

May 27, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

11505

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

REMARKS OF SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD AT THE MASSACHUSETTS VOCATIONAL ASSOCIATION ANNUAL CONVENTION, NORTH DARTMOUTH, MASS., SATURDAY, MAY 15, 1965

I am pleased and privileged to be here today with those who have made a national and even an international reputation in the vital field of vocational education—the members of the Massachusetts Vocational Association.

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

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

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

But we are making progress in many directions.

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

Today I wish to speak about a vitally critical area that has up to now received far less attention—the very young, the preschool and primary school child.

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

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

Its object was to predict the future for the youngsters.

What kind of people would they have become 10 years hence?

Would they be climbing toward productive lives or on their way to prison?

The factors in this study were the child's family and neighborhood; and for most of the slum first-graders these factors were uniformly bleak—an unknown or absentee father; a delinquent or overly permissive mother; a vice infested neighborhood; grinding poverty on the outskirts of plenty; and the total absence of authority, discipline, and good example, lacking even the elemental germs of culture or worthy endeavor.

On the basis of all measurable influences the sociologists made individual forecasts on the fate of each child and foretold for most a useless and futile life of degeneracy and crime—unless something in the picture changed.

Ten years passed.

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

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

There were 3 deviations; 3 out of 200 were spared.

And when the sociologists inquired as to why, they found that in each case their predictions were upset by the unexpected intervention of an outside influence—a concerned and dedicated grandmother who took over the child's upbringing just in time to cheat the grim pattern of predictability from claiming another foreordained victim.

Surely this episode confronts our people with some jarring questions that do not yield to the comfortable formulations of old.

If these children could be scientifically consigned to prison as infants because of the inheritance they received from society, what light is thus thrown on the theological

dogma of free will, or upon the political concept of free choice, or upon the judicial doctrine of due process of law, in its broadest sense?

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

And if we are to proceed with our war on crime, against what or whom is it to be mounted?

Against conditions which breed criminals with almost infallible mathematical precision?

Or against the youths whose essential crime is that they are the faithful products of their environment, just as much as is the Irish girl in the convent or the Oxford don who wears tweeds, speaks the King's English and conducts learned inquiries?

The questions answer themselves.

Against this sombre background, the familiar remedies—more dogs, longer nightsticks, stiffer sentences, more foot patrolmen, are revealed as non sequiturs.

They are necessary, to be sure.

But necessary for what?

Not to win a war against what we like to think of as an alien condition called crime, but rather to defend society from the retribution of its own undiscoverable product.

We can go on multiplying canine corps and radio patrols until the squad cars outnumber the 6 years olds, and still the streets will not be safe nor the prisons sufficient.

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

The only practical answer, the only intelligible answer—even leaving aside such considerations as idealism and charity—is for society to perform the role of the intervening grandmother for all those 6-year olds who have no interested grandmother, or anyone else who cares enough about them to introduce love, direction and discipline into their lives.

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

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

One of the gravest weaknesses of our society is that its redemptive organs, its saving forces, do not begin to function in most places until too late, until the child has already been warped into a chronic rebel or an incipient lawbreaker.

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

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

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

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

But, things being as they are, can we not go further than the good Commissioner?

Why cannot we set up machinery for periodic physical and emotional checkups from birth on for children enduring those conditions so neatly categorized by the unerring crime forecasters?

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

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

Yet this is the very period when the child is beyond the scope of our civilized institutions and is at the mercy of chance—the chance that he will be granted the blessing of good and enlightened parents.

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

We must lift the veil that shrouds those early years.

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

How about children?

Public policy has begun to move in this direction.

This summer the Federal war-on-poverty program, working in cooperation with hundreds of communities, will conduct preschool clinics for 500,000 youngsters, aged 4 and 5.

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

This effort seeks to bridge the cultural gap and the health gap that yawns so incredibly between the underprivileged and the average.

Its directors are prepared to find that a high percentage of these preschool youngsters are suffering from malnutrition and hearing and eyesight failures which can be corrected.

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

Still other tortured little souls will be emotionally unable, for a hundred dark and unknown reasons, to adapt to the classroom atmosphere without extensive remedial training.

I regard this program as one of the most intelligent and promising enterprises of our time, and I hope that every community will give the fullest cooperation.

But it faces great odds.

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

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

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

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

Would that such concern and care had been available to Lee Harvey Oswald and a million like him who today roam the streets in bitterness and hatred.

What better investment can we make than that which heals the sick and the disturbed child—and prevents the adult invalid or psychopath?

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

But how much more thorough we should be when it comes to children, in their pre-

scious, formative years, who do not know enough to go to a clinic, who do not know yet that they are sick, or that they have been robbed in infancy of that which we rightly declare to be the birthright of everyone.

The new clinics could serve hand in hand with the school facilities I have recommended, facilities financed in part through Federal aid, which has at last come to the assistance of our school systems.

There are two predictable objections to reforms of this kind:

One, we don't have the money.

Two, we don't have the right to meddle with a child's upbringing until a total catastrophe has occurred.

To the first objection I say that we must find the money. And if self-preservation remains man's primal instinct, we will find it, either for more and more prisons and police and perhaps even neighborhood pillboxes, or for remedial programs which fight the variable conditions instead of the constant effects.

And if we are really economy minded, we shall choose the latter, for the cost of curing a child is far less than that of caging a criminal.

We have already found the money for many other worthy programs.

We have already decided as a nation, for instance, that we will finance the medical and mental care of our aged.

Now, in the venerable tradition of first things last, I say again, how about the children?

The second objection, that society has no supervisory role over children until the time they enter reform school, is a foolish sentiment that the people of this country entertained and discarded long ago.

We faced this issue when we were trying to outlaw child labor and establish a minimum age for leaving school.

The self-styled moralists of those days, and the strange spokesmen for the dignity of the family, argued that only the father had the right, a divine and inherent right, to decide the fate of the child and to determine whether his 8-year-old should be schooled, or put to work in mine or factory, or regularly horsewhipped, for that matter.

In time, the American people decided that this was Old World nonsense, that society had a stake in and a responsibility to each child, that freedom was safe only in enlightened hands, and that children had some rights, too.

And besides that, our forefathers had broken with the concept of divine rights as far back as 1776, when they came out for human rights.

That view holds true today—and it must be extended to protect the abused and exploited youngsters of our day.

There must be a way for society to judge whether parents are fulfilling, by any civilized standard, their minimal trust, and a way of intervening, as did the grandmothers, in time to salvage the future of the child.

We all recognize this, of course.

The principle is firmly established in the law.

It is the application of the principle that is wanting.

We must stop waiting until flagrant abuse knocks us over the head, until the child stands in the prisoners dock, or lies in the hospital emergency room, before we assert our interest.

We must perfect our ways of uncovering these tragic miscarriages of trust, so easy to perceive.

I have described one approach, which I hope will receive consideration.

The concept that society must find effective methods of intervening to reverse the tide of disintegration that is engulfing large segments of our people is really at the heart of the practical and unpretentious social revolution of our time. This revolution

finds its most ambitious and hopeful expression in the great programs of reform, rehabilitation and education proposed by President Lyndon Johnson.

But its guiding thought has for many years been the motivation of groups such as the Massachusetts Vocational Association—helping young people to help themselves through education.

Vocational education, in particular, is one of the keystones of our national effort to fight poverty, unemployment and crime.

Few satisfactions can equal that of teaching boys and girls the skills that will sustain them throughout life and enable them to be productive citizens, contributing greatly to the life of their communities.

And few endeavors reap such a harvest of public good.

So many things go hand in hand in our attempt to redeem our American civilization from the demoralization that threatens it.

Building up our schools.

Cleaning up our slums.

Caring for emotionally disturbed.

Ending discrimination.

Opening up opportunity.

Curbing the filth in our movie theaters and on our newsstands.

Controlling the insane traffic in guns and drugs.

Elevating the level of our popular art—television.

Improving the administration of justice.

Caring for neglected children—so many good things to be done.

And we are doing them.

And none is more important than the calling to which you have dedicated your lives.

Teach a boy a trade and you have given him something upon which he can fashion the building of his life.

And so it has been an honor for me to be with you today and to discuss these good causes with pioneers who have for many years been blazing the trail to that greater America for which we all hope and work and pray.

Thank you.

### THE UNDECLARED WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my colleague in the House, Mrs. EDITH GREEN, has made a penetrating and eloquent statement in a discussion in explanation of a recent vote, on which she voted against the President's bill providing for a \$700 million military appropriation to conduct his undeclared war in South Vietnam.

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

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

STATEMENT OF HON. EDITH GREEN REGARDING ADDITIONAL \$700 MILLION MILITARY APPROPRIATION REQUEST MAY 1965

Cloaked in the disguise of a military appropriation bill—this House was asked to approve—and did approve—this Government's policy of escalating the war in south-east Asia. Six of my colleagues and I dis-

Since it is conceded by everyone, including

the President, that the \$700 million was not the issue at hand, then at a minimum, surely, in this body which the Speaker refers to as the greatest deliberative body in the world, there should be full discussion of what this resolution does mean while there is still time, hopefully, to resolve these tragic affairs before we bring down upon our heads the wrath of the world and shatter the frail edifice of world peace.

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

This vote represented—in my opinion—a vote for that delusion. It could not have been a vote for \$700 million, for the President himself said this was available in any case. It could not have been a vote to show our united determination to halt Communist aggression, for if more than a decade of effort, more than 400 American lives, more than \$3 billion expended does not show this, then how can \$700 million demonstrate it?

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

Why bother to ask? Once the bomb is dropped, it can always be pointed out that rightly or wrongly—legally or illegally—we are in a war and that American lives are at stake and that it would be disloyal to not approve funds for the war.

I cannot in good conscience lend myself to that kind of devious usurpation of congressional power—and for the purpose of continuing a course of action which I believe will only reap at best, decades of hostility, enmity and distrust of my countrymen by the peoples of Asia or, at worst, utter catastrophe for my Nation and the world.

Yet but an hour and a half debate was allotted for discussion of a measure which profoundly affects the future of our country—and the world, and less than 15 minutes of that time was given to those who might have reservations—who might have questions—who might disagree. I find it impossible to understand why an admittedly unnecessary appropriation request need be manted in a cloak of urgency and secret meaning with full, free and frank discussion of its merits denied.

May 27, 1965

The high point of these whole implausible proceedings was the speech of one of my colleagues who, in one breath, demanded withdrawal of Government funds to an educational project, because some of the participants criticized administration policy in Vietnam and then—in the next breath—he admirably quotes Senator Vandenberg's statement that "every foreign policy must be totally debated, and the loyal opposition is under special obligation to see that this occurs," and this in the context of demanding for himself and others of the minority party a voice in foreign policy decisions. His exact quote is: "These teach-ins are a protest against the national policy of our country. It seems to me that when we have individuals conducting these teach-ins and acting as leaders in these groups, that it is not in the best interests of the national security of our country for our Government to subsidize this kind of operation by financing projects in which these same people play a prominent role." I can see we are all going to have an absorbing year if we follow the advice of the gentleman from Wisconsin—making certain we don't subsidize free inquiry, but only subsidize thought control.

And yet, I wonder if any policy, domestic or foreign, which its supporters here in this House are unwilling to risk to the judgment of free and inquiring minds can prove anything except on the part of its advocates, an abysmal lack of confidence in its strength. Surely a policy in which one believes deeply can stand examination and discussion.

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

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

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

DETROIT, MICH.,  
May 16, 1965.

