political settlement there to which all of our allies can adhere. Certainly, further unilateral American actions in that area without the complete and equal participation of Great Britain and France would be incredibly foolhardy and a threat to world peace.

Recalling that the Democratic Party was able to revive its political fortunes and reverse the public opinion that it was the dangerous war party which resulted from the intervention on the continent of Asia in 1950 when in 1954 Senators Johnson, Kennedy and Mansfield strongly opposed the attempts of many Republicans to stampede President Eisenhower into an Indochina war, I am sure that the present Democratic leadership will not permit the present Democratic administration from being frightened into a war on the continent of Asia by Republican critics. I think that Senator Lyndon Johnson's words during the April 1954 crisis are even more applicable today. He declared that he was "against sending American GI's into the mud and muck of Indochina on a bloodletting spree to perpetuate colonialism and white man's exploitation in Asia."

Considering the poor reporting of your speeches, I would appreciate it if you could send me a copy of each of the speeches which you have made this year on the Indochina problem.

Thank you very much, again, for the important work in which you are engaged in foreign affairs.

Sincerely,

LEONARD P. LIGGIO.

BROOKLYN, N.Y., May 26, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to congratulate and thank you for your clear, convincing, and courageous statements on the war in Vietnam. I heard you on TV on Sunday and was very much impressed. I find myself in 100 percent agreement with what you said. The United States has no right to be taking unilateral action in Vietnam. This situation should be handed over to the U.N.

Would you please send me a copy of one of your speeches on Vietnam? I should like to use it in a social studies class.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely yours,

HELEN V. SCHMITT.

OROVILLE, CALIF., May 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We listened to your presentation on southeast Asia—Vietnam, etc., on the program "Face the Nation." We agree with your faith in the ability of the American people to formulate foreign policy if given the facts. We appreciate your giving us such a factual account of this serious problem. We agree that this serious situation should be taken to the United Nations and that we should not take unilateral action. We are appalled that our American troops are again dying by the thousands in a war we cannot win because it is undeclared and unsupported by the U.N. Stevenson's speech caused us concern.

Mr. and Mrs. W. J. DUNN.

MAY 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: I heartily agree with your position on Vietnam over the CBS interview this Sunday morning.

Thank you for making the issue so clear cut and unequivocal. The peace of the world is at stake, and as you say, "might does not make right," and let us live by international law, and not risk nuclear war. Let us keep nuclear war outlawed.

I am a good Democrat. We need your clear-cut and forceful position on basic issues.

Very sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. MAX KAGAN.

OLD LYME, CONN., May 22, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My family and I wish to thank you for "speaking up" for the American people and not for our military. You spoke eloquently on the "Face the Nation" program and we hope you will continue to be our rather lonely voice in the Senate.

Respectfully,

EVA R. SCHMITT and FAMILY.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., May 28, 1964.

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

DEAR MR. MORSE: We were very disturbed to read that some Pentagon personnel were considering the use of atomic weapons in South Vietnam. We feel that this would be an incredible folly.

We strongly support your stand on Vietnam and are personally in favor of an immediate negotiated settlement with the Vietcong or an immediate and complete withdrawal of American troops and weapons from South Vietnam.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. RONALD JANSEN.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., May 28, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As an engineer I am delighted to see that you are against dropping atom bombs to reduce foliage (and "peopliage") in Vietnam. Our scrap in Vietnam is highly illegal, and unless we can come to a peaceable agreement shortly we should get out of Vietnam.

Sincerely,

Miss FRANCES M. HICKEY.

MY DEAR SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: On Sunday, I've listened to you on "Face the Nation," especially on the subject of the war in South Vietnam. I think your voice was an echo of some of our great Americans of yesteryear. The facts you have revealed, that the United States is conducting an unwarranted war in South Vietnam, your emphasis on informing the people of the United States of all the facts, that if the war is extended to the north it will inevitably escalate to a nuclear war. I think we have reached a crucial point. The war must be ended. I am sure that your recommendation that the U.N. be given the man-

date as the only authority to administer a strong military peace force in southeast Asia to enforce peace instead of war. My congratulations to you for speaking up so truthfully on behalf of us—the people.

More power to you.

Yours for a peaceful policy,

Mrs. L. ROSENTHAL.

CULVER CITY, CALIF.

LOS ANGELES, May 24, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: Both my sons were in the last war, and I hope my grandsons will not have to fight in the jungles of South Vietnam. I therefore commend you for the stand you take to neutralize that part of the world, and I wish you every success.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. SARAH GURAVICH.

MAY 24, 1964.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I was so happy to hear your remarks on television this morning, Sunday, May 24, 1964, regarding the situation and the stand this Government has taken in the war in Vietnam and the Far East generally. I must say I was shocked when I heard Mr. Stevenson's stand the other day. I have been quite an admirer of Governor Stevenson and usually can agree with his ideas but after hearing him the other day I began to think perhaps I was "crazy" for I disagree with his ideas as broadcast this week. After hearing your remarks this morning I was so happy to know there are others who take exception to my Government's stand and intentions.

This is the second letter I have written to you. The other was when you were still a registered Republican and I am a Democrat but I do agree and commend your stand on so many ideas and thoughts. Please keep up the good work and God bless and keep you.

Mrs. ESTHER ROHDE.

LA MESA, SAN DIEGO CO., CALIF.

DENBEIGH, VA., May 26, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: Although I live far from the State which you represent, I want to tell you how much I enjoyed the interview you gave over the radio last Sunday evening.

Your views coincide with mine exactly. I am glad to know that we have a man of your calibre and courage representing all of us in the U.S. Senate.

Wishing you good health and success,

Sincerely,

FRED SMITH.

ERWIN, TENN., May 25, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to congratulate you for speaking out so forthrightly in the cause of humanity and political decency. Every American is indebted to you and the men in our Armed Forces must be greatly relieved to have even one man stand up for minding our own business.

It is almost unbelievable to hear any American having the daring to speak his mind these days; there have been so many obscene political lies such as those on Cuba and Brazil and Guatemala that to have anyone show unflinching courage is a cause for great rejoicing.

I wrote to the President myself about pulling out of South Vietnam, but my letter was not forwarded to the State Department to send me a lot of diplomatic doubletalk.

1964

So hooray for the people of Oregon for electing a great Senator.

Very sincerely,

ELIZABETH SREMAN.

VINELAND, N.J., May 28, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: I listened to your answers on the program "Face the Nation." I agree with you that we shouldn't be in South Vietnam with men even if we are only training their men, I think this should be a U.N. program with our support. The way I look at it we are not getting support of the Communists in Laos because we are engaging in war against them in South Vietnam.

As Gen. Smedley Butler told us here in Vineland about 35 years ago, to never try to fight the Chinese in land fighting as they could send men through our lines just as they proved in the Korean war. President L.B.J. is doing a good job but his advisers are giving him the wrong tips.

Keep up your good work.

If I can help in any way please let me know.

Yours truly,

J. LEWIS HADSELL.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,

May 25, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: I want to thank you for your speech yesterday on TV, "Face the Nation." I believe your speech and answers may have saved this Nation and the world from an atom war in south Asia and a third world war. Your speech was a warning in the 11th hour and I hope the Presidential advisers—who in this case look like teenagers in kneepants—will be sent back to school.

Please, sing out again when necessary.

Sincerely,

GUNNAR L. BERNTSEN.

BIG SPRING, TEX.,

May 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have just listened to you "Face the Nation" and how much I did enjoy you. Do wish we had more Representatives who shared your view in Washington to represent us. We are represented by too many people who can't think for themselves and are just "yes" men. Thank God for having you, a man who does think, and who isn't afraid to express an opinion. I just had to tell you. American people are entitled to know the truth, but do they know it? I don't think so, and I think as taxpayers, we are entitled to the truth.

I had rather have a wrong opinion, than have no opinion at all.

Keep up the good fight and I am so glad you faced the Nation.

Most sincerely,

CLEO I. GUY.

P.S.—Do you put out a newsletter—if so, how could I obtain copies?

LOS ANGELES,

May 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to applaud your TV presentation last Sunday. I agree with your views, especially on Vietnam, and admire your forthrightness and courage. You speak for numberless Americans who seek a peaceful solution to our international difficulties. Keep up the good work.

Yours truly,

GERTRUDE REED.

OSKALOOSA, IOWA,

May 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We heard your television talk against our sending troops to southeast Asia. My husband and I have often talked about this. Why our boys should be sent over there to die in an undeclared war (as you said) is a sad mystery to us. God bless you for speaking out.

Sincerely,

Mrs. C. W. GILDERBLOOM.

This should be done through the United Nations.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,

May 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I just came home from church and turned on NBC and your interview, Face the Nation, was on.

It is the most intelligent information that has been given to the American people. The President should take heed and make this information his own, as only God could use you, Mr. MORSE, to deliver this message now. Mr. Johnson speaks of God so often if he will just let God direct him in carrying out such most important intelligent God-directed information then the American people as you say will go along.

I am a registered Republican and have been all my full experience here in the world, but my God-given intelligence directs my way when it comes to voting. Now, if Mr. Johnson will put God first and let Him direct his way, God also directs the American people.

When it comes to voting, the American people as a whole, vote for the lesser of the two evils. Mr. MORSE, I have been God directed to write this message, as I am an Austrian scientist the past 30 years. I know one must be God directed.

I thank the Father and you for that most important message and let us see it take roots by the grace of God, so be it.

Sincerely,

J. G. WAGNER.

FALMOUTH, MASS.,

May 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Would that we had more Congressmen with the vision, intelligence and courage which you showed in the broadcast of "Face the Nation" today. My name will mean nothing to you but I hope you receive thousands of letters like mine, supporting your views on the present U.S. foreign policy and the United Nations.

Sincerely yours,

ALICE F. MITCHELL.

Republican voter in Florida but really an independent as suiting ideas of candidates.

MILFORD, MASS.,

May 22, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Please stick to the statement you made about not sending American boys to fight in a war we should not be in.

None of our boys should be subjected to such miseries.

When we are not at war those boys go through many hardships and then they are just peacetime veterans and cannot receive any of the GI benefits.

Wishing you well and many years in the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. MARGARET MORSE.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.,

May 26, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: You spoke the minds of millions of U.S. citizens.

We have no legal excuse for sending our soldiers to Vietnam to be killed or to kill.

Too much of foreign troubles are in the interest of some private business or corporation.

We do not have the facts on that, and other things as well.

I was glad to see you stand and be counted—on Vietnam, and civil rights—today.

Sincerely,

J. B. MITCHELL.

MASPETH, N.Y.,

May 26, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: We have just finished looking at the TV program "Face the Nation" in which you participated. We wholeheartedly agree with your views on the whole Vietnam mess. It is a willful waste of human life to send our boys over there. Certainly it is a matter for the United Nations to act upon. We applaud you for bringing this before the public and I hope we will be hearing and seeing more of you on TV. I have just finished writing to Senator Javits, President Johnson, and Senator Fulbright in regard to this very important matter.

Sincerely,

IRENE MALMBERG

Mrs. E. Walter Malmberg.

HOLLYWOOD, CALIF., May 24, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: Thank God. Thank God. Your "Face the Nation" appearance gave us Americans the first full feeling of listening to an American of judgment, wisdom, and courage in the area of foreign policy we have had in years.

You filled us with hope that the truth, the facts, the peril, and the American alternative may yet reach our fellow citizens.

How absurd you made all the martial airs of McNamara, Rusk, and their satellite Stevenson sound against the clarion ring of your clarity and sanity.

Hold fast—you give us our opportunity to make our desires heard, felt, and followed.

With profound gratitude,

HERBERT SIBERMAN.

SILVER SPRING, MD.,

May 24, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I thought your talk on "Face the Nation" today was excellent and I agreed with every word that you said concerning South Vietnam.

I am from Michigan and have always had a very high regard for Secretary McNamara and still do for that matter. However, if he is to become the symbol for what we are doing in South Vietnam, and I guess he is, then you are absolutely right in your decision to oppose him for the vice presidential nomination.

Congratulations and please keep up the good work. I would be very happy to help in any way that I was able.

Sincerely,

JAMES H. INGLIS.

ZION, ILL.,

May 25, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Yesterday afternoon I happened to have on TV and heard your statement in regard to our involvement in the war in Vietnam and the cost it will take in American lives.

11982

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

June 2

All I know is what I hear and read in the newspapers and see and hear on TV but being a veteran of World War I and a member of the VFW I can reach my own opinions.

I say let McNamara fight his own war. If the French couldn't win it how can we? The natives over there do not react like we Americans do; and you cannot change the spots on a leopard.

What is the purpose of the U.N. nowadays? I never did think much of its ultimate success and today we are the biggest sucker in the world. I pray that God gives us statesmen who will put our country in its right place; that they have the guts to stand up and be counted.

I compliment you on your guts to come out and make your stand on Vietnam. I hope millions heard your statement and it should be broadcast from coast to coast. Maybe the people will wake up. They need a good jarring.

Respectfully,

ROBERT S. LEE.

READING, PA.,

May 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: I sure was glad to hear a voice that says what he thinks on "Face the Nation."

Trouble as I see it Mr. Senator our news media have the people educated; it pays more financially to be for a war program than for a peace program.

What I think our leaders should point out to the people that after every war we get more communism, so war is not the answer to solve our problems.

It seems as though the owners of industry think they have nothing to gain with a democratic plan for all industry.

How about Sweden?

Nowadays people have no time or I should say fear to talk politics and economics.

A job is so precious that most people fear to talk about controversial matters.

My wife and I struggled in a small grocery store for the last 40 years. Enjoying good health we were able to educate our three children. Two teachers and one businessman.

With civil rights and unemployment there sure is plenty for our leaders to fight for.

Hope to take a trip to the State of Oregon soon.

Kindly answer.

PAUL E. RICKENBACH.

P.S.—Voters need encouragement, too.

POMONA, CALIF.,

May 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: Thank you for your appearance on television today. Never miss an opportunity to present your views to the American people. You can clarify our thinking.

E. WAMEL.

SOUTH NORWALK, CONN.,

May 24, 1964.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your TV interview today in "Face the Nation." It was wonderful to hear your point of view on southeast Asia expressed so forcefully. Thank you.

Very gratefully,

ANITA WILCOX.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,

May 25, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: Having heard you express your views on the program "Face the Nation," I am writing you again to express my appreciation for the courageous fight you are waging against our disastrous policy in South Vietnam and Laos.