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

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

1. Power should not be America's way of dealing with small nations.
2. Our Government must adopt a policy of self-determination of nations without qualification.
3. We demand the \$50 billion now spent by the United States on armaments be used to eradicate poverty at home and abroad with no strings attached.
4. We specifically recommended that the suspension of bombings of North Vietnam be permanent and that the United States immediately seek negotiations to end the war in Vietnam without qualifications as to time,

place, or participants, including the national liberation front and withdraw all foreign troops from that nation in accord with the Geneva agreement.

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

DAVID WINEMAN,

Chairman, Detroit Teach-in, Cosponsored by the Wayne Chapter, University's Committee on Problems of War and Peace, and Wayne Student Committee To End the War in Vietnam.

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

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

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

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

President Johnson is understandably annoyed with the critics of his Vietnam policy—primarily because he is right and they are wrong. Liberal isolationists at home and myopic defeatists abroad—from Walter Lippmann to Charles de Gaulle—have been urging the President to back down, to negotiate with the enemy at almost any price. On Monday Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat of Oregon, called the President's policy "immoral and godless."

What these people object to is the policy of brinkmanship, honed to a fine art by Eisenhower's Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, but practiced to some extent by four presidents, both Republican and Democrat, since World War II. Dulles, defining brinkmanship, once said: "You have to take chances for peace just as you must take chances in war."

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

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

Ike obtained an armistice in Korea by going to the brink, by threatening to bomb Red China beyond the Yalu. He saved half of Indochina by coming to the aid of the beleaguered French with an airstrike, risking 7th Fleet brinkmanship in the defense of Quemoy and Matsu and saved Lebanon by sending in the Marines.

There were foreign-policy losses, too, under Eisenhower. But they resulted from a refusal to go to the brink, a decision to remain passive during the East German revolt

in 1953, the Hungarian uprising of 1956, Red China's seizure of Tibet in 1959 and Castro's take-over of Cuba the same year.

Perhaps the best example of brinkmanship and the resulting coldwar victory for the United States was the show of force by the late President Kennedy during the Cuban missile crisis of October, 1962—a risky eyeball-to-eyeball confrontation which might have led to World War III, but instead sent the Russians home with their tails (and missiles) between their legs.

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

The liberal isolationists and defeatists were wrong when they attacked brinkmanship under Truman, Eisenhower and Kennedy, and they are wrong today. They have failed to learn the lessons of history which teach, as the President put it so well Tuesday: "To stand firm is the only guarantee of lasting peace." What they cannot seem to realize is that defeat in South Vietnam or anywhere else, as the President warned, "would deliver a friendly nation to terror and repression. It would encourage and spur on those who seek to conquer all free nations that are within their reach."

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

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

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

#### LET'S TALK

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

Nonetheless, the United States definitely should take part. For Cambodia is far from the burning issue in southeast Asia. A conference of the nations that met at Geneva in 1954 to reorganize the former French territories in southeast Asia would not talk long about Cambodia. Sooner or later, and probably sooner, the talk would shift to Vietnam. Thus, a meeting called ostensibly to talk about a minor problem could be a device for backing into discussions of Vietnam, where the controversy carries the seeds of world war.

Since April 7, President Johnson has had the country on the record as willing to talk—anyplace, anytime, with anybody—about ways to end the killing. And talk we must. It is no sign of weakness to seek an honorable peace.

The alternative to talk is total war, not just against North Vietnam but against the real power, Red China. That we do not want. But neither do we want all southeast Asia to be swallowed up by a nation that boasts it is bent on conquest.

Negotiation is not the same as surrender. This is a point that was overlooked last weekend at the all-night rally at the University of Oregon. One group there appeared to advocate turning all Vietnam over to the Red Chinese. Period. Another, more realistic, urged that we explore ways to stop the killing.

Also, it is perfectly reasonable, as Senator MORSE said at the rally, that we try to interest other nations, also, in this major threat to world peace. The trouble has been thus far that other nations have been disinclined to help in stemming Communist aggression while Uncle Sam was willing to do it alone.

The meeting at Geneva might be this Nation's chance to throw some of the responsibility to its critics.

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

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

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

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Curry Democratic Central Committee Backs MORSE's Views on Viet," written by Ruth Brewer, and published in the Coos Bay, Ore., World of April 28, 1965.

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

CURRY DEMOCRATIC CENTRAL COMMITTEE  
BACKS MORSE'S VIEWS ON VIET  
(By Ruth Brewer)

GOLD BEACH.—An apparent grass-roots movement supporting Senator WAYNE MORSE on his stand against the war in Vietnam gained strength this week when the Curry County Democratic Central Committee unanimously agreed to go on record as approving the Senator's views.

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

Prior to agreeing to notify MORSE of the committee's stand, members held a lengthy discussion on the Vietnam war, the dangers involved and damage to prestige of the United States as the results of actions in Asia.

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

On the basis of past knowledge, MORSE's fight to get the United States out of the situation, helped by such Senators as GRUENING, of Alaska; FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas; CHURCH of Idaho, and others, and contents of the Eugene talk, the committee appeared unanimously in agreement from the beginning of the discussion.

"Senator MORSE has been carrying this almost alone \* \* \* he needs all the support he can get, and it's time he realizes that he has it," was one comment.

While it was generally thought that many persons in the country do not keep up with the situation in Asia through the news, and

actually avoid trying to understand the complicated matter, "the man on the street is changing his views," another stated.

"If we are trying to impress Asiatics, we aren't doing it \* \* \* they will resent a police state administered by the United States as much as if it were administered by one of the Red countries. (Asiatics) are just interested in putting rice in their bellies and don't care who runs the shoe store down the street," was the opinion of another member of the committee.

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

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

Though the cry of "communism" might soon be raised in speaking out, "let them cry," declared one member. "If there is one thing I abhor, it is communism. I stand for this country and freedom, and it is my duty and privilege to speak out \* \* \* we are not containing communism, we are helping it (by loss of friendship among the nations of the world due to the Viet situation)," he concluded.

Senator MORSE is to be notified of the committee action.

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

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

ARLINGTON, VA.,

May 10, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want you to know that I believe your position in regard to the South Vietnam problem is entirely wrong.

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

It would be interesting, I think, if you would insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some of the communications that you must be receiving which disagree with your views and support the views of the administration and the vast majority of Members of Congress in the handling of the matters in South Vietnam.

With best regards,  
Sincerely yours,

KARL S. LANDSTROM.

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

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

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

Inserting letters in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, contrary to your false implication, does not carry any approbation on my part of any point of view expressed by the writer. The letters do show the great concern of a cross section of the American people in regard to the warmaking aspects of American policy. I insert the letters because I think people who are opposed to the administration's policy are entitled to petition their Government and make known their disagreement with our foreign policy in Vietnam. I intend to continue to insert letters of protest in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

If you will check my insertions in the RECORD, you will find some of them do not disapprove of the United States conducting an undeclared war in South Vietnam. My mail for months has run around 200 to 1 in support of my opposition to our undeclared war in Asia.

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

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

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

MAY 14, 1965.

MR. KARL S. LANDSTROM,  
Arlington, Va.

DEAR MR. LANDSTROM: You certainly are welcome to disagree with my viewpoint on the undeclared war and thereby the unconstitutional war which the Johnson administration is fighting in South Vietnam.

I am enclosing tearsheets from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD covering my two speeches in opposition to the President's recent request for a vote of confidence on his course of action in South Vietnam.

Inserting letters in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, contrary to your false implication, does not carry any approbation on my part of any point of view expressed by the writer. The letters do show the great concern of a cross section of the American people in regard to the warmaking aspects of American policy. I insert the letters because I think people who are opposed to the administration's policy are entitled to petition their government and make known their disagreement with our foreign policy in Vietnam. I intend to continue to insert letters of protest in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

If you will check my insertions in the RECORD, you will find some of them do not disapprove of the United States conducting an undeclared war in South Vietnam. My mail for months has run around 200 to 1 in support of my opposition to our undeclared war in Asia.

May 27, 1965

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

Very truly yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain other letters, articles, and editorials, which I have received, dealing with Vietnam, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Apr. 26-May 2, 1965]

A SOUND INSTINCT AGAINST ASIAN WAR

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

The President at his news conference Tuesday was aware that millions of Americans are haunted by an instinctive if often inarticulate sentiment that our country has taken the wrong course in Asia. Their instinct, we think, is far sounder than his rationalizations. We hope it will continue to make itself felt until the course is changed. The President wisely refused to join some of his subordinates in smearing his critics as appeasers. He appears to invite honest debate, and should be taken at his word.

The rationalization of his policy rests upon a distortion of history and an obscurity of purpose. It demonstrates confusion as to where we have been, and a hazy ambiguity as to where we are going.

Like the Secretaries of State and Defense, President Johnson describes the situation in Vietnam as a simple one of armed aggression by one nation against another, which we have a duty to resist. It is in fact an infinitely complicated case of civil war, growing out of the determination of Asians to throw off the chains of white colonialism, a civil war in which we are involved on one side and the Communist powers on another.

The indigenous Communist-led nationalist movement which now governs North Vietnam began its revolution over 20 years ago, while Indochina was under Japanese rule during World War II, and continued it against the returned forces of France, finally defeating the French decisively in 1954. It called off the war under the terms of an international agreement which provided for military neutralization, independence, and self-determination.

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

Despite 10 years of massive American aid, successive governments in Saigon were unable to gain the loyalty of their people; today the Communists control more than half, perhaps 70 percent, of South Vietnam. They collect taxes, they export rice, they govern, they wage guerrilla war. The United States, having done everything possible to help South Vietnam win its own war, is now in process of taking over and fighting the war itself, at the risk of world war with China and Russia.

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

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

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

The President's reaffirmation of willingness to enter unconditional discussions is welcome, along with his assurance that active diplomatic efforts are being made "every day" to get talks going. Regrettably missing is any hint of ultimate objectives or terms of a peaceful settlement that would show we are ready to accept something else than total surrender of the other side. Talks about what? They are not likely to occur if, in addition to rejecting even a pause in the air bombardment, we give reason to believe that all we want to talk about is the end of North Vietnamese intervention but not an end of our own intervention.

The essential principles of the 1954 Geneva accords, adapted with due recognition of what has happened in the interval, offer a basis for a fair and reasonable settlement. If the President made them the clear objective of his policy, instead of inventing twisted rationalizations for a war policy, he would have the American people overwhelmingly on his side.

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Times, May 9, 1965]

ADVERTISEMENT SPONSORING END OF WAR IN VIETNAM

The sponsors of this advertisement: Rev. Milton Andrews, Rev. Charles Asplin, Rev. Harold Bass, Rev. Herbert Dimock, Rev. John Gill, Rev. Blaine Hammond, Rev. Herbert Lazenby, Rev. George McCleave, Rev. Chadbourne Spring, Rev. Bernard Turner, Rev. Peter Weller, the American Friends Service Committee, Pacific Northwest Region, and the concerned citizens whose names are listed below join 16,916 Protestant clergymen (New York Times ad, Apr. 18); 2,700 clergymen of all faiths (New York Times ad, Apr. 4); 800 faculty members of colleges and universities in the New York City area (New York Times ad, Feb. 28); U.S. Senators MORSE, GRUENING, CHURCH, MCGOVERN, AIKEN, CLARK, and others; U.N. Secretary General U Thant; the leaders of 17 nonaligned nations; and the many thousands of individuals and leaders around the world who have already spoken out in calling on President Johnson to end the war in Vietnam by peaceful negotiations now.

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

We believe the people of Vietnam are as entitled to peace and the opportunity to secure and better their lives economically and socially as are people everywhere, so that the United States must take the lead in bringing peace as quickly as possible to that land, which has known no rest from war for over 25 years.

We, therefore, call on the President to seek an end to the fighting through immediate

peaceful action rather than through rhetoric or show of force.

(If you agree with the views stated above, one direct action you can take is to add your name to this advertisement and mail the page to: President Lyndon Johnson, the White House, Washington, D.C.)

Mr. and Mrs. Lester Achenbach, Norm Ackley, Jeff Acorn, Joseph Airo-Farulla, Jeff Acorn, Mr. and Mrs. John Affolter, Holly Adele, Selma Waldman Adkins, Joeylyn Airo-Farulla, Blair Allen, Gerald Allen, M. J. Allen, Ray Allen, Mrs. W. B. Allen, Bill Allison, Mark H. Anderson, Ruth Anderson, Chuck Angell, Alfred S. Arkley, Mr. and Mrs. Stanley Arkley, Mr. and Mrs. T. R. Astley, P. J. Ater, Gilbert Allen Atkinson.

Eliot Backup, Elizabeth Bagshaw, Mr. and Mrs. Charles M. Bailey, Jackie Barish, Arthur Barnett, Virginia Barnett, Harvie Barnard, Hermine Basnight, William Basnight, Ethel Bass, B. C. Baxter, Rozette Baxter, D. H. Beach, Margie Bell, James E. Bennett, Mrs. Jean Bennett, Mable Bennett, Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Bennett, Fred Berg, J. Lennart Berggren, Mr. and Mrs. Louis Bernstein, Richard Beyer, Audrey Bickford, Mr. and Mrs. Charles M. Bierley Jr., Marilyn Bierman, Mrs. L. D. Bishop, Jacqueline Blanchard, B. Blasko, Lorne Blucher, Walter Bog-gess, Ruth Bonnevie, S. V. Bonnevie, Edward Bostetter, David C. Botting, Diana Bower, Ted Bower, David Box, David Boxer, Julie Boxer, Helen Bradley, Charles F. Brady, Franz A. Bro-dine, Mr. and Mrs. Arnold Brotman, John Broussard, Emmy Buck, Mrs. Stimson Bullitt, John Bundy, Mr. and Mrs. John Burdick, Pat Burks, Stephanie Born, Lillian W. Burns, Joost A. Businger.

David H. Campbell, Caroline Canafax, Leo Canafax, V. E. Carol, Harold Car-son, Beth F. Carter, Victor Case, Del-ber E. Castle, Pearl Castle, Jeremy Caughlin, Pat Cawthon, William C. Chambers, Carla Chotzen, Walter Chotzen, Mrs. W. G. Chritzen, William B. Christie, Mrs. Annabelle B. Christie, Mrs. W. T. Clark, Henry Leland Clarke, Julia Newbold Clarke, Charles Coe, John Collins, Victor Cook, Cecelia Corr, William Corr, Lida Coryell, Prof. Gio-vanni Costigan, Andrew J. Crane, James Carlisle Crane, Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth G. Crane, Mr. and Mrs. Michael B. Crane, Beatrice S. Crouse, Paton B. Crouse, John Crow, Ruth Crow, Virginia Crow, William Crow, Mrs. C. E. Cunningham, Juliet Cun-ningham.

Michael Dalley, Robert Dale, Mrs. A. R. Dannhauer, J. Robert von Dassow, Elaine Davenport, John Davies, Mary Davies, W. J. Davis, Anne Dawson, Jeffrey Dawson, B. W. De Vault, W. A. Dickinson, Altura A. Dodd, Donald A. Dodd, Lorraine Donegan, Ann A. Drury, Roy Dubisch, David Dunham, Jackie Dunham.

Steven Easterson, Al Edelman, Carol Edelman, Roger Cushman Edwards, Mr. and Mrs. N. Ekroth, Lois B. Elkinton, Richard J. Elkton, Dr. Frederick E. Ellis, Robert J. Ellrich, Ruth Emerson, Jo Erickson, Ray Erickson.

J. Kaye Faulkner, Mrs. John E. Fawcett, Mr. and Mrs. John Fiedler, Mel Field-ing, Mr. and Mrs. Ronald Fiege, Lillian Fiest, Laurie Fish, Mr. and Mrs. A. A. Fisher, Edison S. Fisk, Evelyn M. Fiske, Robert G. Fleagle, A. C. Fleishman, Denis Flood, M. Fogelstedt, Mr. and Mrs. David Fogerty, Jane, Forste Robert Forste, David C. Fowler, Sol Frankel, Richard Frazer, Barbara Frazier, John Frazier, Hazel Fritz.

- Vivian F. Gaboury, Barbara Gamble, Robert Garfias, Francis M. Garton, Sidney Gerber, Mary T. Gibson, Evalyn P. Gill, Louise Blue Givens, James Gladfelder, Harry Glickman, Josephine Godsey, Dr. and Mrs. Morris Gold, Dr. Samuel Goldenberg, Henry Goodman, Ruth Goodman, Mrs. Carol Goodrich, J. Goodrich, Diana Gordon, Louise Goshko, Alex Gottfried, Sue Gottfried, Mr. and Mrs. W. J. Granby, Norman Grant, Genevieve Grant, Gordon Griffiths, Mary Griffiths, Eva Gruber, Mr. and Mrs. Ernest Gwinn.
- Claus Halberstaedter, Ollva Halonen, Taimi Halonen, Roberta Hammer, Ellen Hanly, John Hanly, Orvel Hansen, Mr. and Mrs. Wesley M. Hansen, Isabel Harlock, Ray Harlock, Marita Harris, John Hart, Ben Harwood, Sylvia Havlisch, Mary O'Neill Hayes, John Healy, Lonnie Healy, Ralph Heino, Mrs. E. W. Helander, Martha Hennen, Marjorie Herford, Ernestine Herr, Dr. George B. Hill, Theodore M. Hiltner, Mrs. Francis Hoague, Irwin Hogenauer, Mary Hopkinson, Hazel Horder, Florence Hornig, Grace Howard, Eric W. Hoyte, Virginia B. Hoyte, Wanda Hubbard, Hildur Josephine Hughes, Mr. and Mrs. William R. Hughes, Irene Hull, Walter Hundley, Katherine Hunter, Mr. and Mrs. George Hurley, Raymond Immerwahr.
- Dorothy Jackins, Robert L. Jackson, Roger Jackson, Sue Jackson, Mr. and Mrs. Vernon Jackson, Ann Jacobson, Charles James, Etta Marie James, Larry James, Dr. and Mrs. Charles M. Janeway, David Javorsky, Karen Johansen, Alice Johnson, Leif Johnson, Michael R. Johnson, Sharon M. Johnson, Robert S. Johnson, Robert S. Johnson, Ruth Johnson, Mrs. Robert B. Jones, Sheila Jones, Mildred Joyce.
- Howard Kaminsky, Annette Kaplan, Helen Karr, Milton Karr, Prof. and Mrs. Max Katz, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Kauffman, Dr. Abraham Keller, Mignonette Keller, Dr. and Mrs. Ward Kennedy, Martha Kennen, Harold Kerney, Robert H. Kerr, Robert W. Kessel, Rev. Eugene Kidder, Dorothy M. Kistler, Elmer C. Kistler, Joan Klyn, Mark S. Klyn, Camille Knatvold, Arthur Kobler, Virginia Kobler, Rev. J. C. Kone, Ancl Koppel, Carol Ann Koppel, Jane Krahl, Robert Krahl, Frank Krasnowsky, Aki Kurose.
- Kathy Ladd, Dr. Arthur Lagawier, Lee Landrud, Margery D. Lang, Guy Lares, Lillie Larsen, Mrs. Harold Laughlin, Mr. and Mrs. Harry Levine, Helen Levin, Arthur N. Lewis, Charline Lewis, Paul Lichter, Don Little, Marian Lobasc, Mr. and Mrs. Herbert Lobl, Mr. and Mrs. Ronald Lockwood, Dr. and Mrs. Ernest Loeb, Patricia Loken, Eugene V. Lux, Lillian C. Lux, Timothy Lynch.
- Dr. Sylvia Maccoll, Dr. W. A. Maccoll, Dr. Donald F. Magee, Mrs. S. Manarolla, Mr. and Mrs. David A. Manning, Betty Jean Martinson, Mr. and Mrs. Christ Martinson, Judith W. Matchett, Robert S. Maynard, Deta McEvoy, Mr. and Mrs. E. C. McIntosh, Marguerita McIntosh, Irene McMahlil, David C. Meekhof, Mrs. Sophie K. Meld, Ramona Memmer, Barbara Mercer, Lyle Mercer, Flora Merrill, Mr. and Mrs. Charles A. Metcalf, Stephen L. Michael, Mrs. Alda J. Michael, Dr. and Mrs. Ward C. Miles, Ronald Moe, Mrs. J. B. Mohler, Sally Moore, Wallace Moore, Mr. and Mrs. James Morland, Arval Morris, Rosemarie Morris, Mr. and Mrs. Edgar A. Morrison, Mrs. James B. Morrison, Mr. and Mrs. Michael Mottelson, Mrs. Grace B. Moulton, Bill Murphy.
- John Neal, Mr. and Mrs. David Nicholson, Mr. and Mrs. Ray C. Nicholson, Anna E. Nilsen, John R. Norton, Kae Norton, Ted Norton, L. K. Northwood, Olga Northwood, Elizabeth P. Nunn.
- Eugene Oliver, Jo Ann Oliver, Marian C. Olson, Robert S. Olsen, Gerald Oppenheimer, Mildred Oppenheimer, Elizabeth Orians, Gordon Orians, Simon Ottenberg, Eleanor Owen, Charles Ozure.
- Douglas Palmer, Ida Palmer, Jo Patrick, Mrs. Edith Patten, Fred Van Patten, Dorothy Patterson, Rev. John Paulson, Mr. and Mrs. Clayton A. Paulson, H. Pedersen, Mrs. Ruth Peoples, Rodney J. Peterson, Ruth Peterson, Mrs. A. H. Phillips, Sanford Pinsker, Mr. and Mrs. Carl O. Pisk, Bernard Poil, Orobelle Poil, Ruth Pool, Mr. and Mrs. Viggo Povlsen, Mrs. J. C. Price, V. Price, Garth Putnam, Kay Quinn.
- Marjorie Rabbit, Miriam Rader, Sylvia Ragan, Dee Wardall Raible, Jarold W. Ramsey, Constance Raphael, Dean Raphael, Conner Reed, Mary T. Reed, Richard J. Reed, Robert Reed, D. E. Reinhardt, Margo Reinsch, Robert E. Renk, Clint Reynolds, Isabelle Reynolds, Mr. and Mrs. Paul M. Rice, James G. Richard, Lorna Richards, Edith Rigg, Ron Ringdahl, Eugene F. Robel, Thorun Robel, Mr. and Mrs. R. A. Rocz, Kathleen Bollefson, Violet Roraback, Mike Rubicz, Steve Rubicz, Mrs. Rose Rudnick, Mr. and Mrs. John J. Runnings.
- Selma Sachs, Roger Sale, Richard Saling, Brian M. Scheffer, Linda Scheffer, Victor B. Scheffer, Beth Scheffer, Agnus Schmoee, Ken Schmoee, Dorothy Schroeter, Mrs. Alice E. Schwartz, Dr. and Mrs. Lawrence Schwartz, Mr. and Mrs. William Schwartz, Rose Scott, Alan Selker, Lisa Selker, Lule D. Sellards, Mrs. Louise Shaffrath, Mrs. Joanne Shaw, Stanley T. Shaw, Clara Shaw, Eleanor Stegl, Henry Stegl, Edward Singler, Joan Singler, Edith R. Smith, Edward Smith, Edward A. Smith, Ellen McComb Smith, Mr. and Mrs. Norman C. Smith, Mrs. Watson Smith, Martha M. Smyser, Howard B. Snyder, Margaret Snyder, Edith Soden, Joseph Sommers, Soren Sorenson, Thaddeus H. Spratten, Eleanor Springer, Claire Stafford, Marietta Stark, Roger B. Stein, Edward H. Steinberg, Elva Steinborn, Elaine Steinbrueck, Mr. and Mrs. John Stenhouse, Robert G. Stephens, Joseph Stevens, Mr. and Mrs. John Stanhouse, Robert G. Stephens, Josephine Stevens, Mr. and Mrs. John R. Strickland, Mr. and Mrs. J. D. Strittmatter, Lucy M. Stoy, Lucy N. Stoy, Robert F. Stoy, Mr. & Mrs. Jack I. Sussman, Grace Suzuki, Mrs. Ruth Swanson, Tom Sykes.
- Ronald Tierandson, Tacoma Friends Meeting, Calvin Y. Takagi, Ken Takashima, Helen Talbott, Mary G. Tally, Dr. Souren Tashian, Margaret Terrell, Donald W. Thayer, Sarah Thiel, Mr. & Mrs. Robert Thode, Jack P. Tingstad, Dr. Richard Tinker, A. W. Tinsley, Hazel Tinsley, Barbara Tomlinson, Ralph Toporoff, Imogene Truman, George T. Tsutakawa, Dean M. Tuell, Jane Turner, Maurine Tuttle.
- Betty Lou Valentine, Mr. and Mrs. T. J. Van Ermen, Mr. and Mrs. John Van Horne, J. M. Van Houten, Jr., Mr. and Mrs. Viggo.
- Jean Wilson Wagner, Ella Wald, Fern Wales, Mary Frances Wallace, Rev. Robert Waller, Vera Waller, Mr. and Mrs. John Ware, Colleen M. Waterhouse, Leslie Warner, Tom Warner, Lars Watson, Lucille Watson, Carol R. Weller, Leonard Wessels, Carl West, Helen West, Frances Wester, Mr. and Mrs. A. G. Westman, Doris G. Westman, Winifred E. Weter, John H. Whittenbaugh, Dorothy Wittington, Michael Wlater, Karen Wilkie, Dorothy E. Willard, John W. Willard, Ford Williams, Ida Williams, Mrs. Margaret Williams, Philip Williams, Vivian Williams, Mr. and Mrs. Russell L. Willman, Marjorie M. Wilson, Patricia Wilson, Dr. William S. Wilson, Mrs. Lawrence Windoffer, Alice Woodmansie, Edward Woodmansie, William Wooten.
- Dr. and Mrs. S. E. Yarnell, Marion Yurman, Richard Yurman, Barbara Zepeda, Julian Zepeda, Dean F. Zuck, Joyce Bennett, Dr. Thomas A. Billings, Clara Fraser, Ruth Fawcett, Margaret Kelly, Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth A. Kirkpatrick, Walter B. Laffer II, Ruth Little, Dorothy W. Melland, Marie Severtson, Charles Valentine, Richard W. Wilkie, Patricia L. Woll, Mr. and Mrs. Edward Yellin, William C. Berleman, Bud Havlisch, Donald A. Fox, David McClary.