I am in complete accord with your opinion that if we continue taking unilateral ac-

tion in southeast Asia, it will only result in a holocaust for all concerned.

Thank you for doing your utmost to influence our administration to change their policy, and to work for a peaceful solution.

Respectfully yours,

HELEN LEMBERG.

FLEMINGTON, N.J.,

May 24, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: God bless you for the contribution to peace that you are making with your courageous stand in these troubled times. We need men like you to give leadership to a world gone mad.

Keep up your fight for peace. You have the millions who want peace behind you. You are a man of high principles. May you keep well and lead us to sanity and peace and civil rights.

Sincerely yours,

ALMA SZATMORY.

ITHACA, N.Y.,

May 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am a 16-year-old student in high school. Recently, we have been studying the two World Wars. I have become rather alarmed, especially after starting to read "The Guns of August," by Barbara Tuchman, at the striking similarities, if not in some cases parallels, between the situations of 1900-1914, 1933-39, and 1947-64. Actually, I see many reasons to be optimistic now; international, especially Russo-American, good will seems to be, at least at times, sincerely meant and well thought out. At other times, however, our Nation's policies seem guided by a desire to "conquer nations for democracy" as immoral as the Communist desire to bring countries under their influence which we condemn so strongly in all our words and actions.

The present Vietnam, or southeast Asian, situation, is one such case. Tonight, on CBS radio, I heard you speak in what I found an intelligent and sincere manner on this crisis. I was very encouraged to realize that there are men who hold such realistic and nonmilitaristic or chauvinistic views somewhere in our Government. I find your proposal of a U.N. peacekeeping force in Vietnam sound and necessary, and I certainly hope that you can use your influence to change our country's foreign policy on this matter, for Vietnam is undoubtedly one of the most sensitive triggers in the world today. I am glad you have faith in the American people, as an American citizen. I wholeheartedly support you on this issue.

Sincerely yours,

HUMPHREY MORRIS.

MAY 25, 1964.

"FACE THE NATION," CBS,
New York City.

DEAR SIR: Congratulations on giving the American people a chance to hear the views of Senator WAYNE MORSE. The suppression of his views by the press is one of the more disquieting aspects of the whole Vietnamese situation.

If the Russian delegate to the United Nations had not quoted from Senator MORSE's speech on the Senate floor, many Americans would not have known the opposition exists. If you had not allowed the Senator to "face the Nation" the American people would not have been able to hear the Senator expound his total position. It is absurd for them to get only that part which the Russian delegate thinks suits his case.

CLARK FOREMAN,

Director.

JERSEY CITY, N.J., May 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You spoke out real good on TV today. So when you get together with L.B.J., it will be a forward step for the U.S.A.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. M. CARNEY.

P.S.—Our President is a brave, courageous man. He needs your kind of Senator.

CLAREMONT, N.H., May 24, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: A million "thank you's" for the magnificent delivery of commonsense which you so ably gave to the Nation today. Last night a worried group met to discuss many of the truths you so courageously exposed today. My fear was that so few Americans would know about the machinations in high places. Now, I hope millions have been enlightened, thanks to a great wise Senator.

Very truly yours,

RUTH HAMILTON.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,

May 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I was amazed and flabbergasted to find that the late city edition of today's New York Times (May 25, 1964) didn't carry a single line about your TV interview that took place yesterday.

I expected it to be page-one since it is the most important contribution I've heard to sanity on the question of South Vietnam, etc.

I've written to the New York Times editor expressing my indignation. I should think an inquiry by your office may be in order.

Best wishes,

Sincerely,

ABE WEISBURD.

CHICAGO, ILL.,

May 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We heard your wonderful talk over television on Vietnam and Laos. We agree with everything you said and hope you will keep up the good fight.

We think it would be a good idea to show to President Johnson and Secretary of State Rusk, the letters you get commending your stand, so they will know that the people here want peace and not war in Vietnam.

Very truly yours,

Mr. and Mrs. EDWIN ALBRECHT.

COPY OF TELEGRAM SENT TO PRESIDENT
JOHNSON

Heard Senator WAYNE MORSE on television give his views on securing peace in Vietnam and Laos. Urge that you give most earnest consideration to his suggestions.

W. ALBRECHT.

REBA PLACE FELLOWSHIP,

Evanston, Ill., May 24, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I simply want to express my deep gratitude for your position on the war in Vietnam.

I saw and heard you today on "Face the Nation" and felt a burden lifting, knowing that someone in public office had the courage and wisdom to say the things you did.

I am praying that God will give you strength to continue bringing this message with clarity and force. It will be a dark day ahead for our Nation, I fear, if we continue the policies we have, both toward Vietnam

Sincerely,

JOHN MILLER.

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

11983

ALAMEDA, CALIF.,

May 24, 1964.

SENATOR MORSE: I heard you this morning on "Face the Nation." Congratulations. I hope President Johnson was listening in. The only way to get results with the United Nations is to follow the rules—and the nations that do not pay their way—expel them.

G. MORRIS.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,

May 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations—words cannot express how welcome were your courageous and sensible thoughts expressed on the TV program this afternoon.

I hope everyone you mentioned on the air viewed the program—and I wonder if even you realize how many of the women of the Nation agree with you wholeheartedly.

Please continue to use every opportunity to so forthrightly and forcefully express your ideas—as well as whatever else you can to bring about a change in the present unhappy course of events.

Sincerely,

ISABELLE JOYCE.

MILL VALLEY, CALIF.,

May 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: We have just heard your speech on television this morning on southeast Asia and our military participation in that area. Your talk made it very clear to me that we should let the United Nations handle this situation.

I think the legal aspects are not made clear to the American people.

If you have any literature on this question I would appreciate very much being on your mailing list.

Sincerely,

Mrs. W. W. BLUME.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,

May 24, 1964.

DEAR SIR: Once again I must warmly applaud you, on your talk appearing on "Face the Nation," this Sunday (May 24). It takes great courage to speak the truth as you have and particularly point out the mistakes of some of our topmen specifically in reference to our policy in Vietnam. Please maintain your health so you may continue to speak out for peace through the United Nations, as against an ultimate war that we might be catapulted into with this reckless policy of a unilateral action by the Armed Forces of the United States. God speed to you, sir, and we pray for you every night. I am a veteran of World Wars I and II.

Sincerely,

DAVE LIFNER.

P.S.—Please try to influence Senator CLARK as I and others seemingly cannot.

Thank you.

ATLANTA, GA.,

May 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: I am an insignificant student from India. But allow me to express my admiration and respect for your wise and courageous stand on the issues you discussed on the TV program today.

More men like you, sir, and we could be sure of a world where peace and sanity would preside.

Sincerely,

DAVID YEEDA.

DEAR SIR: I am a college student and I had the pleasure of seeing you on the CBS program, "Face the Nation."

My family and I want to commend you for your straightforward opinions and answers. It is an inspiring sight, indeed, to see someone speak the truth in a time when the unthinkable. There is too much to lose

if the American people believe and practice the "one side coin" that all too many public officials are handing their constituents. I hope that there are many people thinking as you are talking. Perhaps, now that free discussion is not only legal but also respectable, more and more people will say what they think.

I agree with your colleague, Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, in his statement that we are living with "old myths in the face of new realities." It is a shame that it takes great courage to speak the words and beliefs of our Founding Fathers.

Walter Lippmann once wrote, "there has been a benevolent and patriotic conspiracy throughout our public life to pretend that there is only one answer, and that the right answer can be had any day from the official spokesman of the State Department." I am happy to know that there are such courageous leaders as yourself in the U.S. Senate to give us another answer.

My address: John Hamilton; 271 North Fifth Avenue, Canton, Ill.

Very respectfully yours,

JOHN HAMILTON.

SANTA MONICA, CALIF.,

May 24, 1964.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HUBERT: You may or may not have heard Senator WAYNE MORSE's indictment of the current handling of the U.S. conduct of affairs in southeast Asia on the CBS television "Face the Nation" program today.

I think, and many others must think, it urgent that the Congress, the President, and his Cabinet should consider his criticisms and proposals very seriously.

This situation might easily become even more disastrous than the Korean one did. I know you have your hands full managing the civil rights bill—and doing an excellent job at it—but I hope you will use your potent influence, and at once, in this extremely important Asian affair.

With personal regards.

ROY G. BLAKEY.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I knew you slightly when on the University of Minnesota staff some years ago, though I would not expect you to remember me. I hope you will succeed in securing a better and successful procedure in Asia.

ROY G. BLAKEY.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,

May 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: How refreshing and heartwarming it was to hear the facts on Vietnam instead of empty rhetoric which is Mr. Stevenson's forte. Would that more Senators would be less arrogant and more truthful.

Also if we were above suspicion in Laos, why didn't we disapprove of the rightists and the moderates combining? Wasn't it reasonable to expect that the Pathet Lao wouldn't be happy about this? It's supposed to be a coalition government, isn't it?

Thank you and thank you. Keep up your good work.

Cordially,

PAULA KLINGHOFFER.

HANOVER, PA.,

May 24, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I was delighted to hear your forthright views on our foreign policy in southeast Asia on the Face the Nation program today on TV. We need more people who will courageously speak these views and give you a share with the Nation your views. We certainly have bypassed

the United Nations in this situation. I too was disappointed in Ambassador Stevenson's speech to the U.N. You are so right that right actions should not depend on politics or political expediency.

Your views on the civil rights issue were equally appealing to me. I do hope we do not water down the bill, and if it doesn't have all we want for equal rights for the Negroes, I hope you do plug away until the Congress does pass the necessary legislation to give the Negroes their constitutional rights.

Independent thinking of conviction is a refreshing breeze; keep up the good work.

Sincerely yours,

BEATRICE M. MYERS.

WASHINGTON, D.C., May 24, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: My wife and I were fortunate enough to hear you on the program "Face the Nation" today.

I may say that seldom have we been so stirred. What you said was what millions of Americans want to hear. You are absolutely right, Sir, you can trust the informed American people, who are a little tired of being uninformed!

At the end of the program, my wife said "If only we had him for President"—a sentiment that I, and I feel certain, millions of other Americans, echo. Please keep up the good work, in the secure knowledge that the people are behind you. Believe me.

Yours very truly,

A. C. BROOKES.

NORWICH, CONN.,

May 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: May a far easterner say thanks to a far westerner for a very enlightening TV session. I don't even know the name of the program (tuned in late), but it was good. Was it "Face the Nation" with Marvin Kolb, etc.? You spoke of the Vietnam situation and gave us little folk food for thought. You said what you thought was wrong and gave your reasons for it.

The thing I liked most was your obvious respect for those in whom you disagreed. No snide remarks, no political hoorah, just your own honest opinion. I hope Mr. Stevenson weighs your opinion seriously.

I liked your TV visit today and I hope you will again speak over the networks, and often. When "we, the people" hear only one side of any given undertaking, we have very little to evaluate the situation, place, or thing. I like your remarks in regards to the United Nations. We can be a mighty Nation only as long as we are a just Nation. That goes for "at home" as well as abroad.

Sincerely,

VENALDA CHAPMAN.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,

May 24, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
The Senate, Washington.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish that every voter in the country were compelled to read, or have read to him, your comments on "Face the Nation" today. Never have I agreed with any position more completely.

Yours truly,

HENRY L. WOOD.

P.S.—Save time and money by not sending the usual acknowledgement of this note.

MAY 24, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: "WAYNE for President"—wish it were so! I was so delighted with you and your opinions as expressed on "Face the Nation" today.

11984

I also share your disappointment with Ambassador Stevenson. He has chosen to articulate the Government's views, rather than his own deep convictions. I am convinced his views are actually close to your own as expressed on the air May 24.

My admiration for you dates back to 1952. I share your hope that Mr. Stevenson returns to his former greatness.

Most sincerely,

A. KRUEGL.

INGLEWOOD, CALIF.

URBANA, ILL.,
May 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE: Your remarks on "Face the Nation" had logic and adherence to our previous commitments and were very stimulating. I hope we will admit our errors, set a wonderful example by getting out of all places where we do not belong and call all nations to guard peace through the United Nations.

I haven't yet left the Republicans.
Cordially,

W. G. KAMMLODE,
Retired, University of Illinois.

P.S.—No reply please, you have too much to do.

New York, N.Y.

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

DEAR SIR: I support your courageous stand on southeast Asia. However, in attacking foreign authoritarianism, one might consider whether the American citizen has had a chance to express his views on foreign policy at any time since the last war, in view of our "humpty-dumpty" two-party system.

Your truly,

WILLIAM F. GARBER.

MAY 24, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: Your position relative to our involvement in South Vietnam is the most sensible that I've heard expounded.

I recently completed a tour of duty in that country and have retired from active service in sheer disgust with our asinine efforts to assist a people who will not assist themselves.

We have not only overequipped and oversupplied them, but now seem imbued with the idea of going all out in doing their fighting for them.

May God give you the strength to prevail in getting the U.N. into South Vietnam and the United States out.

Yours truly,

F. W. LOYHEWALL.

FALLS CHURCH, VA.

LAW OFFICES OF GEORGE C. VOURNAS,
INVESTMENT BUILDING,
Washington, D.C., May 25, 1964.

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

MY DEAR SENATOR: I listened to your remarks on television yesterday, and—better still—I read your speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD regarding the same subject matter. Of course, you are right.

Permit me, however, to state to you that as long as the U.S. Government permits either governmental or private agencies to poison the atmosphere 24 hours a day, how do you expect the ordinary citizen to understand the implications of your arguments? The ordinary citizen, who is supposed to be the ultimate source of authority in our Republic, has been and is being poisoned every hour with appeals by Radio Free Europe and other agencies, to the extent that he feels that we are at war. It has been said that we are fair in love and war. Therefore, whatever

the Government does in South Vietnam is absolutely proper.

It occurs to me that if the President of the United States—who desires to build more bridges between East and West—and the U.S. Senate want to discharge their constitutional duties and obligations, they must first eliminate all these governmental and private busybodies who, like poison ivy, pollute the atmosphere. A good start would be with CIA and all its manifold activities, and then Radio Free Europe, etc. When that is done, then the voice of those who have constitutional responsibility in promulgating policy will be heard and evaluated by the ordinary citizens. Unless that is done, the voice of the White House and that of the U.S. Senate are voices in the wilderness.