(This ad paid for by the above signers.)

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, May 9, 1965]

#### A REPLY TO SECRETARY RUSK ON VIETNAM

In his address on April 23 before the American Society of International Law, Secretary of State Dean Rusk attacked academic critics of the administration for talking "nonsense about the nature of the struggle" in Vietnam. He continued: "I sometimes wonder at the gullibility of educated men and the stubborn disregard of plain facts by men who are supposed to be helping our young to learn—especially to learn how to think." This abusive language suggests that the administration wants to silence its critics.

This suggestion is confirmed by insinuations from other administration spokesmen about the loyalty of such critics. Precisely in this time of crisis, however, the academic community has both a right and an obligation to point out hazards and inconsistencies in our military and diplomatic policy.

It is easy to see why the Secretary of State is angry. The reasons have nothing to do with "gullibility" in the academic community. He is angry because the facts and wider considerations brought up by these critics have contradicted so many official pronouncements. It is not the scholars but the leaders of the administration who have shown a "stubborn disregard of plain facts."

#### "PLAIN FACTS?"

For example, on March 25, 1965, President Johnson said, "We seek no more than a return to the essentials of the agreements of 1954—a reliable agreement to guarantee the independence and security of all in south-east Asia." But the "plain fact" is that the Geneva agreement did not provide for a division of Vietnam into two nations. On the contrary, the agreement spoke of the two parts of Vietnam as "regrouping zones" and said that "the military demarcation line is provisional and should not in any way be interpreted as constituting a political or territorial boundary." It provided that "general elections shall be held in July 1956, under the supervision of an international commission." No such unifying elections have been held. The Saigon regime, with U.S. approval, refused. Ever since, the United States has insisted that Vietnam remain divided.

On April 7, 1965, the President gave another description of the administration's goals. He said, "Tonight Americans and Asians are dying for a world where each people may choose its own path to change," and further on: "Our objective is the independence of South Vietnam, and its freedom from

attack. We want nothing for ourselves—only that the people of South Vietnam be allowed to guide their own country in their own way." The "plain fact" is that the scale of American intervention is incompatible with the goal of self-determination. North Vietnam has, to be sure, intervened by helping the Vietcong. But at every stage of the war the scale of American intervention has been far greater. The manner of combat shows that we have saturated South Vietnam with every kind of military equipment the terrain allows. We airlift troops and supplies continually. We drop napalm on civilian populations intermingled with guerrillas. We burn and defoliate crops and forests. We have resorted to incapacitating gas. An intervention as massive as this does not furnish a choice to the people. It deprives them of one.

"STUBBORN DISREGARD OF PLAIN FACTS?"

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

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

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

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

WHAT CAN BE DONE?

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

We demand that the administration return to the "plain facts" and make an earnest attempt to obtain a negotiated peace. Reiteration of the phrase "unconditional discussions" is not enough, especially because the condition is attached to it that the rebel forces in the civil war are not to appear at the conference table. Peaceful intentions can be made plainer than this. We must arrange for an immediate cease-fire and offer to negotiate with the principal combatants, including the Vietcong; we must cease our air raids on North Vietnam; we should use the good offices of the United Nations in bringing about these ends and; we must assure the world that we will not use nuclear weapons in the pursuit of victory or in the "pursuit of peace."

ANDOVER NEWTON THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL  
 Walter H. Clark, psychology of religion.  
 Harvey G. Cox, theology and culture.  
 Vincent deGregoris, religious drama.  
 J. Leslie Dunstan, missions.  
 Frances W. Eastman, religious education.  
 Wesner Fallaw, religious education.  
 Nels F. S. Ferre, theology.  
 S. Maclean Gilmour, New Testament.  
 Norman K. Gottwald, Old Testament.  
 John H. Scammon, Old Testament and Hebrew.

Earl J. Thompson, Jr., church history.  
 Joseph C. Williamson, theology.

BOSTON COLLEGE

Eugene Bushala, classics.  
 Edward J. Collins, history.  
 Sister Terese Anne Donovan, history.  
 John M. Von Feisinger, psychology.  
 John L. Heineman, history.  
 Edgar Litt, political science.  
 Raymond T. McNally, history.  
 Allen Wakstein, history.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

William J. Alston III, physics.  
 Saul Bernstein, social work.  
 William P. Bryan, chemistry.  
 Amiya Chakravarty, physics.  
 Bernard Chasan, physics.  
 Robert S. Cohen, physics.  
 Paul Deats, Jr., theology.  
 Alvin L. Denman, human relations center.  
 Anthony J. DeVito, modern languages.  
 L. Harold DeWolf, theology.  
 John Endicott, chemistry.  
 Frank Giese, modern languages.  
 Sonja K. Gross, chemistry.  
 Robert H. Hamill, chaplain.  
 Kenneth Haygood, education.  
 George E. Hein, chemistry.  
 Walter L. Holcomb, theology.  
 Wayne B. Jones, theology (registrar).  
 Frederick Koss, social science.  
 John H. Lavelly, philosophy.  
 Jean Lennox, biochemistry.  
 Paul Liacos, law.  
 Robert E. Luccock, theology.  
 John L. Maes, theology.  
 Dorothy Meckel, modern languages.  
 Banks McDowell, law.  
 Ronald M. Milburn, chemistry.  
 William Clifton Moore, theology.  
 Walter G. Muelder, theology.  
 Paul Nash, education.  
 Freda G. Rebelsky, psychology.  
 Miriam M. Ritvo, human relations center.  
 Eugene C. Roemele, law.  
 Julius A. Roth, sociology and anthropology.

ogy.

Donald T. Rowlingson, theology.  
 S. Paul Schilling, theology.  
 Armand Siegel, physics.  
 Peter E. Siegle, education.  
 John F. Smith, chaplain.  
 Robert H. Sproat, English.  
 John Stachel, physics.  
 Robert L. Treese, theology.  
 Marx W. Wartofsky, philosophy.  
 James B. Whipple, education.  
 Charles R. Willis, physics.  
 Alvin D. Zalinger, sociology.

BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY

Herbert H. Aptekar, social work.  
 Joseph S. Berliner, economics.  
 Leo Bronstein, fine arts.  
 David Buchsbaum, mathematics.  
 Oscar P. Chilson, biochemistry.  
 J. Cobb, psychology.  
 Helen Codere, anthropology.  
 Joseph L. Cohen, biochemistry.  
 Lewis A. Coser, sociology.  
 George Cowgill, anthropology.  
 Jean Danner, biochemistry.  
 Betty Davidson, biochemistry.  
 Samuel James Davidson, biochemistry.  
 P. Diamandopoulos, philosophy.  
 Robert O. Doyle, physics.

James Duffey, European languages.  
 Kenneth Feigenbaum, psychology.  
 Gordon Fellman, sociology.  
 Joachim Gaehde, fine arts.  
 David S. Gil, social work.  
 Ray Ginger, history.  
 Eugene P. Gross, physics.  
 Allen Grossman, English.  
 Thomas C. Hollocher, biochemistry.  
 Joseph W. Infelburg, biology.  
 David Kaplan, anthropology.  
 Nathan O. Kaplan, biochemistry.  
 Jacob Lauren, fine arts.  
 Harris I. Lehrer, biochemistry.  
 S. S. Lehrer, biochemistry.  
 Lawrence Levine, biochemistry.  
 Denah Lida, European languages.  
 Farnsworth Loomis, biochemistry.  
 Heinz Lubasz, history.  
 Robert A. Manners, anthropology.  
 Stephen Miller, social work.  
 Robert Morris, social work.  
 William T. Murakami, biochemistry.  
 Joseph S. Murphy, political science.  
 Richard Onorato, English.  
 Robert Perlman, social work.  
 Arthur Polansky, fine arts.  
 Thomas E. Ragland, biochemistry.  
 Jessica E. Reimann, biochemistry.  
 Karl Reisman, anthropology.  
 Benson Saler, anthropology.  
 Stanley N. Salthe, biochemistry.  
 Gordon Sato, biochemistry.  
 Morris S. Schwartz, sociology.  
 John Scott, social work.  
 Violet M. Sieder, social work.  
 Richard Silverstein, biochemistry.  
 Mitchell Sporin, fine arts.  
 Philip E. Slater, sociology.  
 Morris Soodak, biochemistry.  
 Mark Spivak, sociology.  
 Maurice R. Stein, sociology.  
 Arnold Strickon, anthropology.  
 Sahl Swarz, fine arts.  
 Norbert I. Swislocki, biochemistry.  
 Marie Syrkin, English.  
 Jerome H. Targovnik, biochemistry.  
 Helen Van Vunakis, biochemistry.  
 Eugene Walter, sociology.  
 Rolad C. Warren, social work.  
 Alex Weingrod, anthropology.  
 Robert S. Weiss, sociology.  
 Kurt H. Wolf, sociology.  
 Irving Kenneth Zola.

BROWN UNIVERSITY

Allan Clark, mathematics.  
 William Crossgrove, German.  
 Alan Howard, mathematics.  
 Michael Rosen, mathematics.

CLARK UNIVERSITY

Charles Blinderman, English.  
 Abraham Blum, psychology.  
 Walker Crockett, psychology.  
 Gerald N. Grob, American history.  
 J. Fannin King, romance languages.  
 J. Richard Reid, romance languages.  
 Mordecai S. Rubin, romance languages.  
 Morton Weiner, psychology.

COLLEGE OF THE HOLY CROSS

Charles A. Baker, French.  
 William Van Etten Casey, S.J., theology.  
 Thomas M. Coffee, sociology.  
 Joseph F. Donahue, S.J., theology.  
 John H. Dorenkamp, English.  
 Joseph M. Fallon, S.J., sociology.  
 Aldo Fortuna, English.  
 James A. Gross, economics.  
 Leon E. Lewis, English.  
 Frank Petrella, Jr., economics.  
 Paul Rosenkrantz, psychology.  
 Donald F. Traub, philosophy.  
 John H. Wilson, English.

DARTMOUTH COLLEGE

L. H. Noda, biochemistry.  
 Donald E. Ollins, biochemistry.  
 Milton J. Rosenberg, psychology.  
 Melvin V. Simpson, biochemistry.

Andrew Szent-Gyorgyi, cytology.  
Arnold Wishnia, biochemistry.

**EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL**

Carl Edwards.  
Hubert L. Flesher.  
Joseph Fletcher.  
L. G. Patterson.  
Charles Smith.  
Owen Thomas.  
William Wolf.

**GODDARD COLLEGE**

Frank T. Adams, Jr.  
Donald M. Barnes, history.  
George Beecher, education.  
Corinne Elliot.  
Vincent Erikson, anthropology.  
Francis Fay.  
Wilfred G. Hamlin.  
Jerome Himeloch, sociology.  
Erland Jacobsen, literature.  
W. Allen Last, chemistry.  
Laurent LaVallee, economics.  
Corinne W. Mattuck.  
Robert Mattuck, literature.  
Arthur Mitzman, history.  
Steven J. Noren, philosophy.  
William E. Osgood, librarian.  
Buryl Payne, psychology.  
Thomas R. Whittaker, literature.  
Thomas Yamamoto, art.  
David York.

**HARVARD UNIVERSITY**

James Luther Adams, divinity.  
Stephen L. Adler, physics.  
Henry D. Aiken, philosophy.  
Charles M. Allen, Jr., chemistry.  
William L. Alworth, chemistry.  
Harold Amos, bacteriology.  
W. French Anderson, bacteriology.  
John S. Ansow, English.  
Joan Argetsinger, biology.  
Ralph Balerlein, physics.  
Gerald Barnes, philosophy.  
G. Octo Barnett, medicine.  
Jonathan Beecher, history.  
Ursula Bellugi, social relations.  
Marshall Berman, government.  
A. Blendenstock, engineering.  
Richard Bienvenn, history.  
A. Blumenthal, cognitive studies.  
Dwight Bollinger, romance languages.  
Raoul Bott, mathematics.  
Boyce W. Burge, medicine.  
Mary E. Burge, American civilization.  
Frank P. Casa, romance languages.  
David F. Cavers, law.  
David Wade Chambers, history of science.  
Jon Clardy, chemistry.  
Richard A. Cone, biology.  
Ian Cooke, biology.  
Stephen Coutts, chemistry.  
Frank Cross, Near Eastern languages.  
Richard D'Ari, biology.  
P. J. Dart, biology.  
Bernard D. Davis, bacteriology.  
Julian Davies, bacteriology.  
David Denhardt, biology.  
Howard Doldfine, bacteriology.  
Donald Dubin, bacteriology.  
Leonard M. Faltz, bacteriology.  
Ann E. Farnham, bacteriology.  
Ned Feder, biology.  
Robert E. Fenichel, applied physics.  
Sam Fillenbaum, cognitive studies.  
Gordon Finley, social relations.  
Stephen J. Fischer, education.  
Michael Fried, fine arts.  
W. H. Furry, physics.  
E. Fursphan, medical school.  
George Gaylord Simpson, archeology.  
F. W. Gehring, mathematics.  
Barry Gewen, American civilization.  
Stephen J. Gewirtz, mathematics.  
Walter Gilbert, physics.  
Stephen Gilman, romance languages.  
Owen Gingerich, astronomy.  
David M. Gitlitz, romance languages.  
Harvey R. Glasser, Russian research center.  
Eugene Godfredsen, astronomy.

Rabbi Ben-Zion Gold, Hillel adviser.  
Howard Goldfine, bacteriology.  
James Gordon, general education.  
Luigi Gorini, bacteriology.  
Martin Gouterman, chemistry.  
Joseph C. Grannis, education.  
Ann Graybiel, biology.  
Walter Grossman, history.  
Jean Harrison, biology.  
Chester W. Hartman, psychiatry.  
Jay Hauben, physics.  
Nicholas L. Heer, Middle Eastern studies.  
Stephen Heinemann, biology.  
D. Heller, medical school.  
Kenneth J. Hertz, mathematics.  
Steven Hess, romance languages.  
Mahlon B. Hoagland, bacteriology.  
K. Hoffman, mathematics.  
Charlotte Hogsett, romance languages.  
Richard A. Holt, physics.  
Mathilda Holzman, psychiatry.  
Donald Hubbard, education.  
H. Stuart Hughes, history.  
Garrett M. Ihler, biology.  
William Irvine, astronomy.  
Kurt Isselbacher, gastroenterology.  
Robert M. Jackson, romance languages.  
R. V. James, engineering.  
R. V. Jones, engineering.  
Wolfgang Kalhofen, astronomy.  
Leon R. Kass, chemistry.  
Stanley N. Katz, history.  
Gordon D. Kaufman, divinity.  
Myron Kaufman, chemistry.  
Jerry L. Kazdan, mathematics.  
Roger Kelleher, medical school.  
Steven L. Kleiman, mathematics.  
Jerome H. Klotz, statistics.  
Mike Konrad, biology.  
E. Kravitz, medical school.  
Lawrence B. Lapson, astronomy.  
John H. Law, chemistry.  
David Layzer, astronomy.  
Jeana D. Leventhal, bacteriology.  
David H. Levey, economics.  
Pavel Machotka, social relations.  
Martin Lubin, pharmacology.  
Michael Manove, mathematics.  
Gerald Marsden, education.  
Paul Martin, physics.  
Ann Matthyse, biology.  
Jo Ann D. Medalie, psychiatry.  
Jacques Mehler, cognitive studies.  
Everett Mendelsohn, history of science.  
Martin Micheren, biology.  
Stanley Milgram, social relations.  
Henri E. Miltler, astronomy.  
Edwin E. Moise, education.  
Clarence L. Morgan, medical school.  
Barrington Moore Jr., Russian research center.  
David Morrison, astronomy.  
W. H. Morse, medical school.  
David Mumford, mathematics.  
Leonard Nash, chemistry.  
Franz Nauen, history.  
Peter Neumeyer, school of education.  
Pearn P. Miller, applied physics.  
Frederick A. Olafson, education.  
William E. Palke, chemistry and physics.  
Phillip Pearle, physics.  
Martin Peretz, government.  
Edward Pincus, visual arts center.  
Gerald Platt, social relations.  
Mordea Jane Pollock, romance languages.  
Mary C. Potter, cognitive studies.  
W. M. Preston, physics.  
Charles Price, university preacher.  
Mark Ptashne, biology.  
L. F. Quigley Jr., school of public health.  
David L. Ragozin, mathematics.  
Benito Rakower, school of education.  
Lillian Randall, rad. grad. ctr.  
Jonathan F. Reichart, physics.  
Edward Rendall, medicine.  
James L. Rice, Slavic languages.  
Herbert Richardson, divinity.  
Anne Roe, education.  
Constance H. Rose, romance languages.  
Larry Rosenberg, psychiatry.

Judy F. Rosenblith, psychiatry.  
Robert A. Rosenthal, cent. res. & devel.  
Robert A. Rothstein, Slavic languages.  
Susan Rubin, romance languages.  
Jon Rubinstein, history.  
Rose Sabaroff, education.  
Carl Sagan, astronomy.  
Israel Scheffler, education.  
Bartholomew P. Schiavo, history.  
L. H. Scott, history and literature.  
Richard Sennett, American studies.  
Victor W. Siedel, medicine.  
Raymond Stever, geology.  
David S. Sigman, chemistry.  
B. F. Skinner, psychology.  
Rev. Reginald Smart, chaplain.  
Frank Smith, cognitive studies.  
H. Warren Smith, chemistry.  
Joseph L. Snider, physics.  
Sergei P. Sorokin, anatomy.  
P. A. Sorokin, sociology.  
Bessie Sperry, education.  
John Spiegel, social relations.  
Max L. Stackhouse, divinity.  
Peter Stansky, history.  
Jeffrey Steinfeld, chemistry.  
W. Stolz, mathematics.  
Stephen Strom, astronomy.  
Marsha H. Swislocki, romance languages.  
Kenneth Taylor, history of science.  
Karl Teeter, linguistics.  
Ruth D. Terzaghi, applied physics.  
Abigail Thernstrom, government.  
Stephen Thernstrom, history.  
Allan Tobin, biology.  
Stephen V. Ullman, mathematics.  
Dorothy V. Vivian, romance languages.  
Lise Vogel, fine arts.  
Thomas von Foerster, physics.  
Ruth Wald, biology.  
George Wald, biology.  
Donald Wallach, biological chemistry.  
William P. Weber, chemistry.  
Charles A. Whitney, astronomy.  
D. V. Widder, mathematics.  
George Williams, divinity.  
Thomas H. Wilson, physiology.  
David E. Wolfe, anatomy.  
Peter N. Wolff, medicine.  
James P. Wright, astronomy.  
Danny Wulff, biology.  
Lawrence Wylie, social relations.  
Linda Zak, romance languages.  
Robert Zevin, economics.

**MASSACHUSETTE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY**

Marcia K. Allen, biology.  
Joseph Altman, psychology.  
Warren Ambrose, mathematics.  
Donald Appleyard, city planning.  
Michael Artin, mathematics.  
Elliot Auerbach, laboratory nuclear science.  
Maria L. Bade, biology.  
Alan H. Barrett, electrical engineering.  
Eugene Bell, biology.  
Aron Bernstein, physics.  
T. Bever, modern languages.  
Carl J. Black, humanities.  
Stephen L. Bloom, mathematics.  
Rev. Myron Bloy, chaplain.  
Frank Bonilla, economics.  
George S. Boelos, philosophy.  
David Botstein, biology.  
Richard N. Boyd, philosophy.  
Joseph Brenner, medical department.  
Gene M. Brown, biology.  
Manuel Blum, electrical engineering.  
Harold H. Carter, chemical engineering.  
Jule G. Charney, meteorology.  
M. Chessman, meteorology.  
Noam Chomsky, modern languages.  
Stephan L. Chorover, psychology.  
Jared L. Darlington, res. lab. electronics.  
John M. Dolan, res. lab. electronics.  
J. R. Dennett, mathematics.  
Robert M. Dowben, biology.  
Murray Eden, electrical engineering.  
Robert Fabry, res. lab. electronics.  
Franklin M. Fisher, economics.  
Maurice S. Fox, biology.