As ever, yours,

GEORGE C. VOURNAS.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
May 24, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: Thank you very much for your excellent exposition of the foreign policy that we, as a Nation, must adopt both on legal and moral grounds. I am happy that you didn't permit the not-so-friendly reporters divert you from the main issue, which was to inform the American public.

I have also written to "Face the Nation," and President Johnson to express my support of all you said.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. GERTRUDE ETTENSON.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
May 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As a staunch supporter of Adlai Stevenson when he was running for President in 1952 and 1956, I must agree with your adverse criticism of him as expressed on today's "Face the Nation" television program and I have written him to tell him so.

Of course he may have his own reasons for saying what he does in the U.N., including—God forbid—that he believes it. But I can't really think that. Is there anything you can think of, beyond what you said today, for prevailing on him to be what I hope is still himself—the self we all so admired and respected in 1948, 1952, 1956, and even 1960? If so, will you let me know what it is? And would it be possible to have a copy of today's television program? I think you did us a yeoman service in saying what you did. I'm all for it. More power to you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. CORINNA MARSH.

HUNTINGTON PARK, CALIF.,
May 24, 1964.

To U.S. Senator WAYNE MORSE of Oregon.

DEAR SIR: I heard you today on "Face the Nation." I am mighty pleased to learn that men like you do exist in this country in which I put my last hopes and the only ones to save the justice and freedom of this planet.

Because I feel like you, I put my whole life and future at stake and disregarded all the advices of friendly people and preferred self-sacrifice in order to be able to come to this country and do help the cause of law and righteousness before the violent people destroy them completely. It took me 10 years to come here and only 4 years to lose hope and faith in my ideals and to get almost completely discouraged and stopped on my way of search for the law of truth and justice.

Listening to you today a spark of hope lit in my heart and I want you, sir, to know that I do support your views on the law, and everything that forefathers of this country

sacrificed for that reputation of sincerity, truthfulness, peace, and justice in and for the United States of America and made it a symbol and a leader of peace, justice, and freedom for the rest of the world that lost most of these great gifts our Father Almighty presented to all of us equally.

I hope, sir, this letter may give you additional strength in your struggle for defense of good rules that Jesus Christ, Mohammed, Buddha, and other great leaders recommended to mankind for their happiness and their salvation.

Very truly yours,

PETER BASIC.

WAYNE, PA.,
May 25, 1964.

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

SENATOR: My thanks to you for the ideas expressed on television today, and for the fight you are making in the Senate for a wiser foreign policy.

I am one American who feels that our foreign policy has been largely negative, even stupid, for a long time. By his handling of the Cuban revolution, President Eisenhower forced Cuba into the arms of Russia, then we complain because Cuba embraces communism.

We have kept mainland China out of the United Nations, when it was very important for her to be there, so that there would be a world tribunal to which she was responsible. It would be a very different story today if China were a member of the United Nations and had to answer to that body for her actions in Laos and Vietnam.

And it looks as if we are preparing the way to get nuclear weapons into the hands of West Germany, still largely influenced, if not dominated by Nazis. How can we ever hope to get peace with Russia, if we insist on making Germany the strongest power in Western Europe? And we talk of the "free world" and our devotion to democracy, yet it is our power that keeps the unspeakable Franco in his position of dictator over the tortured Spanish people.

I agree with you—there can never be world peace unless we build up a world under law, we've made a beginning in the United Nations; we should strengthen it by using it, and not ignoring it, using our power to go off on unilateral expeditions just because we have the power. To me, that is cowardly.

Respectfully yours,

REBECCA P. ELLIOTT.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just finished watching and listening to you on TV. I am in 100 percent agreement with you on one main issue. The American people are not getting the facts. This has been a sad 15 years for the American people. I have been believing this line for the last 13 years, ever since I came from Korea. Why is that press don't not give the people the facts about our international situation? As I am stating in my speech tomorrow, I think if the American people were really told how they have been swindled the last 15 years. I would go as far to say there would be the greatest uprising this country has ever seen. I have read "The Ugly American" and "Nation of Sheep," and I have been in the Orient and around the world. I know for a fact we are being led around like a bunch of sheep. The money we have poured into Asia is beyond belief. What has it got us, nothing.

We are almost banging in the jungles of southeast Asia. Latin America, they are not being told about. I hope in God's name that you and the President and a few of the politicians that God some good common-sense. Will go after the press and make one thing clear. Get the facts to the people.

There should be done to account for our money in Asia, too. Korea—

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

11985

\$85 billion, Formosa—about \$10 billion or more. We have \$50 billion in Asia. And we are where we were in 1950. Only we are now being readied to get the boot, if we don't do something fast. I hope that you get a bill in Congress and see that every damn dollar of this money is accounted. I just got my income tax return back for audit and I wrote and told maybe they would like to keep it so they could buy a few more rotten B-26's. Captain Shank's letters which were published in Life and other magazines is what really burnt me up. I know because I fired duds in Korea, a good many of them. Give them hell, Senator MORSE. If we had a few more people like you the American people would get up off their fat cans. If they had the facts.

Thanking you.

Sincerely,

GENE LANSING,
Disabled Veteran of Korea, July
1950 to September 1951.

MAY 24, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: I first want to congratulate you on your stand on foreign policy expressed on the CBS television program, "Face the Nation," on the 24th of May. I want to say that I completely agree with you and that I am appalled at the situation in southeast Asia in general, and in South Vietnam in particular. Specifically, what I am writing to you about is this: You stated that the American people are not being informed of the true facts abroad. I would like to know, from you, what I as an individual can do to help inform our people of the truth. I would deeply appreciate any advice you can give me on what I can do.

Yours truly,

HARVEY SANDERS.

ALBION, MICH.,
May 26, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from Oregon,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your attempt to prevent a global war in Vietnam.

ARTEUR W. MUNK, PH. D.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
May 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I was one of your interested listeners on "Face the Nation" today. Thank you for clearly telling us (one and all) just what's going on in this our beloved land, which we all love and want to preserve. How I wish you could have been on for an hour or two. Hope you are successful in convincing your fellow constituents how really right you are.

Yours truly,

Mrs. NORA BOSSMAN.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

DEAR SENATOR: May I compliment you proudly on the forthright stand and explanation you gave us on "Face the Nation." If the United Nations fail, lose their ethical value, we are lost.

Mrs. SCHATZ.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
May 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I endorse wholeheartedly your support of the U.N. and of the wisdom of taking the issue of South Vietnam to the Security Council and if necessary of bringing it before the General Assembly. I oppose strongly our unilateral action there (Vietnam).

Sincerely,

MARION M. MALLERY.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,

May 22, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Again my thanks and gratitude for your consistent, courageous, and timely efforts for peace and a more realistic approach to our very dangerous foreign policies. It is good to know you now have help in this noble task from your co-workers GRUENING and MANSFIELD. The world now knows we, the common people, have voices (even) in the U.S. Senate that want and work for peace.

Respectfully and cordially,

G. J. RINDLER.

CLEARWATER, FLA.,

May 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: I agree with you that the undeclared war we are waging against the people of Vietnam is unconstitutional, and also illegal under the charter of the United Nations—as you stated on the "Face the Nation" program today. We should cease our unilateral action there at once and turn the whole southeastern Asia problem over to the United Nations.

I am very disappointed in Adlai S.

Sincerely,

LILLIAN C. McFARLAND.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: After listening to you on "Face the Nation" on Sunday May 24, I agree that the United States should take the Vietnam issue to the United Nations, and withdraw our troops. I am against the United States helping militarily.

Sincerely,

Mrs. MARY E. FITZGERALD.

NEW YORK CITY.

MAY 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I happened to catch your TV interview by sheer chance. I want to tell you, I was both delighted and amazed to hear some straight talk for a change on the southeastern situation.

I meant to write to you later during the week. But when I heard the radio announcement that Senator GOLDWATER advocates using atomic weapons, I was horrified, and I'm writing to you at once. For God's sake Senator, for humanity's sake, don't let up a moment in your fight for a commonsense and a realistic approach to the southeastern crisis. I fear to think of what could happen if the United Nations doesn't act soon.

I am writing to Senators KEATING and JAVITS who are the Senators from my State urging them to support your program.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH EDWARDS.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
May 23, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I support vigorously your statements concerning southeast Asia and Vietnam. Events of the past week have stirred me to write and urge that you intensify your courageous and straightforward opposition to recent administration statements concerning this area. The futility of our present policy is evident to any student of history, and to increase force is sheer folly. If the purpose is to demonstrate that the American way is best for Asians, then our means better be changed or they will find other ways.

Thank you for your attention.

Very truly yours,

RICHARD J. HUNTER,
Member Los Angeles County
Democratic Central Committee.

GREENBRIER MILITARY SCHOOL,

Lewisburg, W. Va., May 23, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It was my pleasure to see and hear you on the press conference TV program just completed.

You did a superb job. I enjoyed all of it. I only wish you had had a chance to comment on Senator GOLDWATER's candidacy and a few other matters of importance.

Sincerely,

J. W. BENJAMIN.

PRINCETON, N.J.,

May 25, 1964.

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

DEAR MR. SENATOR: The undersigned wish to tell you that they heard the opinions you expressed on the television program on May 24 on our foreign policy, and to congratulate you on your courageous outspokenness. We agree with your opinions wholeheartedly.

Yours respectfully,

MISS MARGARET R. LAW.
MARY ROZICH.
CATHERINE _____
NATALIE ALEXANDER.

WEST HAVEN, CONN.,

May 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on that excellent interview that you had on television today. If you see anything I can do to help make our Vietnam policy more intelligent please let me know.

I wish you would write the President urging him to have Senator HUMPHREY as his Vice Presidential candidate.

Cordially yours,

JEROME DAVIS, LL.D., D. LIT.

FOREST HILLS, LONG ISLAND, N.Y.

May 24, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: How right you are about the American people not being informed about what is going on in South Vietnam (from your statements on the TV "Face the Nation" program). To confirm the truth of your statement and my sincere agreement with you, I am sending to you a copy of a letter I have written to the editor of my union paper the RWDSU Record just a few days ago.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. KATIA SPELOTTI.

FOREST HILLS, LONG ISLAND, N.Y.

May 21, 1964.

The RWDSU RECORD,
Editor of Letters.

DEAR EDITOR: To someone who is in the dark (myself) and needs enlightenment, please explain: Who started the war in South Vietnam? Who is fighting whom, and what for? And if our country is not at war with them, why are our boys there, and so many of them have given their lives, for what? I seek a truthful answer and hope to get it from you. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. KATIA SPELOTTI,
Stern Local 5.

SOUTH BOSTON, MASS.,

May 24, 1964.

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

My DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations on your frank discussion during "Face the Nation." Please keep us informed. The majority of Americans want to do what is right.

June 2

11986

AS SOON as I finish this letter, I am writing to the President, asking him to bring the situation in South Vietnam before the United Nations.

God bless you.

Sincerely yours,

Miss MARY LYDO.

MANHATTAN, KANS.,

May 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on a very fine showing today on "Face the Nation." I agree with and fully support everything you said. Keep up the good work.

I am deeply disturbed—have been for some time—that we Americans do not seem to be getting the full truth about what is going on in such places as southeast Asia. How can we get the facts?

Respectfully yours,

WAYNE AMOS.

GRAFTON, MASS.,

May 25, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Last night my wife and I heard "Face the Nation"—an interview with you. Fine.

We couldn't agree more with the views you so eloquently expressed—regarding Vietnam especially and foreign policy in general.

Could we have a copy of the interview to share with friends?

Gratefully yours,

REGINALD ANDERSON.

URBANA, ILL.,

May 26, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from Oregon, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for your words on "Face the Nation," which came over our local station here at the University of Illinois on May 24.

We must certainly utilize the gift we have in the United Nations. Idealism is thought highly of us as graduate students. I and my colleagues are sometimes criticized in being "idealists" but we are at a point in foreign relations where peace is absolutely necessary. We must remain idealists and use the United Nations. We must communicate with other nations—via the U.N.

Continue to speak. Thank you.

Sincerely,

HOWARD THORSHHEIM.

MAY 24, 1964.

HON. WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senator, State of Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My confidence in the Democratic Party and my faith that our Nation is in the hands of some responsible leaders has been renewed tonight after hearing your remarks on CBS' "Face the Nation."

Your plea that we must strive for international peace through international law accepted by all nations under the guidance of the United Nations is most timely, though grounded in a timeless philosophy. Thrasymachus in the "Dialogues" was wrong when he believed that justice was in the interest of the stronger, yet it would seem, as you pointed out, that our presence in Vietnam is rooted in such a notion. The verbal struggle, even over procedure, in the United Nations is a far more satisfactory alternative than an arms struggle continually threatening our very existence.

Needless to say, your desire to "give the Constitution to the Negro" via a strong (and sternly enforced) civil rights bill is admirable. More power to you and to leadership like yours which will bring the Nation to

a position of being the rightest in the world, rather than the strongest.

Sincerely,

JAMES K. L. LAWRENCE,
Vice President, Young Democrats,
The Ohio State University Law School.

RACINE, WIS.,

May 26, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you as a father whose sons are in the armed services and who is, I hope, a loyal American. I agree with your stand on sending our boys into a mess the French, with their Legionnaires, could not cope with, what business is it of ours anyway; don't we recognize the United Nations any more, or are we so smug in our belief that we should run the whole world? Our sons are too precious to us to be at the beck and call of any politician or small nation hollering for help, let some of these people do their own fighting. If I had the means I would challenge the legality of sending our men into undeclared wars.

We are a sorry mess as a nation when we sit back, do nothing, and let our State Department experts condemn our sons to death, the last mess like this took a presidential election to get us out of. I sure pray it doesn't go that far this time. Please Senator continue your fight in the Senate and if needed call on the parents of the servicemen to pitch in and help you convince these nonbelievers of American family life.

Sincerely,

LEONARD DAVIS.

WEST TOPSHAM, VT.,

May 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Heard your television talk today and we heartily agree with all you said. As we have heard before there won't be an end to fighting in Vietnam in view of what is going on now. What can be done to make the President and others in authority change their views and do what is right instead of employing might? Hammer at them until they take notice and end this foolish waste of money and men. We are just dairy farmers but this senseless war touches all our lives.

I never believed in the Democrats foreign policy and the party is too socialistic to suit me. We hear some people say, "I believe in getting all we can out of the Government." People lose their independence and pride after too many handouts. I love our country, have always been a Republican, but do think a lot of President Johnson I believe he is a good, honest, and sincere man. Pardon the long letter.