Harold Freeman, economics.  
 Bernard Frieden, city planning.  
 Theodore W. Gamelin, mathematics.  
 Vincent Giambalvo, mathematics.  
 Steven N. Gilborn, humanities.  
 Marcus C. Goodall, res. lab. electronics.  
 Roe Goodman, mathematics.  
 Glen E. Gordon, chemistry.  
 David Gordon, physics.  
 Annamaria T. Gorini, biology.  
 Bernard S. Gould, biology.  
 E. Graham, mathematics.  
 John C. Graves, humanities.  
 Richard Greene, biology.  
 Charles G. Gross, psychology.  
 Leon Gunther, physics.  
 A. R. Gurney, Jr., humanities.  
 Theodore Gurney, Jr., biology.  
 Morris Halle, modern languages.  
 Alfred E. Harper, nutrition.  
 Hyman Hartman, biology.  
 Alan Hein, psychology.  
 Richard Held, psychology.  
 Rev. Robert C. Holtzapfle, chaplain.  
 Thomas H. Jackson, humanities.  
 William D. Jackson, electrical engineering.  
 Elizabeth W. Jones, biology.  
 J. Katz, philosophy.  
 S. J. Kayser, modern languages.  
 Gyorgy Kepes, architecture.  
 E. Kirk, modern languages.  
 M. Kudlick, mathematics.  
 K. Kushner, mathematics.  
 G. Lakoff, modern languages.  
 Elizabeth Landers, modern languages.  
 Emmet Larkin, humanities.  
 Paul Lee, humanities.  
 Thomas A. Lehrer, economics and political science.  
 Mark Levensky, humanities.  
 Cyrus Levinthal, biology.  
 Klaus Liepmann, humanities.  
 Francis E. Low, physics.  
 Salvador E. Luria, biology.  
 Kevin Lynch, city planning.  
 Boris Magasanik, biology.  
 Kenneth Manly, biology.  
 Michael B. Marcus, mathematics.  
 Stephen Marglin, economics.  
 Paula Menyuk, research laboratory electronics.  
 Travis R. Merritt, humanities.  
 Franco Modigliani, economics and management.  
 Philip Morrison, physics.  
 Philip M. Morse, physics.  
 Walle J. H. Nauta, psychology.  
 A. C. Newell, mathematics.  
 W. O'Neill, modern languages.  
 Robert Pendelton, mathematics.  
 Norman Pettit, humanities.  
 Louise Pfeiffer, psychology.  
 Norman A. Phillips, meteorology.  
 Rabbi Herman Pollack, chaplain.  
 P. M. Postal, modern languages.  
 Hillary Putnam, humanities.  
 H. Putz, mathematics.  
 J. Ravin, mathematics.  
 Daniel B. Ray, mathematics.  
 Harold Relche, humanities.  
 Helen R. Revel, biology.  
 Phillip W. Robbins, biology.  
 J. Robinson, mathematics.  
 Ronald Rolfe, biology.  
 Steven Rosencrans, mathematics.  
 Bruno Rossi, physics.  
 A. K. Roy, mathematics.  
 Rev. John Russell, Jr., chaplain.  
 Herbert D. Saltzstein, psychology.  
 Leo Sartori, physics.  
 David L. Schalk, humanities.  
 B. W. Sekuler, psychology.  
 Karl Shell, economics.  
 Abner Shimony, humanities.  
 Irving Singer, humanities.  
 I. M. Singer, mathematics.  
 Marc J. Shulman, biology.  
 Malcolm Skolnick, physics.

Huston Smith, humanities.  
 Norton Starr, mathematics.  
 Arthur Steinberg, humanities.  
 Marvin Stodolsky, biology.  
 Benjamin K. T'sou, research laboratory electronics.  
 John James Ucci, mathematics.  
 John Vierter, research laboratory electronics.  
 Patrick D. Wall, biology.  
 William B. Watson, humanities.  
 Burton White, psychology.  
 George W. Whitehead, mathematics.  
 Hurd C. Willett, meteorology.  
 John W. Winchester, geology and geophysics.  
 George Wolf, nutrition.  
 Victor Yngve, electrical engineering.  
 William H. Youngren, humanities.  
 Richard Zatorski, research laboratory electronics.

NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY

Richard Arnowitz, physics.  
 Perry A. Bialor, sociology-anthropology.  
 Roger Brightbill, psychology.  
 Wendell R. Brown, education.  
 Henry H. Crapo, mathematics.  
 Alan N. Cromer, physics.  
 Ellen N. Dunlap, mathematics.  
 Theodore N. Ferdinand, sociology-anthropology.  
 Mitzi Filson, library.  
 Walter L. Fogg, philosophy.  
 Marvin H. Friedman, physics.  
 Norbert L. Fullington, history.  
 Michael J. Glaubman, physics.  
 Stephen J. Golburgh, education.  
 Roberta Gordon, modern languages.  
 Joseph D. Gresser, chemistry.  
 Edward A. Hacker, philosophy.  
 Ruth Harmon, education.  
 Walter Hauser, physics.  
 Masanori Higa, education.  
 John Kazantzi, English.  
 Frank F. Lee, sociology-anthropology.  
 Lila Leibowitz, sociology-anthropology.  
 Milton Leitenberg, biology.  
 William F. Luder, chemistry.  
 Antonio L. Mezzacappa, modern languages.  
 Harold Naidus, chemistry.  
 Irene A. Nichols, education.  
 John D. Oberholtzer, physics.  
 Saul Rogolsky, education.  
 Norman Rosenblatt, history.  
 James Ryan, modern languages.  
 Eugene J. Saletan, physics.  
 Freda Salzman, physics.  
 George Salzman, physics.  
 Ina Samuels, psychology.  
 Bertram Sharf, psychology.  
 Gilbert A. Schloss, English.  
 Donald Shelby, economics.  
 Robert L. Stern, chemistry.  
 Harold L. Stubbs, mathematics.  
 H. Ti Tien, chemistry.  
 Michael T. Vaughn, physics.

SIMMONS COLLEGE

Donald S. Dunbar, psychology.  
 Tilden G. Edelstein, history.  
 David Emerson, physics.  
 Richard Freedman, English.  
 Henry J. Halko, history.  
 Ruth C. Hawthorne, history.  
 Manfred Klein, German.  
 Lawrence L. Langer, English.  
 Ruth S. Leonard, library science.  
 Joseph T. Leverich, mathematics.  
 William M. Manly, English.  
 Josephine F. Milburn, government.  
 Carroll F. Miles, government.  
 Margaret B. Milliken, English.  
 George W. Mitchie, English.  
 Mary K. O'Brien, nursing.  
 Sumner M. Rosen, economics.  
 Richard C. Sterne, English.  
 Wylie Syther, English.  
 Roy M. Tollefson, government.

SMITH COLLEGE

Louis Cohn-Haft, history.  
 Robert J. Fabian, mathematics.  
 Philip Green, government.  
 Bruce Hawkins, physics.  
 Murray Kiteley, philosophy.  
 Paul Lauter, English.  
 Alice Lazerovitz, philosophy.  
 Bert Mendelson, mathematics.  
 Michael Rice, physics.  
 Peter Rowe, government.  
 Ramon Eduardo Ruiz, history.  
 J. Diedrick Snoek, psychology.  
 A. H. Spees, physics.  
 Melvin Steinberg, physics.  
 Francis Stienom, astronomy.  
 Donald Trumpler, mathematics.

TUFTS UNIVERSITY

Reilly Atkinson III, physics.  
 Marston Balch, drama and speech.  
 Ernest Cassara, religion.  
 Carl Cohen, mathematics.  
 John Cornwall, economics.  
 Mary Jane Cramer, sociology.  
 Dorothea J. Crook, psychology.  
 Morris A. Cynkin, medical school.  
 William Dameshek, medical school.  
 Allen E. Everett, physics.  
 Sanford Freedman, psychology.  
 Morris Friedkin, pharmacology.  
 Sol Gittleman, German.  
 Hilde Hein, philosophy.  
 Roslyn B. Henning, classics.  
 Dennis V. Higgins, English.  
 Franklyn D. Holzman, economics.  
 David Isles, mathematics.  
 Leonard Kirsch, economics.  
 Madeline Kovach, German.  
 Melvin J. Krant, medical school.  
 Norman Krinsky, pharmacology.  
 George F. Leger, mathematics.  
 Zella Luria, psychology.  
 Lewis F. Manly, economics.  
 Bernard McCabe, English.  
 Nancy Milburn, biology.  
 Robert L. H. Miller, religion.  
 Kivie Moldave, medicine.  
 Thornton B. Ratz, psychology.  
 Gene Reeves, theology.  
 Douglas W. Reynolds, art.  
 H. Ronald Rouse, mathematics.  
 Gerhard Schmidt, biochemistry.  
 Edwin Schur, sociology.  
 Robert Schwartz, medical school.  
 Newlin R. Smith, economics.  
 Gary M. Spackman, French.  
 Manfred Steiner, medical school.  
 Walter J. K. Tannenber, medical school.  
 Jack Tessman, physics.  
 Robert H. Webb, physics.  
 John C. Wells, German.

UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT

Max M. Allen, psychology.  
 Curt F. Beck, political science.  
 J. David Colfax, sociology.  
 Douglas P. Crowne, psychology.  
 Maurice L. Farber, psychology.  
 Amerigo Farina, psychology.  
 R. C. Gosselin, mathematics.  
 Jerrold Heiss, sociology.  
 David A. Ivry, finance.  
 Seth Leacock, sociology.  
 Charles H. McCaghy, sociology.  
 Dennison Nash, sociology.  
 Charles A. Owen, Jr., English.  
 G. N. Raney, mathematics.  
 H. Reschovsky, mathematics.  
 Kenneth Ring, psychology.  
 A. Robert Rollin, psychology.  
 Joy S. Roth, zoology.  
 Julian B. Rotter, psychology.  
 William A. Wilson, Jr., psychology.  
 Elliott S. Wolk, mathematics.  
 David Zeaman, psychology.

May 27, 1965

11514

## UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT

Horace W. Briggs, political science.  
Robert V. Daniels, history.  
Denez Gulyas, sociology.  
Samuel B. Hand, history.  
Robert L. Hoffman, history.  
Richard E. Leidberg, chaplain.  
William Metcalfe, history.  
Anthony Molho, history.  
Edward Rossman, romance languages.  
Daniel Scheans, anthropology.  
Thomas J. Spinner, Jr., history.

## WORCESTER POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE

Bernard Howard, mathematics.  
Bruce C. McQuarrie, mathematics.  
Bomeo L. Moruzzi, electrical engineering.  
Philip Shakir, mathematics.  
David Todd, chemistry.

## YALE UNIVERSITY

Robert P. Abelson, psychology.  
Layman E. Allen, law.  
James Appel, psychology.  
Richard J. Andrew, biology.  
James Appel, psychology.  
Wendell Bell, sociology.  
Bernard J. Bergen, sociology.  
Merton C. Bernstein, law.  
Harry J. Benda, history.  
John M. Blum, history.  
George Braverman, biochemistry.  
Abram Chipman, psychiatry.  
Dorothy D. Carlo, psychology.  
Michael Cole, psychology.  
Barry E. Collins, psychology.  
Robert M. Cook, sociology.  
Alice Cornellson, psychiatry.  
Sheila Counce-Nicklas, biology.  
Robert S. Crowder, psychology.  
Robert A. Dahl, political science.  
David J. Danelski, political science.  
Gaylord D. Ellison, psychiatry.  
Thomas I. Emerson, law.  
Edmund Fantino, psychology.  
Harry Fein, psychology.  
Yasuko Filby, psychology.  
John F. Flynn, psychology.  
J. G. Gall, biology.  
Arthur W. Galston, biology.  
Frank T. Gardner, psychiatry.  
Fred Gault, psychology.  
Joseph Glick, psychology.  
David Goldberg, psychiatry.  
Harry Gollub, psychology.  
Laurence Gould, psychology.  
Leroy C. Gould, sociology.  
M. M. Haith, psychology.  
George A. Huaco, sociology.  
Michael Kahn, psychology.  
Kenneth Keniston, psychology.  
Bill Kessen, psychology.  
Charles A. Kiesler, psychology.  
Daniel L. Kline, psychology.  
E. E. Krickhaus, psychology.  
Theodore Lidsz, psychiatry.  
Robert J. Liston, psychiatry.  
Staughton Lynd, history.  
James A. Mau, sociology.  
James D. Millikan, philosophy.  
Ronald N. Morris, pharmacy.  
George D. Mostow, mathematics.  
Pauli Murray, law.  
Nea M. Norton, psychiatry.  
R. C. W. Prescott, psychiatry.  
Charles A. Reich, law.  
Charles E. Rickart, mathematics.  
Julian M. Sturtevant, chemistry.  
Josiah Thompson, philosophy.  
Roy C. Treadway, sociology.  
Cynthia M. Wild, psychiatry.  
Mary C. Wright, history.  
George Wolf, psychiatry.

## OTHERS

Sigmund Abeles, Wellesley College.  
S. P. Colowick, Vanderbilt University.  
Flora Donham, Phillip Donham, Irvin  
Dress, Cardinal Cushing College.  
Alexandra Elliot, Samuel Friedman, Univer-  
sity of Michigan.  
H. Gintis, Suffolk University.

Kenneth Greenblatt, Jerome Grossman.  
H. L. Holcomb, Cambridge Electron Accelerator.

Sidney Kaplan, University of Massachusetts.

Hedda Korsch, Wheaton College.  
Allen Kropf, Amherst College.  
Carole Labrousse, Wellesley College.  
Joan Levin, Emmanuel College.  
Hilde Geiringer von Mises, Wheaton College.

Jane Marcus, Thomas O'Donnell, Pine Manor Junior College.

Ruth Anna Putnam, Wellesley College.  
Mark Rich, Trevor Robinson, Frederick L. Schuman, Williams College.

Rebecca H. Shankland, Wheaton College.  
Susan Raymond Vogel, Wellesley College.  
Henry T. Yost, Amherst College.

(Institutional affiliation listed for purposes of identification only.)

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

(The cost of presenting this statement is approximately \$6,500. A major portion of this amount was contributed by the names listed above. Further contributions toward the cost of this and subsequent advertisements are needed. Checks, payable to the Greater Boston Faculty Committee on Vietnam, may be sent to Post Office Box 543, Central Square Station, Cambridge, Mass., 02139. Prof. Everett Mendelsohn, secretary; Prof. Cyrus Levinthal, treasurer.)

PORTLAND, OREG., May 19, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Building.

HONORABLE SIR: Congratulations to you and Senator GRUENING for your courage. Perhaps one day when another book is written on Profiles in Courage, you will both be included. How sad that their aren't more Senators who have the courage to speak out against the policy being pursued by our Government.

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

Sincerely yours,

ROSE M. SCHULZ.

PORTLAND, OREG., May 21, 1965.

SENATOR MORSE: There are a lot of words on radio and in papers about you being against the U.S. involvement in the "Gold-water war" in Vietnam, and the mess in the Dominican Republic.

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

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

How about giving the constitutional amendment some thought? And words? Please don't bother to reply.

Respectfully,

E. P. CICHY.

PORTLAND, OREG., May 12, 1965.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Much like the boy in the USO advertisements, I picture you back in Washington wondering "Does anybody know I'm here?" Although I am a high school student, underage, and therefore, do not "count," I am very aware of your opinions on Vietnam (as is nearly everyone else). I know you are there. I am listening

(even though the Oregonian does not quote you with enthusiasm) and I am proud that you represent my State.

Out of protest more than anything else, and because I do not want to support action that I am uninformed on, I have not made up my mind to one course of action or another on Vietnam. The reason? Because the American people have not been told the facts about Vietnam. I cannot believe that we are being dealt fairly with. There is a silence between those vast and diverse areas and the people—people who are being asked (or should be asked, somewhere along the line) in some measure to determine their fate. If the American Government steps into a country to maintain the status quo, rotten and corrupt as it may be, is it not, or should it not be, the American people who are stepping in? And if the responsibility is ours, does not the American Government have a responsibility to us? We are becoming the servants to a vast government machine whereas the Government should never be a machine and should always be the servant to the people. We are losing sight of our own system of freedom, in a grave sense. But is all this ideological banter set aside for wartime conditions. Indeed: Whose war? I don't recall it coming up before your august body of Representatives and Senators, do you, Senator MORSE?

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

Yours truly,

Miss MEGAN TAYLOR.

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

KLAMATH FALLS, OREG.,

May 17, 1965.

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

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

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

I urge you to call for an immediate cessation of the bombings. I believe the United States could do far more for the Vietnamese and for our own prestige by taking the lead in a call for negotiations.

Respectfully,

SERENA A. WEAVER.

GREATER PORTLAND COUNCIL  
OF CHURCHES,  
Portland, Oreg., May 20, 1965.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Greater Portland Council of Churches is morally concerned with the Vietnam situation. We want you to know of this concern. It is rooted in our calling as Christian people to "seek peace and pursue it." We recognize also our responsibility to "do justly and love mercy." Our concern, therefore, is peace with justice. We wish to express our interest in the true needs of the people of southeast Asia, our hope for the most helpful and constructive American policy toward that region, and our concern about the continuing escalation of what you recently termed "a real war" in Vietnam.

We believe that American aims should be stated positively in terms of backing "the revolution of rising expectations" which characterizes the desires of Asian peoples along with African and Latin American peoples. We do not feel that our country has emphasized sufficiently our basic sympathy with the development of political, economic, and social justice in southeast Asia. In this connection, we urge that our Government support the Mekong Delta project now underway, which promises so much for the well-being of southeast Asia, in amounts comparable to our military expenditures in the area. This would confirm U.S. concern for a constructive alternative to present trends. It would be incontrovertible evidence of our peaceful aims for the region. It would contrast with any who seek to exploit or seize these areas for their own purposes. In connection with our special concern for South Vietnam, we would note that its future depends on making it viable in terms of integral relationships with the entire region.

We hold with all thoughtful and discerning men who prize freedom that communism is a grave hazard and a most exploitative form of social organization.

However, we are forced to accept the fact that to present the American case as basically that of fighting and containing communism is too limited and too negative a rationale for our foreign policy, and especially for our significant presence in southeast Asia. We are further aware of how little this interests and appeals to many peoples of southeast Asia, whose attention is fixed on other pressing concerns. Thus, we recognize the necessity of our Government's prudent use of the working concept of co-existence with governments in Asia which are not patterned after our own. We accept the fact that southeast Asian countries will evolve their own forms of government with which we must work, even though they may bear little resemblance to Western democracies.

We believe that our country must move beyond unilateral action in Vietnam before the escalation and expansion of war involves the overt intervention of Communist China and increases the hazards of nuclear war. We reject unqualifiedly any and all proposals for the preventive or preemptive bombing of China as an aspect of the present situation. Since negotiation is inevitable either during war or at the close of war, and protracted conflict extends the suffering, escalates fear and hatred born of war, and deepens the tragic aftermath of war into which communism can most successfully move, we urge the ceaseless exploration and use of all avenues of negotiation. We support your announced intention of "unconditional discussions," which we realize must include the Vietcong, which is composed of both North and South Vietnamese. We understand the impossibility and inadvisability of our policing the internal affairs of countries around the world. We believe that we should

work energetically for the creation of an Asian International Armed Police Force for protective purposes in Vietnam to supplant our forces at the earliest possible moment. We are painfully aware of the difficult role the United States has been taken, and which to Asians and other colored peoples of the world can be so easily misconstrued. To secure the order and security with justice of that entire region now demands that we, in concert with other nations, find alternate, long-range solutions commensurate with the serious needs and great possibilities of that area.

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

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. CATE,  
Executive Secretary.

HERMISTON, OREG.,  
May 19, 1965.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We wish to commend you on your stand against President Johnson concerning his interventionist foreign policy. We believe that if the United States continues to pursue this policy the results will be catastrophic. We find that by talking to people that there is more opposition than the polls show. We hope that you, Senator GRUENING and Representative GREEN will keep hitting at Mr. Johnson where it hurts.

Sincerely yours,

CHAS. SNIVELY,  
LOIS SNIVELY.

EUGENE, OREG., May 21, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We profoundly support your efforts to alter U.S. policy in Vietnam. We equally urge you to do anything in your power to halt our appalling intervention in the Dominican Republic.

Sincerely,

CONRAD D. MILLER,  
LAURA J. MILLER.

PORTLAND, OREG., May 21, 1965.

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

MY DEAR SENATOR: In response to a letter which recently appeared in the Journal, I am writing to let you know my attitude toward your stands on Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.

I am wholeheartedly in favor of your position.

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

Thank you.

Sincerely,

DON HAROLD KILLIAN.

NORMAN, OKLA.,  
May 8, 1965.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is to commend you for continuing to urge a negotiated settlement in Vietnam.

The widening of the war has only made matters worse by increasing the risk of another world war.

Truly yours,

MARGARET E. SALMON,  
EDWARD J. GOODMAN.

MADISON, WIS.,  
May 11, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to take this opportunity to thank you for having the cour-

age to vote against the \$700 million Vietnam appropriation.

Sincerely yours,

RUTH H. MYRLAND.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,  
May 15, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am inexpressibly grateful for your voice of opposition to America's disastrous and cruel foreign policy, particularly regarding Vietnam. I find the thought extremely frightening, that if not for you and the Alaskan Senator, there would be virtually no official questioners of the lie the American people are being indoctrinated with. I pledge to work with you for the peace and justice the people of this earth deserve.

Sincerely,

IRA CHALEFF.

SANTA FE, N. MEX.,  
May 14, 1965.

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

HONORABLE SIR: I want to be counted among those who are desperately against our action in Vietnam and intervention in other parts of the world.

The stand you have consistently taken is deeply appreciated by many Americans. The Congress is really our only hope to stop the American madness, but according to a Quaker visitation made in Washington early in April (259 calls), "the Congressmen are disturbed about Vietnam but none appeared to be interested in taking any initiative."—Gretchen Tuthill, who headed up the visitation for the American Friends Service Committee.

It is our responsibility, as the represented, to inform you that many of us feel that the work done by Senators like you and Messrs. GRUENING, CHURCH, McGOVERN, GAYLORD NELSON, etc., is the only means possible to retrieve our country from the mess it has built up for itself under the leadership of the President and his advisers in the Pentagon and State Department. When a handful of men has this much power, our form of Government loses even its resemblance to a democracy.

If the Congressmen are to represent the people, as they are sworn to do, they must restrain the hand of America, or the future can be only a horrible question mark. Nobility really means great power in a hand that withholds its use.

May your leadership continue to be strong and inspired.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. MONICA KERNBERGER.

ROCHESTER, N.Y.,  
May 10, 1965.

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

SIR: I support wholeheartedly the statements you have made recently with respect to our stupid, shameful involvement in Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic.

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

Very best regards,

ROGER E. LAMB.

LAWRENCE, KANS., May 16, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: Please add my voice to yours in opposition to the present Vietnam policy. You are not alone in speaking against those who now will not even deign to speak at all. It is no doubt the nature of "hawks" to fly above the "herd," but I hope Mr. Bundy is not so far away that you can't be heard.