Yours truly,

Mr. and Mrs. K. A. BATTEN.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,

May 24, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I listened to your "Face the Nation" today and could not agree with you more. You are right on all points.

Sincerely,

WINNIFRED WYGAL.

SANTA CRUZ, CALIF.,

May 24, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: Having just listened to the broadcast of "Face the Nation" this morning, in which you expressed your views on our war in Vietnam, I wish you to know that I am completely in accord with everything you

had to say. My hope is that your stand on this aspect of our foreign policy can be more widely brought to the attention of the American people.

Is it possible to obtain a transcript of this interview of which I write? I am participating on June 12, in Santa Cruz, in a public discussion of our southeast Asia policy. Therefore I am anxious to obtain any pertinent material including speeches you may have made recently. The time is short, but I am hopeful that I may be able to receive from you before this meeting any printed matter that can be used at this discussion. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

ETHEL E. ANDERSON
Mrs. Frank A. Anderson.

MONROE, GA.,

May 26, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senator From Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Your television appearance of May 24 was received here yesterday. While not in complete agreement with your philosophy it was rare and refreshing to hear one clearly defined. How nice it would be if more of your colleagues (nationwide) would put courage behind their convictions and give the American public a clear picture and thus a clear choice.

Thank you for your message.

Sincerely,

DOROTHY (Mrs. J. L.) MATHEWS.

VERGENNES, VT.,

May 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Heard you on "Face the Nation." That's telling 'em, Senator. Best I've heard in a long while. More power to you.

WOODBURN HARRIS,
Retired Farmer.

URBANA, ILL.,

May 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just heard you on "Face the Nation" and must tell you how completely I agree with you—decision by an honestly informed public. We have altogether too much government by edict from Washington which bypasses Congress.

More power to you. The things you said need to be said.

Sincerely,

W. E. CARROLL.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,

May 25, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: Please accept my compliments for your honesty, courage, and straightforwardness on "Face the Nation" yesterday, May 23.

It is reassuring to see and hear a U.S. Senator who speaks his opinions boldly, clearly, and fearlessly and has a realistic grasp of foreign affairs.

No doubt the administration and Mr. Stevenson are dismayed that you cut through and exposed the entire phony basis of our activities in the Far East. And many Americans must have been startled. As you said; We do not know all that is going on—and half of what we read and hear is distilled or "administered." Certainly the nations of the world know we are not being honest with them nor with ourselves. Please continue to speak up. There are still many Americans who believe in integrity.

THOMAS SATELLI.

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

11987

EASTCHESTER, N.Y.,

May 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is to support your position on South Vietnam as expressed on "Face the Nation" yesterday.

We have had an almost continuous "brink of war" atmosphere since 1946 now, and there are strong pressures to continue this—apparently indefinitely. Republicans and Democrats seem to compete in war cries. I am grateful that there are such admirable exceptions as yourself.

I question the intelligence and integrity of the CIA. I am shocked to see pictures of tortures by our Allies in South Vietnam in the press—almost routine by now.

With best wishes for success,

Sincerely,

L. PACH.

PANAMA, ILL.,

May 25, 1964.

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

HONORABLE SIR: I sure humbly thank God for having you, Senator, in the Senate.

I do fully subscribe to your standing, that you do not want our young men in military services to fight and to die in places where the United Nations Forces should be employed.

Honorable Senator, I served in World War I for 3 years in France and Germany.

My son served in World War II for 6 years in Pacific and Asiatic war operation with the 1st Division of Marines. Now thousands of our young men are fighting and dying where all free nations men ought to be with them.

God bless you, dear Senator. Protect you and yours.

Respectfully,

JOSEPH SAFRANEK.

PASADENA, CALIF.,

May 4, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have just turned off the "Face the Nation" program after the end of your part in the program. Often I have wondered why we are in South Vietnam, and why it was not in the province of the U.N. instead of the United States.

As I understand it our involvement goes back to the policy of Foster Dulles in the Eisenhower days, and I support a change is difficult.

But I agree heartily with your argument today and what you think should be done. Why should a civilized world have to fight to make things go right?

From brief reports I gather that Senator FULBRIGHT and Senator MANSFIELD also do not agree with what we are doing to southeast Asia. Let us hope more voices will be raised for a change—and not to nuclear means, but a way of peace.

Sincerely,

EDNA K. NEUGEBAUER.

KEW GARDENS, N.Y.,

* May 25, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I listened to your interview on "Face the Nation" May 24 on channel 2. Many thanks for your sincerity and outspokenness with regard to our position in southeast Asia. I agree this crucial matter should be handled by the United Nations.

I hope the news media will publicize this interview and also give us the true facts, as you suggest.

Respectfully,

LEE M. ROSENSTEIN.

BELLEVUE, WASH.,

May 24, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: After hearing you on "Face the Nation" I can only say that I wish I lived in Oregon so I could support you. It might be worth moving to Oregon just for that privilege. You expressed by own thoughts in a way I am incapable of.

Thank you.

JOSEPHINE MCCORMICK.

MAY 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Yesterday, Sunday May 24, I saw and heard you on a TV program. I would like to thank you for what you said and for what you are trying to do.

I do not write letters to Senators very often but I felt in this case I had to. I'm sure that your office will be flooded with mail from all "way out" nuts calling you all kinds of names and saying you are a sellout, etc. Let me say this to you now: There are many hundreds of thousands of our people who are with you and for you but they just don't write. They are like me.

But if you continue to state your case often enough the people will grasp onto the problems you spoke of and they will demand that something be done about them.

Please go on talking and asking and showing the way as you have been doing. Perhaps you will give some courage to other Members of the Senate to speak out the way you have.

May your tribe increase.

Very truly yours,

RAYMOND E. DRAPKIN.

NEW YORK CITY,

May 25, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You may be interested in seeing the enclosed letter I just addressed to the President. I hope it may contribute one mite in support of the valiant work you are doing on the issue involved, not merely in representing the conscience of millions of concerned Americans, but in pressing our Government toward a policy of peace and reason.

Sincerely yours,

IRVING KAPLAN.

MAY 25, 1964.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Friday morning, May 22, I read the statement of your Ambassador to the United Nations, Adlai Stevenson, presenting the U.S. position on the current problems in Indochina. That same Friday, in the evening, I could not overlook the enclosed AP wirephoto in the New York Post. You will see that according to the accompanying text, it is not the Vietcong as anyone following Ambassador Stevenson would unquestionably expect, but the South Vietnam soldiers, advised, guided, and paid by us, who are responsible for the scene depicted.

How long, Mr. President, can we continue to rely on the cry of aggression to cover the crimes of perfidious governments our own representatives establish and our own Government supports in distant southeast Asia? How long will our own fate be hopelessly bound to the endless mistakes initiated by John Foster Dulles in 1954 and the ensuing horrors for which we must bear responsibility in that unfortunate land.

I find just one ray of hope in Ambassador Stevenson's statement; That we are pre-

pared to go back to the 1954 agreement. This, of course, is the agreement which Mr. Dulles and Mr. Nixon tried to avoid even at the risk of world conflagration; the agreement which Mr. Dulles, with his unmatched genius for legalisms and mastery of the self-righteous pose, had us, as Secretary of State, on the one hand agree to without signing, and on the other hand circumvent by unilateral intervention; it is the agreement which otherwise would long ago have terminated all traffic in armaments and military personnel throughout Indochina and reunited North and South Vietnam after democratic elections. I hope, Mr. President, you will direct our policy vigorously toward this end.

Sincerely yours,

UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT,
Storrs, Conn., May 25, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Can I take only a minute of your time to tell you of my admiration of your continuing criticism of American foreign policy with respect to Vietnam?

You are apparently one of the few men in the higher echelons of the Government that has the integrity to stand up and fearlessly state extraordinarily simple and elementary facts. The continuation of our policy in Vietnam has no goal in sight—the myth of establishing freedom there is at best a question of freedom for a few and at worst is simply absurd. Nor do any of the alternatives mentioned, save for U.N. intervention, offer even the slightest hope of constructive action. The fact of the matter is that Vietnam has a long future of dichotomized, dictatorial politics before it, and the question of who is going to perform the administration of these politics is largely an unimportant and uninteresting one, except insofar as one answer to the question involves the senseless killing of Americans and Vietnamese alike and the perpetuation of the tendency toward "the garrison state" here at home.

All of this is not to advocate a complete abandonment of American involvement and interest in southeast Asia. Rather, only our present, unsuccessful, and senseless policy must go. And since you are one of the few who seem to recognize this, perhaps it may mean something to you if I testify that the support for your position here in the hinterlands of Connecticut is not inconsiderable. In short, keep up the good work. There is a larger number of people behind you than you might think.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. HIGLEY.

MODESTO, CALIF.,

May 25, 1964.

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

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Yesterday we listened to your comments on "Face the Nation," re our international relations and the U.N.

We agree with you 100 percent. We sincerely hope your remarks together with those of Senator FULBRIGHT, will bear much fruit. You gave some constructive suggestions for our foreign policy. Keep it up.

Sincerely yours,

DR. THOS. ISHERAN ILLICK.

11988

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

June 2

WESTMONT, N.J.,
May 24, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your speech on Vietnam of May 24. It was a masterpiece. Please keep it up.

CHARLES R. MORRY.

EVANSVILLE, IND.,
May 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your efforts to convince the President that war in Vietnam should not be enlarged are appreciated. France learned that Vietnam was a lost cause. Our country should waste no more men or materials in that country. Keep on with your good work.

Sincerely yours,
Mr. and Mrs. GEORGE HESSENAUER.

SHEVEPORT, LA.,
May 24, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: This is to assure you that you have wholehearted and whole-minded support in your position, concerning U.S. foreign policy in Vietnam and on the civil rights question in our domestic policy.

The expression of your position in the press conference on TV this morning echoes the feelings and thoughts and fears I may add of many people who regard our present course as highly unrealistic.

I thank you for giving expression to these thoughts and I wish you to be assured that you have wide support.

Sincerely yours,
Mrs. CORNELIA M. PAUSTIAN.

MIAMI, FLA.,
May 27, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE: I admire the stand you have taken on Vietnam. Why does the United States take on the responsibility of this war alone? What is the United Nations for? Our supposed "allies" don't even offer to help and we are not informed of the true situation in Vietnam by our returning representatives. We can forget about Communism in Cuba apparently, but send our men thousands of miles to fight a losing war. Do we still have a Congress?

J.P.

RENTON, WASH.,
May 24, 1964.

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

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to express approval of your views on Vietnam as stated on "Face the Nation" on Sunday, May 24.

It is interesting to note that on a news broadcast immediately following your interview it was stated that Senator GOLDWATER advocates the use of low yield atomic blasts along the border between North and South Vietnam.

The need to work incessantly for a legal means for keeping order between nations is increasingly apparent.

Thank you for your courageous expression of your views.

Very truly yours,

RACHEL L. BOWEN.

KELLOGG, IDAHO,
May 25, 1964.

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

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I consider I would be remiss in my duty as a citizen if I didn't write to as many Senators as possible, to go on record as being in support of our present operation in Vietnam.

We should not become involved in that part of the world, in any action which would require the presence of our servicemen, or any loss of life on their part.

The time to have taken a stand in Asia, I feel, was during Truman's war in Korea, when we were already actively committed there, also had a very able man, General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, who could have won for us a victory over communism in that part of the world, had he not been prevented from doing so by a less intelligent and far-seeing man.

Besides, if we didn't have the will, or ability, to fight communism in Cuba, at the Bay of Pigs, 80 miles off our shore, why should we go 7,000 miles around the earth looking for a fight which should, in my estimation, be placed under the United Nations, an institution which was supposedly set up to handle these so-called limited wars. It's an institution to which we contribute heavily financially.

Hoping you will use all the power of your office to prevent another tragic mistake like Korea, with its wanton waste of the lives of American youth.

Thanking you.

Sincerely,

M. MACMILLAN.

PACIFIC GROVE, CALIF.,
May 24, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My wife and I were strongly impressed with your position on "Face the Nation" this morning in regard to our present embroilment in South Vietnam.

We wish to thank you for your courage, and the clarity with which you stated your views, which we strongly endorse.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM H. BLISS.

TAMPA, FLA., May 25, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: I was fortunate to have caught your interview on television, Sunday, May 24, so that I heard all of your views on Vietnam and civil rights instead of the sparse words as reported in our Tampa Tribune.

My opinion has changed about you over the years as I matured in knowledge of our foreign and domestic affairs. In our history, many great statesmen have echoed the simple truths which set the rules for freemen. They can't be reiterated too often: "Our foreign policy should be set by the wishes of an informed American public who can well decide what is right." Thomas Jefferson stated in similar words "When the people are properly informed, their judgment is better than that of a few."

Yes, our foreign policy should reflect what the average American thinks, who looks for high ideals in his local and National Government. We should be a Nation which reflects right, not might. I have stated that many times in "letters to the editors," etc.

As to the United Nations, it has been the most successful, in representation and effort, in really keeping peace in the world, of any other entente or organization, previously.

Best wishes,

LOUIS FRITZE.

P.S.—Civil rights—Our country is growing in attaining government for freemen.

SHARON, MASS.,
May 25, 1964.

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

I strongly support your efforts to limit

and end our military involvement in Vietnam.

Your courageous leadership on this most crucial of issues is an inspiration.

I would appreciate being sent the text of your speech(es) bearing on this.

Sincerely yours,

ALFRED J. KUTZIK.

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF.,
May 25, 1964.

Re Vietnam and the U.N.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to commend your statements heard yesterday on TV on the "Capital Cloakroom" program relative to the role that the United Nations should be asked to play in the Vietnam crisis.

I heartily agree with your contention that this whole matter should be referred to the United Nations and that our Government should support a U.N. peacekeeping operation there.

It seems to me that we cannot win a war on the mainland of Asia, as we learned during the Korean war, and that this is a typical case where the good offices of the U.N. Secretary-General and a U.N. force should be utilized.

Too often we do not call in the U.N. or request the U.N. to act until it is too late or until matters have deteriorated to such an extent that the U.N. position is almost unsolvable.

Respectfully yours,

CONSTANCE DE SANTILLANA.

GLENORA, CALIF.,
May 24, 1964.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: On "Face the Nation" today, you have outfaced the petty and pettifogging politicians with the acid bite of principled truth.

It was a most statesmanlike performance and should serve to alert such a fallen idol as Adlai Stevenson that one can always escape the web of circumstance by an act of conscience.

It was sickening to those of us who held him in high esteem, to watch him read, schoolboy fashion, a statement of foreign policy that diminished both himself and the American people. I like your confidence in us.

Latterly I have felt like "The Ugly American," "The Unlawful American," and "The Oppressive American." All this guilt is being wished on us, and the perpetrators dress policy up in phony labels which fool only the gullible and the immature.

It gave me back some faith to hear you speak out for right against might, for law against expediency, and for peace above everything.

Respectfully,

STELLA FALK.

LOCKPORT, N.Y., May 29, 1964.

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

I notice that you and several other Senators have been brave enough to oppose extension of the war in South Vietnam.

It is a war, yet undeclared and unapproved by either Congress or the American public.

Government officials should take note of the fact that some of us don't appreciate half of our tax going to support the military and their war that appears to be a flagrant violation of the so-called police powers of the executive department.

Some of us are also opposed to it because it obviously violates the 1954 Geneva agreement.

Then there is the consideration that our support of Diem and now Khanh is hardly popular with the South Vietnam people—in view of the number of deserters, the constant shelling of U.S. advisers needed to

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

11989

Idealists are also squeamish about the use of experimental techniques of warfare, such as chemical sprays in forests and rice paddies that often maim innocents.

With over \$3 billion spent (according to Mike Mansfield), with more than \$1.5 million a day needed to continue the war, with all the majesty and might of the U.S. military, which prides itself as the most powerful force in the world, the war has still continued to swing to the side of the Vietcong. We are entitled to ask why. And the answer must be that the effort is not popular; that victory can only come with massive onslaught, an open declaration of war, military occupation, the threat of a frightful engagement with North Vietnam and China.

Because of the latter's numerical superiority, that kind of total war would have to boomerang into a nuclear conflagration of East and West that would make Armageddon look like kid stuff.

The rightwing coup in Laos, probably abetted by CIA agents, and formation of a neutralist government with heavy rightwing support, and the subsequent struggle there accompanied by overtones of U.S. promises to aid the people poses a further threat to the peace of Asia.

I think if Americans were honestly presented the facts, they would not support a war that cannot possibly be won short of horrifying casualties.

Presented the facts of the Geneva agreement, American citizens would question the legality of the American role in South Vietnam—certainly as flagrant an act of aggression as the Soviet repression of the Hungarian revolt.

We must call for immediate withdrawal of American forces from the area, and reconvene the Geneva Conference with all interested parties, including representatives of the Vietcong. The solution in these countries is up to the people there, and all foreign intervention must be arrested. Consider the fate of the American Revolution if France and Spain had joined Britain against the tiny band of men led by George Washington.

ALFRED S. HOPKINS.

P.S. I am not a Communist and the views here expressed are strictly my own, as guaranteed by our Constitution that, incidentally, was born in blood and sweat.

P.P.S. Please send a copy of your recent talk on this subject and bill me if there is a charge.

MEDFORD, MASS., May 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: After listening to your views as expressed on "Face the Nation" today, I sort of felt obliged to write you and let you know just how I and I know hundreds of thousands of Americans feel about your commonsense logic.

We certainly have some queer thinking going on in our Government. It is indeed refreshing to hear common horse sense as you made things clear today.

I trust that you will give some thought to accepting the Vice Presidency if President Johnson should offer it to you. I am writing him tonight, suggesting that he do so. I shall get as many others as I possibly can to do the same. You are needed in a higher position in Government.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR M. SMITH.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

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

DEAR SENATOR: Bravo. Bravo. Bravo. I heard your remarks on CBS radio Sunday, May 24. It was like a breath of fresh air breaking through the dense fog that has enveloped all of our country's airwaves. If only we had a few more voices like yours.

Might I suggest a TV nationwide hookup? I feel confident that some such group can be

organized to secure funds for such endeavor. It is a must if we want to save humanity from nuclear holocaust.

Keep on this great effort of yours and all of America will be grateful to you.

Respectfully,

SIDNEY EHRLICH.

MOUNT VERNON, N.Y.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Both my wife and I heard your interview with newsmen about the war in South Vietnam. We would like you to know that we approve completely of what you said. We thank you for having the courage to speak out for reason and good sense. Both here and in the city I have yet to meet anyone who has wanted us to continue our involvement in the Vietnamese massacre. People here are shocked at the suggestion of expanding the war. But our Representatives in Congress do not represent us. God knows whom they do represent. We count on you to make our lost voices heard in the sea of congressional irresponsibility and Pentagon warmongering. Keep up the good work.

WILLIAM DUELL.

TUJUNGA, CALIF.,
May 25, 1964.

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

DEAR MR. MORSE: Your remarks on the TV interview this Sunday afternoon in regard to the war in Vietnam were wonderful to hear.

We agree with you that we are violating international law in southeast Asia and that the problem is one for the U.N.

Keep up the fight for a peaceful world.

IVER AXELSON.

LINCOLN PARK, MICH.,
May 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We heartily agree with you about our role in Vietnam and about what should be the role of the U.N.

We appreciate your forthright remarks about the civil rights bill.

We wish we had more Senators like you.

Most sincerely yours,

D. SPEER.

SENATOR MORSE: Please be advised that I agree with you wholeheartedly on your stand on the whole Far Eastern mess.

Why can't we put this in the United Nations lap before another Korea develops.

Sincerely,

IVAN F. WARD.

LARKSPUR, CALIF.,
May 25, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from Oregon.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My respect and gratitude for your statements before the "Face the Nation" broadcast Sunday, May 24. Your courageous statements were a sane voice in our unfortunate situations in southeast Asia. You gave me hope and confidence again.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH BRAY.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.,
May 24, 1964.

Hon. Senator W. MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just a brief note to say I support your efforts to seek a political solution to the war in Vietnam.

A photograph published May 23 in the San Diego Union shows preparation of a Vietcong prisoner for torture to secure intelligence. I am fearful if this war continues we will find ourselves justifying such torture, and the American character will be seriously corrupted. I cannot see how this war in Vietnam can be regarded as a just war—again, my thanks

to you and to Senator MANSFIELD for your efforts to halt it.

A. L. FLICK.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
May 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We listened to you this morning on "Face the Nation" and as a family we commend you highly.

I do believe the people are very much confused and curious as to what is going on in South Vietnam. At least all who are interested in anything. There are those who amble on through life following the leader—fair or foul, sad to say.

We believe in the U.N. and you.

Congratulations.

ELLA KITTEDGE.

BALLWIN, MO.,
May 26, 1964.

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

Honorable DEAR SIR: I listened to your remarks last Sunday, May 24, on television program "Face the Nation."

I heartily agree with your remarks and your opinions.

Four of my sons have served their tours of duty as commissioned officers in the Army Reserve. Three of them served in Korea in a so-called police action. My fifth and last son will be commissioned a Second Lieutenant in the Army Reserve upon his graduation from college next month, and I certainly do not want him sent to Vietnam, Laos, etc.

If the people of these nations are not interested in defending their freedoms I am certainly opposed to sending American troops, some of them sacrificing their lives, defending it for them.

Yours respectfully,

DANIEL A. MCCARTHY.

P.S. I served 6 months as an enlisted man in World War I.

BELLEVUE, WASH.,
May 27, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am a former resident of Oregon. While there I voted for you several times, for I was proud of the stand you took on important issues. Although I cannot vote for you now I am very much impressed by your courage and good sense.

In my opinion you are definitely correct in regard to the position you have taken about the war in Vietnam.

Thank you and good wishes.

Sincerely,

ALIDA J. MICHAEL.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

DEAR SENATOR: I think you ought to know that a great many of us here in Wisconsin thoroughly agree with your stand on southeast Asia. * * * Somewhere along the line someone had to tell the truth and keep telling the truth. I am glad and grateful that it was you.

You owe it to the American people to persist until all the facts are known. I, too, think, as you, that once the public has facts, it can act with great wisdom.

Sincerely,

SOL BENSMAN.

P.S.—Would appreciate a copy of your Senate speech on southeast Asia.

HARRISBURG, PA.,
May 27, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: It did us good to hear you speaking out against our terrible actions in Asia when the whole world is against us especially in Vietnam.

11990

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD -- SENATE

June 2

Hoping that you can get your friends to keep us out of further losses.

Sincerely,

BONNIE and MANUEL SEGAL.

TEMPLE CITY, CALIF.,
May 26, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: I have not always agreed with you on the stand you took in the past.

As is often the case it is easier to throw rocks than roses and often we agree with a person but fall to let them know of our support. Both myself and a number of friends are taking this opportunity to thank and congratulate you for your talk on "Face the Nation" Sunday, May 24. What a pity we do not have more stalwarts who express themselves so forcefully.

Sincerely,

GRACE M. CLARKSTON.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
May 30, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We just wrote President Johnson supporting your courageous stand against our South Vietnam policy of continuing and escalating this "dirty" war. We are against military solution to all world problems, instead of the use of more diplomacy.

We are indeed grateful to have a few dissenting voices in the Senate such as yourself, who represent the popular feeling of the United States. The U.S. public we feel has not really been well informed on the matter. If the fact were brought out more perhaps there would be greater pressure by the people toward stopping this useless war.

We are glad that you are doing your utmost to stop this unnecessary taking of life.

We again support your policies toward a peaceful world. It is with regret that we do not live in your State so that we could vote for you.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. BERNARD WEINTRAUB.

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK,
LONG ISLAND, N.Y., May 30, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: This is to express my strongest support for your courageous and realistic stand against continued U.S. involvement in the civil war now taking place in South Vietnam, and against U.S. intervention in other parts of southeast Asia, such as Laos and Cambodia, not to speak of invasion of North Vietnam.

If sanity prevails in our Government's policies and a third world war is avoided, it will be due to men like yourself who have the vision and courage to protest against the prevailing militaristic hysteria which grips our Nation. If men like yourself sat in the White House this would be a better country to live in.

Yours very sincerely,

GEORGE W. ROSE,
Instructor.

DETROIT, MICH.,
May 30, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am one of the millions of people in the United States who admire your vision and moral standards in regard to the most shameful war waged for 10 years on small nations which want to get rid of colonial and imperial domination, in order to build up a dignified human existence, as they see fit.

Deep-felt thanks for your consistency and courage. Like the prophets of old, you call the rulers of this country to their senses and therewith save the rest of esteem and ap-

preciation still left for America the Beautiful.

If your advice is snubbed and disregarded, then woe to the United States of America.

I would be very grateful if you could send me, if possible, five copies of more of your most outspoken speeches, and including the one I heard over the radio "Face the Nation" on Sunday, May 24.

I will do my best to make your message known to as many people as possible.

Gratefully yours,

ALICE HERZ.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
May 28, 1964.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON.

The White House.

DEAR SIR: I have just heard Senator MORSE's speeches in the Senate on the crisis in southeast Asia, and particularly Vietnam.

I humbly believe that his appraisal of the situation should be given careful consideration.

I believe that if the American people were to have these facts the majority would be in agreement.

The alternative, as Senator MORSE and many other able statesmen and scholars have warned may lead to an escalation of the war to uncontrollable limits.

Respectfully,

MATHILDA SELIGER.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
May 27, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I was privileged this evening to hear, on KPFA, Pacifica Radio in Berkeley, Calif., a program of excerpts from your various Senate speeches since March on the subject of our country's activities in Vietnam.

I agree with your position on the illegality and immorality of our efforts in Vietnam, and I can only hope that your voice will be heard more. Finding, among my acquaintances, very little regard for the Government's position in Vietnam, and a general feeling that we are wasting time, lives, and money on corruption, it is a relief to find a voice in the Senate speaking on this subject, and speaking in such a manner.

I am not one of your constituents, but you do, in a sense, represent the entire country as well as your State. I am writing my Senator, THOMAS KUCHEL, to commend your stand to him.

Incidentally, although I am not aware of your position concerning our actions toward Cuba, I trust you have thought about the legality and morality of these actions.

Sincerely,

THOMAS LEE.

MODESTO, CALIF., May 26, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: I agree with you that the war in Vietnam is a costly and illegal war and one in which we cannot expect to win. If any action is to be taken in Vietnam it should be a force sent by the U.N.

Sincerely,

R. H. FRENCH.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., May 28, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I take this opportunity to applaud your stand on the situation in southeast Asia and particularly in South Vietnam.

I wholeheartedly agree with the various points you have made regarding the fact that we are in South Vietnam illegally and unconstitutionally, that Congress has been too slow to act, and that the problem should be given to the United Na-

tions. We are not only, as you state, a colonial power in this situation; but our use of airplanes, napalm bombing, and chemical spraying is actually terroristic since they are often directed against the civilian population.

Thank you again for your unique effort on behalf of ending our military participation in southeast Asia.

Sincerely yours,

EUGENE EAGLE, O.D.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
May 30, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Keep up the fight to move our troops out of Vietnam. I listened with admiration and thankfulness to your talk in "Face the Nation" last week. I agree that we must repudiate the policy enunciated by Adlai Stevenson in the Security Council. I could feel him crawl.

I am writing to my own Senators, telling them how much I admired your stand, and urging them and the President of the United States to negotiate on the Vietnam question.

Cordially yours,

LILLIAN RUBIN.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
May 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Listening to the television program "Face the Nation" last Sunday, I was delighted to hear you giving your views about the war in South Vietnam, and I share these views with you.

Yes, we should make an end with this fighting war and give it over entirely to the United Nations for the purpose of the establishment of peace.

It was good to hear you in this program speaking up for what is the right thing to do, the real right thing and the only right thing; that, what God would want us to do too, even if it does not always mean a victory for us.

I hope you will continue to speak up and defend the truth in the world and keep your wonderful courage and your high ideals in the ultimate righteousness of all things.

May God bless you and guide you in your work as a Senator and in the part you have as a leader in our Government.

Sincerely,

GERTRUD BROWNE.

FOREST HILLS, N.Y.,
May 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I was greatly impressed and horrified by your description of the Vietnam and Laos situation, and wish to commend you on your forthrightness.

I too would like to see the U.N. handling the situation there as I fear this talk of escalating the war. Your mention of our possible use of atomic weapons worried me and when Senator GOLDWATER later in the afternoon mentioned it also, I felt panicky.

I am writing to my two New York Senators to ask them to support you in solving the Vietnam and Laos situation by putting it in the hands of the United Nations.

Thank you for your courage.

Sincerely yours,

BETTY EDWARDS.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
May 27, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My husband and I have just listened to a program on Pacifica Radio, KPFA, concerning Vietnam. The program by you and others in the Senate on American involvement in

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

11991

South Vietnam. In these days of clichés and meaningless statements of patriotism, your candid analysis of this situation is both refreshing and frightening.

To our knowledge, unfortunately, your comments, have not gone far beyond THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Such a critical analysis of American foreign policy deserves wider audience.

Would you consider forwarding to us any future statements you may make on this issue?

We encourage you to continue your efforts in insisting that American foreign policy be stripped of its myths and analyzed within the framework of the rule of law.

We are most anxious to help you in your vallant efforts in any way we can.

Sincerely,

LOIS PATSEY,
RICHARD PATSEY.

DETROIT, MICH.,
May 30, 1964.

Senator PHILIP A. HART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HART: I wish to communicate to you the fact that my feelings regarding U.S. military intervention in South Vietnam coincide with those of your colleague from Oregon, Senator MORSE.

I agree with him when he said on the floor of the Senate, " * * * this illegal and unilateral course of action of the United States in South Vietnam could lead to a third world war." I agree with him the war should not be extended to the North. I agree with him that the United States should pull its troops out of South Vietnam and a neutral Vietnam be established.

Proposals contrary to the above would seem to constitute grave dangers to world peace and I would be unable to support an advocate of them.

Yours for peace,

PETER WERBE.

BELEN, N. MEX.,
May 28, 1964.

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

MY DEAR SENATOR: As an American, I wish to compliment you on your daring exposure of the McNamara war in the nation of Vietnam. Indeed, someone must make such, and I want to thank you for doing so. Commonsense tells Americans the war being waged there on our part has no semblance of constitutionality. May I ask, How long will dirty politicians seek to abridge and diminish our constitution and usurp power unto themselves—under the disguise of executive authority?

I can tell you, Senator, there are some in our land who seem bent on bringing about another revolution in America by reason of their insistence on assuming personal power. A people finally tire of such—and the case in point here abounds with just that type of material.

May I say thanks again.

Sincerely,

WM. T. WALKER.

PHOENIX, ARIZ.,
May 28, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I commend you for telling the American people the truth about the war in Vietnam.

I have just written to Senator GOLDWATER concerning his policy of using atomic weapons in Asia and am going to get others to write him our opposition to his foreign policy.

Sincerely,

DOROTHY JACOB.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
May 26, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: If a fellow does wrong, give him hell. Likewise, if he does right, give him a pat on the back.

I listened with great interest to your "Face the Nation" program last Sunday and just wish to say "Bravo." I agree with every word you said. God help our country when there are not a few men in Congress who are not afraid to speak out the truth. There are very few.

Sincerely,

MARIAN S. PHILLIPS.

MAY 25, 1964.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I should have written to you sooner, but have been so busy writing other authorities in and out of government about yours and Senator GRUENING's incredibly patriotic stand for the prevention of nuclear war and getting our boys out of that mess in South Vietnam.

I say "incredible," because "the Establishment" and all the rest of the people making these military decisions for our country seem not to give a damn about our lives or whether we all get blown up in a nuclear war.

It looks like the "pretensions of the Pentagon," as you so well put it, have everyone being pulled around by the nose.

Thank goodness—not you and the dozen or so others—who have had the courage to stand up to the maniacal militarists; not all the military people—but too many of them.

McNamara was on CBS-TV last Thursday in that report to the press. He was very emotional about this South Vietnam involvement, his eyes blazing as he expounded his desires for escalating this war.

It was horrifying to see this lack of sobriety and responsibility in the Secretary of Defense. He positively looked unstable—reminding one of Forrestal.

Well, Rockefeller and Goldwater have toned down their bluster for nuclear bombs and going into North Vietnam. But we'd like some assurance from President Johnson.

The American people will ever be grateful to you for your wisdom and true faithfulness to the welfare of our country.

Gratefully,

Mrs. M. SIEGEL.

P.S.—Your explanation on "Face the Nation" Sunday, will encourage millions of Americans to stand up for their lives. Stupendous, Mr. MORSE.

VENICE, CALIF.,
May 26, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I applaud your courageous and patriotic efforts to get us out of the South Vietnam mess. Do we have to make the same mistakes—and worse—of the French who used ex-Nazi soldiers and criminals to stamp out independence in South Vietnam? Why can't the South Vietnamese have their day in court—the U.N. with all foreign troops pulled out of their country and allowed to vote their own officials into power?

As you know, the present situation is a disgrace. We can "save face" and show the world we still believe in democracy by acting like democrats (small "d") instead of "world conquerors." (Shades of Hitler.)

Thanks again for your noble efforts. I only hope you can get our Government to act sensibly before we get involved into

Respectfully yours,

GEO. PERMAN.

MOUNT VERNON, N.Y.,
May 27, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: Allow me to express my appreciation for the remarks which you have made from time to time in criticism of the policy which we have been following in Vietnam and now in Laos. I would urge that you continue this pressure up the State Department and the President to the end that we shall withdraw our forces and extricate ourselves from this war for which there is neither moral nor political justification.

Very truly yours,

WARREN P. SHEEN.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH,
May 27, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are in complete agreement with your statement on U.S. involvement in the South Vietnam civil war as expounded on "Face the Nation."

We have allowed ourselves, little by little, to be drawn into an untenable position where we have no support from SEATO, Australia, or our Western allies. We do not believe military victory is possible in this guerrilla war or that we can in the long run maintain pro-Western Governments on China's border. Therefore we favor seeking a negotiated settlement of the conflict now.

Respectfully,

R. D. BAUMBACHER,
MARIAN M. BAUMBACHER.

COLUMBUS, OHIO,
May 28, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The administration is obviously planning to compound the folly of its Asian policy by extending the undeclared war in South Vietnam to Laos and North Vietnam. The American people and their Congress are being disregarded, as usual, by the hotheads who are willing to risk war with China.

Would it be possible to suspend the business now before Congress in order to clear the way for unlimited debate concerning the southeast Asia crisis? Certainly there is no issue more important than this one, as it brings us face to face with the question of human survival. Civil rights, unemployment, education, and other issues are extremely important, but an international crisis which carries with it the danger of war with China—and the terrible threat of nuclear holocaust—should be first on the agenda for the time being.

Sincerely,

MARCUS A. BOWEN.

MUSKOGON, MICH.,
May 27, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I was much impressed by your television talk Sunday, May 24. Keep up the good work by letting people know that our boys are fighting an illegal war in the Far East.

The people of America are not aggressive. They desire peace. It is certain influential people with money invested in Asia that want us involved. American boys should not be asked to fight for them.

Sincerely,

ERNESTINE WALL.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
May 28, 1964.

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

I stand back and support your news about the U.S. position in South Vietnam and neighboring areas. I

11992

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

June 2

am ever more deeply worried and I notice the same among the students, and people of all walks of life who are not articulate enough to express their profound anxieties and who have neither newspapers nor public relations offices on their side. All of us thus rely on the courageous men like you who may still be able to prevent even graver mistakes from being committed and even worse horrors being perpetrated; and who, instead, will veer the course toward constructive solutions which are in the true interest of the United States of America.

If I can be of any assistance to you in my field, which is international law, I shall be honored and glad to do so.

Respectfully,

JOHN H. E. FRIED, Ph. D., LL.D.,
Visiting professor of political science,
City College of the City University of
New York; formerly, expert, Judge
Advocate General's Office, U.S. Depart-
ment of the Army; special legal con-
sultant, U.S. military tribunals, Nuern-
berg; member of the Secretariat of the
United Nations.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

DEAR SIR: Today when seemingly there is little hope for the world, may I say, sir, that people like yourself offer a promise of hope. It is too bad there are not more like you. It certainly would make your job easier.

This last Sunday I saw you on "Face the Nation". Although I am a Negro I was not only impressed with your statements on civil rights but also on your comments of the U.N. Getting the facts to the people cannot be overemphasized.

I plan to travel through the State of Oregon on my vacation. And I shall certainly tell my children about you.

Thanks so very much.

GEORGE LAMPKIN,

WHITEFISH BAY, WIS.,

May 27, 1964.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I was so pleased to hear your opinion on the Vietnam situation. The neutralization policy seems the most intelligent projected thus far, if it can be done.

My friends and I would be most willing to make a supreme effort for supporting any move in this direction.

Sincerely yours,

GLADYS SCHOENIKE BOHR.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I applaud your fine speech on the South Vietnam situation. It was wonderful to hear you—and you are a brave and courageous Senator—as you always have been.

You are not my Senator. I am visiting here from Chicago, where I live.

I was fortunate to hear you, and I noticed those in the gallery were enraptured too.

This I know—we must join with that lone voice. Yours is like a voice crying in the wilderness. But it will catch hold and others will stand up and be counted.

I just could not leave Washington without telling you how wonderful you were today, and I am a good Democrat, usually.

Sincerely yours,

IDA ROSE SILVERMAN.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,

May 28, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I just want to tell you how much I appreciate your recent Senate speeches, opposing the war in Vietnam. Every morning when my husband and I read the Times we get quite depressed, until we are lucky enough to find an excerpt from one of your speeches, which gives us a little hope that somebody in the Senate may listen to you and start thinking a little

So thank you very much, both for thinking and for speaking your thoughts. I know that many people support you in your efforts—probably the majority of the people in the whole world. I hope that your constituents appreciate you as much as we do.

Sincerely yours,

JOAN LESTER.

P.S.—It was particularly your May 20 speech which prompted this letter. It was excellent, and quite frightening.

JACKSON, MISS.

May 28, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Washington, District of Corruption.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: How long will Congress allow our boys to be murdered in Vietnam without modern weapons? We have no business there in the first place. Why didn't the aid we have given these countries make them want to help themselves?

Under McNamara the no-win-kill-our-boys policy will wreck this Nation, but Congress has sold out to the State Department, the Justice Department, and the President.

Yours very truly,

JNO C. BATTE.

SANTA ANA, CALIF.,

May 26, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We as parents, of a young marine stationed in Vietnam, wish to express our thanks for your honest, sincere, and uphill stand on our position in Vietnam. May your faithful work and enduring wisdom, be rewarded by our Creator. Your views are shared by me and my wife. Yes, we are Democrats, but have voted twice for a Republican when we thought he was the best choice for our President. As small, humble Americans and parents of a marine in Vietnam, we want you to know, that there are many who share your views on the above matter.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. JOHN T. HUNASKY.

ROYAL OAK, MICH.,

May 23, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: You made me proud to be an American. History will vindicate your stand on this aggression of ours in southeast Asia. There should be a world court of justice similar to the one after World War II. The Nazis were no more guilty than are these scoundrels of ours in South Vietnam with napalm bombs and all the other crimes we commit.

Congratulations on your courageous, forthright vocal stand on our shameful and shameless crimes. You have lots of friends who agree with you.

Sincerely,

WALTER ALLMENDINGER.

MAY 28, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I was in the visitor's gallery of the Senate yesterday May 27, 1964, when you attacked the administration's policy in Vietnam. I was very much impressed by your attack on this senseless slaughter of U.S. forces. The one question I have been left with, is what can the average man on the street do to alert his fellow citizens? Would your office send me a copy of your speech on the Senate floor May 27, 1964, and any other material exposing "McNamara's War."

Respectfully yours,

WILLIAM ZAHN.

Addendum to SENATOR MORSE: Thank you, sir, for your timely warning to the American people. I only hope they will heed the voice

carefully the process of military intervention (based on military modes of thinking) in the process of foreign policy making. To my distress, I find the same patterns operating to some extent here. At a conference some years ago I heard a speech by a colonel who had just come back from Vietnam where he had recommended military assistance as the remedy to be applied. As you say, it was a mistake. But we keep throwing in good money after bad, in an effort to "save face" just as the Japanese did during the thirties.

And when we get in just a little too deep then the Chinese will come along and finish us off—as they did the Japanese eventually, and as they practically did to us in Korea.

I think you are absolutely right to go back to first principles: our treaty commitments and moral commitments under the U.N. Charter. I am attempting to get the tapes of the dramatization of your Senate remarks (and those of Senators FULBRIGHT, JAVITS, et al), and intend to play them for my classes.

If you have extra copies, I would be delighted to have them.

Sincerely yours,

YALE MAXON.

OAKLAND CITY COLLEGE,

Oakland, Calif., May 26, 1964.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The writer is a Naval Reserve officer (retired) with 5 year's residence in the Far East and a Ph. D. in International relations—Far East. I have been listening to Senator MORSE's recent speeches in the Senate on our involvement in Vietnam. I urge you to heed his advice.

I was in Japan in the late thirties and saw the Japanese get sucked into, and then bogged down in, illegal war with China. Casualties mounted, and the mirage of "victory" retreated into the indefinite future, but the Japanese "had a tiger by the tail and could not let go."

The Japanese were an obedient and docile people compared to the Americans. The latter will not support a full-scale war in Vietnam. They are profoundly uneasy over even our present degree of involvement.

If we follow Mr. McNamara's advice and get any more committed than we already are, sooner or later it will be proposed that we employ nuclear weapons to "win." It will be argued that "American prestige" is at stake. Yet the use of nuclear weapons is clearly genocide, against which the civilized world recoils. If we were to use them we would be branded (and rightly) as the world's worst murderers—if, indeed, we did not in the process bring on Armageddon. We must not blunder into this fatal sequence of events.

We must realize that Asia cannot be "protected from communism" or "made democratic" by illegal military support of tyrannical regimes carried out in direct violation of our obligations under the U.N. Charter.

We would be far better off in the long run to try to get the U.N. to handle this—or even to accept the good offices of the French to neutralize the area—than to follow the McNamara policy of expanding the war. This is a time for cool judgment and honest facing of facts. I urge you to reject the McNamara advice which, in an effort to "save face," can only make things a great deal worse than they already are.

The Japanese—who are Orientals and share a common culture with the Chinese—could not subdue China although they mounted a total effort over a period of many years. How much less can the Americans—babes in the wood, comparatively speaking, with a

¹"Control of Japanese Foreign Policy: A Study of Civil-Military Rivalry, 1930-1945," University of California Press, 1957.
See Ochs, Fred, "The Warfare State."

1964

different culture, and vastly further separated in space from China—hope to dominate southeast Asia by means of either half-hearted efforts or full-scale efforts. This thing can become a quicksand—let us avoid it while there is time.

If we intervene, why shouldn't China? This is what happened in Korea, and I believe it would happen here.

Sincerely,

YALE MAXON,
Instructor, Asian Civilization.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,
May 28, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your speech on Vietnam. I am not proud of the way our Government has interfered there. I realize this administration inherited an unfortunate policy from previous ones, but when a method fails, more of the same is not the answer. Since Laos has also erupted we should go to the conference table and seek a solution to southeast Asia by neutralization or U.N. supervised elections. Do we want to confront militarily China's vast hordes? I'm glad my Senator NELSON also spoke up.

Sincerely,

EVELYN C. KNAPP.

OLD FORGE, PA.,
May 29, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just a brief note to compliment you on your splendid performance on "Face the Nation" on May 24, 1964. I agree with all of your views. Keep up the good work.

Very truly yours,

NICK ERMOLOVICH.

LEOMINSTER, MASS., May 26, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We listened to you on radio Sunday and think you were great. We agree with every word you said. We were wondering for a long time already why America is doing everything and not the United Nations.

It is too bad that there are not more men like you in Washington.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. GUSTAV FRICKE,
WALTER LINDERER.

MEDIA, PA., May 28, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Last Sunday evening I heard you speak on the radio as you were being interviewed by members of the press.

I was most favorably impressed by your point of view that the United States should deal with the Far East through the United Nations, and that we should not take matters in our own hands claiming (since it suits us here) that might is right.

Your arguments were well thought out, based on a good fund of facts and relying always on the fundamental principle of the rightness of international law.

I agree with you that this is absolutely the only course of action that the United States should take. I thank you for taking this stand and wish you well in your crusade, and sincerely hope that you can win over many in Washington to your point of view.

Sincerely,

MARY P. ENGLE.

BROOKLYN, N.Y., May 28, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: My hope for the future of my country rests in men like you, and those of your Senate colleagues who share your humane viewpoint.

I have today sent the President the following message:

"DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: If, in our policy of containment, we march our troops up to the border of China, we march ourselves up to the edge of nuclear war. For God's sake, Mr. President, never lose sight of the fact that we live in a nuclear age. If we must not 'lose face' there must, I repeat, must be other alternatives to nuclear holocaust. New York newspapers print the news that you are ready to embark on a 'hard sell' to the American people of the need of sending our troops. Must the Democratic Party always be the war party?"

Very truly yours,

Mrs. BETTY TRAUN.

BERKELEY, CALIF., May 27, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your statements on U.S. involvement in Vietnam. You represent completely my feelings on that subject.

Sincerely,

LILLIAN ELLIOTT.

BAYSIDE, N.Y., May 29, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your speech of May 21 commenting on Mr. Stevenson's U.N. speech, which, at best, was a disgrace.

Could I please have a copy of your speech?

Thanks,

BARBARA A. ZELUCK.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., May 27, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: We commend you on your idea that the United Nations keep the peace in Vietnam. It takes courage to speak out like this. We are glad that you have the combination of this courage and clear thinking. Keep it up.

Sincerely,

ROBERTA HEYER,
WARREN HEYER.

MODESTO, CALIF., May 27, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to comment on your appearance on "Face the Nation" last Sunday. It was, in my mind, the greatest statement made of our foreign policy since Senator FULBRIGHT's Senate speech, on the floor of the Senate.

It is now clear that Ambassador Stevenson is no longer a man with ideas of his own, but rather a "tool of the State Department." If he came up with something new it would be a novelty indeed.

What kind of war is it where the higher rank's have their wives and children with them and it takes a large number of troops just to guard them.

If it is to be a military operation, let it be one, or get out. Man for man, and gun for gun, we could never hope to win.

I can only say that if there should be more Senators like yourself and Senator FULBRIGHT perhaps something would be forthcoming.

Sincerely yours,

DELMER MORRIS.

LAKESIDE, CALIF.,
May 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I appreciate the great effort you are making to stop the criminal war in Asia.

I hope a great many Americans heard your message this month on "Face the Nation."

I should like to receive some of your speeches you have delivered in Congress concerning the U.S. participation in this war.

Yours truly,

LILLIAN ALLEN.

REDWOOD CITY, CALIF.,

May 28, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to express my thanks for your continuing fight regarding southeast Asia. I have kept myself fully informed about the problem, and am convinced that we must withdraw immediately; our presence there is intolerable.

It is equally amazing to me that the State Department can print such drivel and pass it off as "fact sheets" and/or blue books. They must have a very low opinion of the American intelligence, which, I must say, seems to be continually verified, since we continue to send money, and more money, and more money to South Vietnam.

Can you tell me who else to write (besides L.B.J., Kuchel, Engel, Gruening) to regarding this issue?

Most sincerely yours,

EDWARD APPLEBAUM.

YORK, PA., May 27, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: Last Sunday I heard you on TV and I do agree; and hope something can be done to keep our boys from going to Vietnam.

I am sure there are a lot of people who do not think it necessary for us to get mixed up over there, to the extent of sacrificing our young men. Hope you can convince others in Washington to keep our young men out of that war.

Please do what you can, and I will be grateful.

Thank you,

Mrs. STEIN.

MAY 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: I seen and heard you on "Face the Nation" program this morning.

So herewith wish to compliment you on your Christian attitude and convictions as to foreign policy through League of Nations. May God bless you.

Gratefully yours,

WM. R. MORITZ.

CORONA DEL MAR, CALIF., May 27, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We got in on your TV session last Sunday and have to congratulate you on the ideas which you set forth on the Vietnam picture. In our estimation both you and Senator FULBRIGHT are on the right side of the fence. We have the utmost respect for the President and Mr. McNamara but it seems to us that they are fearful to let go of the tiger's tail right now due to the conditions existing in the political arena.

If a few more Democrats would get behind you fellows we believe that there would be quite a change in the Vietnam picture.

Yours very truly,

WARREN S. LOUD.

P.S.—Your work on civil rights is also appreciated.

PALO ALTO, CALIF., May 24, 1964.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for saying officially what I as a private citizen was thinking. I cannot understand why a country with our democratic tradition must continue to support the military adventure going on in former Indochina, caring nothing for the poor nameless peasants who bear the brunt of the napalm and lesser hurts. Now that a United Nations organization exists, I believe it should be respected.

Further, I think we should support the French proposal for a reconvention of the guaranteeing powers of southeast Asia. We should support the French proposal to reduce and discontinue our military operations there, despite this being an election year.

Although I am a California voter, I strongly support your position as stated this past week.

Very truly yours,
Mrs. JANE TAYLOR GORAJ.

NEW YORK, N.Y., May 29, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Last night on the television news program, the announcer spoke of a speech you had made on the Vietnam southeast Asian crisis, critical of the Government stand. However, a thorough search of today's New York Times fails to disclose any mention of it.

I am very seriously concerned with the growing crisis in southeast Asia, and dissatisfied with the position taken by Rusk and Adlai Stevenson. It seems to me we are throwing good money after bad, trying to prop up the military dictatorship in South Vietnam; and even more seriously, we are losing American lives, and are in grave danger of losing many more. Today's announcement that Premier Khanh wants to reunify Vietnam under a non-Communist government sounds very dangerous—a man who can't control the major part of his own country wants to undertake to conquer another. Actually, the original Geneva agreements called for such reunification on the basis of elections, but that was never carried out, and I'm afraid "elections" is a dirty word to Khanh.

What I wanted to say was, that I am very thankful that there is a voice in the Senate opposing further involvement in this war, calling for negotiation not escalation, but I would like to know just what you are saying. When even the New York Times, whose own news reports of the war are what made me so dubious, prints only one side of the matter, it seems as if the American people may be pushed into a very dangerous situation, possibly even a world war, while only hearing one side of the question.

So could you possibly send me a copy of your speech yesterday, as well as those made last week, and also just mentioned in Sunday's Times editorial summary, and any other pertinent material you may have? Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ISABEL MAUES.

MAY 25, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: Congratulations on your honest and forthright stand on U.S. policy in Vietnam as expressed on "Face the Nation." We hope you will be able to convince our California Senators. Please continue to bring your arguments to the American public.

Mr. and Mrs. DAVE LANDY.

TARZANA, CALIF.

May 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We just finished listening to "Issues and Answers" as we do every Sunday at this time. You were superb.

It is such a refreshing experience to listen to a man with such a realistic (and yet idealistic) outlook on our world problems. I only hope you are right in your faith in the American people. No doubt you can see the broader picture, but from this end of our country, the "kooks" (extremists from either right or left) seem to be the most vocal—make the most noise—one almost can believe the whole country is truly "way out."

My husband and I had the pleasure of a fleeting introduction to you some years back.

I didn't want this to turn into a "fan letter" (although we are all your most ardent admirers), but for some reason it is a known fact that the extremists are more vocal and take to pen more often, and these communi-

cations are constantly being referred to as the "voice of the people," that I decided to add my little letter to your pile of "bouquets." (God knows our "public servants" receive enough undeserved "brickbats.")

With all good wishes to you and yours and may God give you many long years of good health and a long, long life. We need more men like you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. (PAUL) ANN M. HERZOG.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want you to know that I support you in your stand against the administrator's policies on Vietnam. To face and speak the truth can be painful and it takes courage; I respect you for this. Enclosed is a letter I have sent to a number of our representatives concerning my attitude toward our policies in Vietnam. I thought you would appreciate a copy at this time. How is the mail running toward Vietnam?

Sincerely yours,

RONALD C. CONANT.

BOSTON, MASS.,
May 25, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: While my letter may have little effect upon our precarious and deplorable policies in Vietnam I find that my conscience and beliefs as an American force me to write this letter at this time, realizing that this statement is long overdue. Not only are we losing a war in Vietnam, but more important, we are losing American lives in a war that can only be detrimental to whatever is left of our image as a Nation founded on, and believing in, the rights of the popular majority to govern itself.

In the past we have supported such men as Batista, Chiang Kai-shek, Syngman Rhee, Diem, and presently Franco and the military leaders in Vietnam under General Khanh. Our support of these men has been based upon their statements that they were against communism. But what were they for? None of them have been for political, educational, social, and reforms of freedom upon which our Nation has been established. Time and truth have exposed these men and their regimes for what they were. The same will certainly be true in Spain and Vietnam. Instead of aiding and supporting the people, we have allowed injustices to continue as long as the countries remained anti-Communist.

What has happened? Without any hope from the United States of pressuring these governments into beginning social reforms, the people have instead turned to the Communists for aid in their plight. Surely we can learn this lesson before it is too late in Vietnam. The Diem regime has been exposed for what it was. The strategic hamlets have been more like concentration camps and have fallen one after another to the national liberation front. The Saigon government lacks the popular support of the people, and can hardly maintain itself outside of that city while the Vietcong roams unmolested with aid from many villages. Raiding Cambodian villages (at the rate of 263 incursions in 1½ years) and killing their women and children is unpardonable. As is bombing Vietnamese villages of no military importance such as Ben Cau and then under the personal supervision of Ambassador Cabot Lodge and Gen. Paul Harkins offering the villagers a few thousand piastres for their dead is reminiscent of the senseless, sadistic, bombing raids of the Nazi Germans on helpless Spanish towns during the Spanish Civil War.

Increasing aid to the Saigon government would not only magnify our defeat when the end comes for Vietnam, but also help the possibilities of a nuclear blockade. Once China enters the war, which she will certainly

do if we further our participation. Our U.S. Army military advisers admit that the morale of the Vietnamese is very low and that they are terrified of the Vietcong. In other words, our soldiers cannot rely upon the Vietnamese to stand up to the national liberation front and fight their own war. The result has been increased loss of Vietnamese and American lives and victories for the Vietcong. How can we carry the war to North Vietnam if we cannot control Saigon, never mind South Vietnam? Bombing North Vietnam would not kill the rebels, but helpless civilians, resulting in further world opinion, including that of our allies, being lodged against us.

Committing American troops to this country has been another proposal offered as a solution to this crisis. This would be folly. The national liberation front is well trained in guerrilla and jungle warfare, while only a very small contingent of American troops, those in special forces, are. In order to win this war our troops would have to occupy every bit of soil in Vietnam since concealment is very easy in the jungles. This of course, would be an impossibility.

Neutralization of Vietnam with a United Nations peace-keeping force is the only solution to the problem with the eventual holding of free elections. Since we have become deeply involved in this country, this move would allow us to withdraw while losing as little prestige as is possible at this late date. Perhaps more important, we would be strengthening the United Nations by showing the world that we have faith in its potential for handling a difficult situation. I have attempted to be realistic and objective as is possible in my evaluation of Vietnam.

Further, we can learn a lesson from our policies in Vietnam, which we should have learned a long time ago throughout South America, Cuba, China, Laos, and Korea. We have given billions to dictators, but not a thought to the people. Man has always lived in hope of something better, and as we have moved to the present period of history, man the world over has become more critical of his situation. If we do not begin having faith in the will of the people to overcome all adversities, both natural and human, which attempt to stifle his right to better his life we might just as well plunge into a grave and cover ourselves over with our shame.

I look back on our revolutionary heritage with pride and hope for the future, but our present policies in places like Spain and Vietnam fill me with anger and disillusion. We must develop a humanitarian foreign policy rather than feeding a money and life consuming military-industrial complex for no other reason than that of Machiavellian self-preservation even if we remain devoid of human responsibility. Certainly the Peace Corps and the United Nations are a beginning and not the end.

If we took all the money we gave and are still giving to these dictators and started aiding the people we would have nothing to fear from the Communists. You may say that this is not "as easy as all that, to give money and other aid to the people while bypassing the leaders," well, all I can say is that these people will then turn to the Communist world for aid in overthrowing their leaders, which has been continually done in the past, leaving us with the dictators without countries to dictate.

I await your reply.

Sincerely yours,

RONALD C. CONANT.

NEW HAVEN, CONN.,
May 24, 1964.

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

Dear SENATOR MORSE: My wife and I applaud your stand on foreign issues as re-

1964

lected in your discussion with reporters on "Face the Nation" today.

I sincerely hope that ways will soon be made available to implement your recommendations, especially as these take good advantage of the presence of the United Nations.

We know that it requires a great deal of courage to speak as you do.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER H. CAPPS.

POMONA COLLEGE,
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY AND
ANTHROPOLOGY,
Claremont, Calif., May 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is to convey my heartfelt thanks for your fine performance on "Face the Nation" today.

It is time that we had some forthright speaking on the mess in Vietnam, and it was both heartening and inspiring to hear you talk as you did. Everything you said was absolutely true.

With all good wishes,
Yours sincerely,

JOHN E. OWEN.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
May 31, 1964.

To Senators HUMPHREY and MORSE.

MY DEAREST FRIENDS: After a long meeting and discussion with the members of my union here, we all agree in one position in common, "we do not want any further involvement in southeast Asia."

Our members here agree with the position taken by Mr. WAYNE MORSE that we spill no more American blood over there.

Some of our members took the position (and I partially agreed) that many of our reasons for fighting on foreign soil are the same reasoning used by the Germans under Hitler.

Personally I think that some of our leaders are just stupid enough to think that the rift between Russia and China is so great that neither would come to the aid of the other if we get an immoral hot war going with China.

We as a nation have no right to allow a hand full of warmongers to decide our destiny and possibly the destiny of the world. I'm sure there is a handful of leaders in the Pentagon who would prefer to burn up the earth rather than give it to the people.

Gentlemen, I am very frightened by our immoral attacks on other countries, including Cuba. I'm convinced that history will prove that "while we were denazifying Germany, we caught the disease."

Gentlemen, I beg you to face up to this plot going on in the meeting in Hawaii. Expose the warmongers. I have a lot of living I want to enjoy.

With best personal regards to both of you, I remain

Your dear friend

ELVIS E. SWAN,
International Representative, RWDSU,
AFL-CIO.

[From the Washington Post, May 29, 1964]

WHERE DOLLARS PROVE HARMFUL
(By Jack Anderson)

Though it isn't mentioned in the appeals to Congress for more aid, one cause of our setbacks in southeast Asia has been the distressing fact that American aid has often corrupted and weakened the men it was supposed to build up.

The United States has poured millions into the jungle kingdoms of South Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand. This was supposed to make them bulwarks against the spreading Red tide, which threatens

Youths were taken out of the rice paddies,

put into American-made uniforms, and elevated to sudden affluence. With their U.S.-guaranteed paychecks, they were able to buy luxuries they had never known existed: wrist watches, transistor radios, fun in town.

Now there often seems to be more fun than fight in them. They dislike giving up their new living standards for the dangers and discomforts of jungle combat.

The taste of luxury has also corrupted many of their officers. They like to have orderlies serve them tea in bed in the mornings. They prefer to ride in jeeps on their patrol missions; they disdain the thought of slogging through the jungle in pursuit of guerrillas.

A few have found they can increase their comforts merely by accumulating more of those wonderful dollars. By failing to report casualties and deserters, for example, officers discovered they could pocket the missing men's pay. Others sell U.S. supplies on the black market in the happy conviction that there's more where those came from.

HOW TO GET RICH

The generals and politicians who have handled American aid have also had a dismaying habit of growing rich in their jobs. The new South Vietnamese leader, Gen. Nguyen Khanh, has found it necessary to shoot embezzlers.

Yet he has been remarkably fortunate in his own finances; indeed, he has boasted that he is worth \$10 million.

In Laos, the Central Intelligence Agency's protege, Gen. Phoumi Nosavan, has been unsurpassed in his opposition to communism. But he has also partaken generously of the fruits of the capitalism he upholds.

When the United States withdrew military assistance, he found it hard to break old habits. He was appointed minister of finance in the new coalition government. Immediately, he founded a private bank which has benefited from his financial policies.

His former U.S.-paid army has fared worse. Deprived of dollars, Phoumi resorted to the printing press to produce the salaries for his soldiers. Result: An outbreak of inflation.

Now he is leading the cry for renewed military aid for Laos.

Though U.S. arms are needed to fight off the Reds, those who bear them somehow must be taught to put principles ahead of profits.

IOU NO. 25—TURN ON THE LIGHTS IN TEXAS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, there is competition in the electric power industry. IOU's—investor-owned utilities—in Montana and Texas vigorously compete for several titles. They are the top contenders for the "light overcharge" championship of the United States.

They vie for preeminence in use and abuse of the restricted stock option, by which company insiders dilute the equity of ordinary investors and obtain millions of dollars worth of tax-free profit from stock purchased at a small fraction of its cost to the ordinary stockholders.

They provide cash contributions and leadership for organizations which would maim, if not kill, the income tax, the United Nations, civil rights legislation, and the companies' competitors, and which view UNICEF as a sinister Communist plot.

Power companies in Texas and Montana represent the industry's leadership ident of Texas Power & Light, and J. E.

Corette, president of Montana Power, each served recently as president of Edison Electric Institute, the trade association of the electric power companies, which constitute the largest industry in the Nation.

This giant industry spends millions of dollars each year questioning the motives of its critics, attacking its competitors—the rural electric and municipal power systems—and berating the Federal Government, which has nevertheless favored the industry with nine tax cuts since World War II. These tax reductions, in many instances, have not been passed on to the consumers who paid those taxes for and to the company.

Mr. President, I am all for President Johnson's exemplary attitude toward economy, in the matter of turning off lights. But more meaningful reduction of costs to the electrical consumer requires illumination of some of the dark recesses of power company operations. We need to turn the spotlight of publicity on these companies.

MONTANA, TEXAS RATES MOST EXORBITANT

I shall first report on the extent of overcharges by Texas IOU's. The January 3, 1963, issue of Public Utilities Fortnightly, an industry publication, carries an analysis of rate of return of electric utilities in 1960. The analysis was presented to the New York Society of Security Analysts by Frank D. Chutter, utility analyst for Massachusetts Investors Trust. It is the biggest mutual fund in the country, with more than a quarter of a billion dollars invested in electric utilities.

Mr. Chutter reported that Montana provided the highest rate of return of any of the 48 continental States—8.7 percent; Texas was next, with 7.4 percent.

Arnold H. Hirsch, a Washington, D.C., utility consultant, analyzed the rate of return for the 3-year period, 1958-60, for the major electric utility in each State. He computed the rates of return by two methods. First, he based the rate of return on Federal income taxes actually paid. Montana was again the highest in the Nation, with 9.3 percent; Texas was second, with 9.1 percent.

Then he computed rate of return based on normalization of Federal income taxes. Montana was again highest in the Nation, with 8.9 percent; Texas was again second, with 8.5 percent. Tables showing rate of return in all States appear on pages 9626-9627 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 4, 1964.

THE \$84 MILLION ANNUAL OVERCHARGE IN TEXAS

During the 5-year period 1956-60, the annual rate of return for Texas electric utilities rose as high as:

Utility	Percent	Amount
Texas Electric Service.....	10.1	(\$80,667,000)
El Paso Electric Co.....	9.6	(16,975,000)
Texas Power & Light.....	9.5	(60,594,000)
West Texas Utility Co.....	8.9	(20,810,000)
Community Public Service.....	8.5	(6,993,000)
Central Power & Light.....	8.3	(38,513,000)
Dallas Power & Light.....	8.2	(33,221,000)
Southwestern Electric Power.....	8.1	(27,448,000)
Gulf State Utility.....	7.8	(26,287,000)
Southwestern Public Service.....	7.6	(28,486,000)
	7.4	(1,133,000)

In parentheses, in the above tabulation I have placed the overcharges to consumers during the 5-year period. By overcharge, I mean profit to the company over and above a 6-percent rate of return, which is considered reasonable by most regulatory commissions and utility experts.

The average rate of return for Houston Lighting & Power, during the 5-year period, was 8.4 percent, which permitted the company to collect \$80,160,000 in overcharges.

The average rate of return for Montana Power—still the light overcharge champion, although hard pressed by Texas companies—was 9.4 percent over the 5-year period, which resulted in an overcharge of \$39,391,000. The total overcharge, over the 5-year period, by the 12 Texas companies, was \$419,287,000; from analyses of company reports compiled by National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, based on taxes actually paid, using data and accounting procedures of the Federal Power Commission.

BIGGER GIVEAWAY THAN DIXON-YATES

Mr. President, to realize the magnitude of these overcharges, to put them in perspective, it is useful to recall that one of the reasons for congressional concern over the Dixon-Yates contract, 10 years ago, was its provision of a 9-percent rate of return for the utility combine. But in Montana, in Texas, and in some other States, the permitted rate of return is frequently or regularly, over a period of years, greater than that which was properly denied the Dixon-Yates group.

The question arises: Why does not the Texas regulatory commission do something about these overcharges? The answer is, there is not any. Texas is one of the few States without a State agency with jurisdiction over electric power rates. Some major Texas electric companies also deny that they come under the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission. In its 1963 report to the Securities and Exchange Commission, Texas Utilities, a holding company whose subsidiaries are Texas Electric Service, Texas Power & Light, and Dallas Power & Light, reported:

Each (subsidiary) utility believes that it is not a public utility as defined in the Power Act and has been advised by its counsel that it is not subject to regulation by the (Federal Power) Commission under such act.

Nevertheless, Texas Power & Light blandly tells the public, through its advertisements, that it is "regulated." I may add that this denial of Federal jurisdiction is made despite the fact that Texas Utilities receives power via high voltage interconnections with the Southwestern Power Authority and Lower Colorado River Authority, which are not Texas intrastate institutions. The electric power companies of this Nation—as the maps in their national advertisements show—are well along on the way toward interconnections that extend far beyond one State's borders. The current president of Edison Electric Institute, Walter Bouldin, said this year that by 1966 "all the major operating groups in the industry will be capable of operating interconnected as a nationwide interregional grid."

But as part of the hokum that attends the electric power industry, the companies tell the regulators one thing, and the public another.

HOW THE RESTRICTED STOCK OPTION WORKS

Key officials of several Texas power companies profit handsomely—and secretly—from use of the restricted stock option. It works this way:

The board of directors grants to selected company insiders options to purchase stock. The option price is slightly below the market price at the time of the option. The market price of Texas utility stocks, as those in many other electric companies, has been skyrocketing for several years. For example, the market value of stock in Texas Utilities has increased more than eightfold since 1950, Southwestern Public Service more than fivefold. Both have had two 2-for-1 stock splits during this period.

The utility executive with options to buy stocks at a previous, much lower price, is going to encourage the inflation in the market value of the stock, so that he can reap an even greater windfall profit, at the expense of the ordinary stockholder and the ratepayer. This, Mr. President, is exactly what is happening in Texas, in Montana, and in other States.

Unlike depletion allowances, no risk whatsoever is involved in the restricted stock option. It is pure gravy. For example, brother officers of the company granted executive A an option on 5,000 shares of stock back in the fifties, when it was worth \$10 per share. He exercises his option now, when the stock is worth \$50 per share. Bingo, he has made a paper profit of \$40 per share, or \$200,000. He can convert that to hard cash, and can pay capital gains—a maximum of 25 percent, but frequently much less—on the \$200,000. But if he is smart, as most utility officials are, he gives the stock away, to his wife, his sons—in one Texas case, to a "prospective daughter-in-law," to a family foundation, or to his favorite charity.

In these cases he does not pay any tax at all. Furthermore, in many cases the full, inflated market value of the stock can be deducted from his own personal income tax.

His family is happy; his favorite charity is happy; he becomes known as a great philanthropist, viewed with reverence and respect even by the ordinary stockholders and ratepayers, who are unaware that it was their money which he gave away, tax free.

A \$350,000 WINDFALL FOR ONE IOU EXECUTIVE

Since 1957, the president of Texas Utilities, G. L. MacGregor, of Dallas, has received approximately \$350,000 in windfall profits under the stock option gimmick. This is in addition to his annual remuneration of \$92,150. His retirement benefits will amount to \$42,438 annually.

W. W. Lynch, president of Texas Power & Light, a subsidiary of Texas Utilities, has received approximately \$200,000 in windfall profits via the stock option during the same period. This is in addition to his annual remuneration of \$100,000 and retirement benefits estimated at \$33,397 annually.

C. A. Tatum, Jr., president of Dallas Power & Light, another subsidiary of Texas Utilities, has received approximately \$100,000 in windfall profits, through the use of restricted stock options, during this period. This is in addition to his annual remuneration of \$70,950. His annual retirement benefits amount to \$30,282.

Through the restricted stock option device, many utility executives pay less than a quarter for stock which costs ordinary stockholders a dollar. For example, on July 12, 1962, Beeman Fisher, president of Texas Electric, bought 204 shares of stock. The market price that day was \$43.50 a share. He paid \$9.72 a share. His annual remuneration is \$70,800 a year; his annual retirement benefits, \$12,123.

The IOU's mentioned above, which comprise Texas Utilities, serve 75,000 square miles in northern, eastern, and western parts of Texas, including Dallas, Fort Worth, Wichita Falls, Waco, Odessa, Midland, and Tyler. But ratepayers in the Texas and Oklahoma Panhandle and in New Mexico also help subsidize utility officials who gouge customers and ordinary stockholders, through use of the restricted stock option. This is accomplished by Southwestern Public Service, which has its headquarters in Dallas.

The chairman of the board of Southwestern Public Service—H. L. Nichols—has made a windfall profit of approximately \$200,000, through use of the restricted stock option since 1957. This in addition to his \$60,000 annual salary and \$12,900 in annual retirement benefits.

A. R. Watson, president of the Southwestern Public Service, has received approximately \$180,000 in windfall profits from exercise of restricted stock options since 1957. This is in addition to his \$55,000 annual remuneration, and \$23,180 in annual retirement benefits.

OPTION WINDFALLS NOT CONSIDERED IN RATE CASES

Mr. President, there are at least five principal adverse effects of utility executive use of the restricted stock option.

First. Little is known, even by regulators and utility consultants, about the profit afforded IOU insiders through the device. It follows that the income from options, in at least some if not all cases, is not considered in rate cases. Hidden income—just as a padded rate base—adds to the consumer overcharge.

Second. Issuance of this cheap stock to company insiders dilutes the equity of ordinary stockholders.

Third. It reduces the company's capital, in that a share of stock sold on the regular market would bring in two, three, four, and sometimes five or six times as much capital.

Fourth. Prospective investors—including the mutual funds and insurance companies which invest heavily in electric utilities—are unable to determine the extent to which stock in a company has been watered, or inflation encouraged, by the restricted stock option. I previously reported to the Senate on May 13—that insiders held options on approximately 10 percent of the stock—