Respectfully,

JOSEPH F. WETZEL.

May 27, 1965

FAIRFAX, VA., May 17, 1965.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: At this dangerous time when U.S. foreign policy in Vietnam and elsewhere seems to be succumbing more and more to impulsive and irresponsible action, your courageous, rational and balanced public statements are a beacon of hope.

I want you to know that you have earned the deep admiration and gratitude of Americans in all parts of this country.

Sincerely,

MYRTLE BRICKMAN.

BOULDER, COLO.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your courage in acting on behalf of the best principles of American democracy and humanitarian thought in voting against endorsing our rash policy in Vietnam and, at least by indirection, in the Dominican Republic.

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

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

Sincerely,

RUSSELL OLIN.  
CAROL OLIN.

OLD BETHPAGE, N.Y., May 17, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

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

Isn't there some way we can stop the President from leading us in this terrible path to future war? I have written letters to all my Congressmen and Senators but it seems of little avail. Letters to the President seem futile, but still I write.

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

Very sincerely yours,

ROBERT G. BACH.

CHAPEL HILL, SOUTH HADLEY, MASS.,

May 17, 1965.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have just now seen excerpts from your two speeches in the Senate on May 5 and 6. I am writing to express my deep gratitude for what you said there and for the great courage it took to express such views in the present atmosphere in the United States.

In tone and style, attitude and actions, President Johnson has generated this atmosphere. He has built upon the conditioning of 20 years of the cold war. And in the past 4 months he has undermined 150 years of American effort to build a world of international law and comity. He has returned to the insufferable self-righteousness and truc-

ulence in foreign affairs of President Theodore Roosevelt. The Johnson corollary to the Monroe Doctrine strikes at the heart of the inter-American system, flaunts treaties, charters, and the pledged word of the United States. In Vietnam he has done the same things, but with the infinitely greater danger of total war with China and perhaps the Soviet Union. He has destroyed the detente painfully and partially inaugurated by President Kennedy and former Premier Khrushchev. He has violated his own spoken word even as he uttered it to the people of the United States and to the world. Whatever his intentions his actions have widened the war, drawn America in deeper to that tragic situation, and alienated other governments and peoples throughout the world. He has acted unilaterally, arbitrarily, and intransigently; he has defied petitions and criticisms from the Senate and from many responsible persons in the academic world. He has profoundly frightened millions of people and brought not only the good faith but even the sanity of the administration into question. And he has surrounded himself with a group of advisers who are obsessed with fear of communism and the belief that it can be contained and defeated by the use of American military power and the threat of nuclear war.

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

Sincerely yours,

DAVID P. LEONARD.

KINGSTON, N.J., May 12, 1965.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I was in the Senate gallery last Thursday, the sixth, just at the end of Senator DIRKSEN's speech, in which he attacked you, not by name, for refusing the support the President on Vietnam. I thought your reply to him, that you would let nothing stop your criticism when you saw something wrong, was right, and that your entire course has been right; I am writing this to thank you for what you have been doing. I am one of those thousands in New Jersey who is unrepresented in the U.S. Senate, and I am glad to see that you and a few others are giving me a little bit of what the English used to call "virtual representation."

One thing more, Senator. I hope that in all your attacks on this evil, and, what is worse, stupid and shortsighted policy you will not neglect to propose alternatives. The President's offer of a TVA for southeast Asia in his Johns Hopkins speech is not only the most constructive thing he has done, it is the only constructive thing he has done. I hope that you will not advocate that we ignore the people there, but that we start trying to help them and stop trying to rule them by force.

Yours sincerely,

ROBERT D. BULKLEY, JR.

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

CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGE

AT FULLERTON,

Fullerton, Calif., May 11, 1965.

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

DEAR SIR: I support your honest and courageous stand against the current U.S. policy in Vietnam.

I feel we should withdraw immediately and unconditionally.

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

I realize that it is physically impossible to answer each inquiry individually, but

academic inquisitiveness leads me to pose the following question: If a secret ballot were taken in the Senate regarding Vietnam policy, what, in your opinion, would be the probable outcome?

Sincerely,

J. E. MORROW,

Assistant Professor of Psychology.

LONG ISLAND, N.Y.,

May 17, 1965.

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

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

Respectfully,

PHILIP OKE.

Mrs. RAYMOND OKE.

SOMERVILLE, MASS.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

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

Sincerely,

P. G. MITCHELL.

(No reply needed.)

WOODMONT, CONN., May 16, 1965.

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

DEAR SENATOR: I write in support of your recent criticisms directed against the Johnson administration's foreign policy in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. I endorse wholeheartedly your negative vote on the Vietnam appropriation and regret that more representatives of the people did not show similar courage in opposing the measure. I fear that we in America are rapidly reaching the point where criticism becomes equated with subversion and where consensus politics becomes a substitute for hard thinking.

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

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

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL E. PARRISH,  
Graduate Student, Yale University.

PORT CHESTER, N.Y.,

May 18, 1965.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It was very reassuring to read of your intervention in the Senate about foreign policy.

We are greatly impressed by your eloquence and clarity which is a consequence of maturity and knowledge. Senators like

May 27, 1965

you are the hope of all Americans. A policy of arrogance, aggression, compulsive possessiveness only spells disaster. The American people are not Texas cattle to be branded with these characteristics. We voted for President Johnson because we thought he would continue the policies of the late great President Kennedy. Yet, it seems Barry Goldwater is in the Presidency. We live in times in which none of us can remain indifferent. The greatness of this country is due to the free enterprise of ideals and ideas. Why should we change now?

Very sincerely yours,

E. A. GOMEZ, M.D.  
GERDA GOMEZ

BOSTON, MASS.,  
May 18, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I congratulate and thank you for the fight you are waging against an expanded war in Vietnam.

I would only amend your remarks in one slight respect. You say that China moves in on the ground, we will have to send 300,000 troops. But Walter Lippmann writes in a recent column that there is plenty of talk in State and Defense these days about sending 350,000 troops to South Vietnam, regardless of what China does. In this they are consistent. We can only have our way in South Vietnam at the cost of a massive military occupation of the country. The alternative is a government in which the Vietcong will play a large part, a government that will demand U.S. withdrawal, a government that will begin to normalize relations with the North and with China.

The greatest danger of a U.S. occupation in Vietnam, in my judgment, is not that it will bring about war with China or even Russia, but that it will bring, as the Algerian war did in France, the destruction of freedom and of democratic institutions at home. We are already on this road; we will go much farther.

Sincerely,

JOHN HOLT.

ELLENBURG, WASH.,  
May 14, 1965.

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

DEAR SIR: I often discuss with my family and friends what should or should not be done about the escalation of the war in Vietnam. All give you credit for your great courage in speaking out on the Vietnam situation. It is the least I can do to inform you, that in truth, you have many, many backers in this area. If only there were some way we could speak a little louder.

This is the country of all of us—not just those in high offices. Mr. Rusk intimates we shouldn't object to what is going on and that we should consider the "real facts."

What are the real facts in regard to Vietnam and Santo Domingo? It is very frustrating to always have to be guessing what they are. We talk among ourselves and make statements as to what we think is back of all the fighting, but come up with no real facts. We wonder if, other than communism, they are racial, religious, political, plain showing of strength, or all of these together. We wonder if President Johnson is making all final decisions and/or is being dictated to by certain officials, special interests or leaders of other countries who may have something to gain politically or otherwise. If we were told the facts as events happen we would not come up with wild assumptions for which we could possibly be very wrong.

We and the press talk of freedom, the free world, the American way, and the right of all people to choose their leaders. Isn't there some way we can continue to make these expressions have real meaning. I myself hope that some unknown event will arise or some minds be prodded into working out

some kind of peace before use of the atomic bomb.

I would appreciate knowing of any source of information that would give some truths in regard to our deep involvement in Vietnam and Santo Domingo.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. BERTHA FIEGE.

HARVARD COLLEGE OBSERVATORY,  
Cambridge, Mass., May 12, 1965.

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

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing just to add my voice to those who praise you most highly for your continued opposition to the U.S. war in Vietnam. Thank God for you and Senator GRUENING; I sincerely hope others will soon join you. Keep it up, and good luck.

Sincerely,

DAVID MORRISON.

COPENHAGEN F, DENMARK,  
May 16, 1965.

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

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

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR FORER.

Senator MORSE: I strongly support your courageous, strong stand against the U.S. action in Vietnam. All of Denmark does, too, from what I can read in the newspaper. Above is a carbon of a letter mailed to President Johnson.

Your speeches give courage to us all.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR FORER.

PLYMOUTH, MICH.,  
May 15, 1965.

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

When you left the Republican Party I felt very sad, but I have since learned why and have become an Independent too.

Keep on pounding out the truth. We surely need it. I feel better tonight. Most of the time I am torn as to what to believe—how must it be for our young people? I hope they keep it up on the college campuses of our country.

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

Sincerely,

MARGARET PIERCE  
Mrs. Frank J. Pierce.

ASHFIELD, MASS.,  
May 17, 1965.

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

My son has just registered for the draft and I can envision 18 years of careful attention, love, direction, and guidance, as well as money, going into a square box. Having fought almost 4 years in World War II, narrowly missing extinction several times, I am fed up with this myopic megalomania for war displayed by men in positions of power in this country. Like you, I refuse to acquiesce to this concentrated drive toward war. Would, however, that I could do more.

In the recent past I have given up a well-paying job in a munitions factory (so-called defense) in order to pursue work toward a doctorate. Hopefully there will yet be time to practice what I have spent 2 years trying to acquire an educational background which is acceptable at the college level.

Meanwhile, my very best wishes to you and the few others who are courageously waging the battle for human survival.

Sincerely,

DONALD FITZGERALD.

P.S. 1.—May I have a copy of your speeches May 5 and 6?

P.S. 2.—Please put my name on the list of subscribers to your campaign needs. Also, would you pass this on to Ted KENNEDY. Thank you.

PRINCETON, N.J.,  
May 17, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your noble and responsible speeches in the Senate on May 5 and May 6 regarding our foreign policy in Asia set you apart from your colleagues as a true Senator, a true leader. Everything I have read in my past 10 busy years as a mother of five has led me to the conclusion that in your line of reasoning is the only path to a world of hope for our children and their counterparts all over the planet. I do not intend to stop reading and learning and I do not intend to stop writing my Representatives and my President, urging them to take heed of your longer sighted and wiser view of our changing world. Impatience and political expediency and military might cannot bring about the "better world" we must arduously work toward for those who come after us. President Johnson seems to want to create a world in his own image as a kind of personal "7 days wonder."

My husband, a busy physician, joins me in sending you best wishes and gratitude.

Very sincerely,

Mrs. Alfred T. Halt.  
MARIE J. HALT

MAY 16, 1965.

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

DEAR SIR: May I express, belatedly, my appreciation and admiration for your stand against President Johnson's request for \$700 million for further military requirements in Vietnam. Today a similar message shall be forwarded to Senators GRUENING and NELSON for having joined with you in this action. I regret that I can't number myself among your constituents, and I shall so inform my own Senators who are either in accord with President Johnson's increasingly arrogant foreign policy or lack the courage to publicly denounce it—in any case neither of them represent my position in this matter.

President Johnson's rapid resort to and expansion of the old style "gunboat" diplomacy has led me to finally accept the proposition that he deliberately misled the American people in the last campaign when he argued that a difference existed between himself and Goldwater with reference as to what actions were necessary and proper in troubled areas like Vietnam. Either he deliberately misled us, or he has been, in an amazingly short time, completely sold on the position taken by the "war hawks." Apparently no "dove" can reach him now.

May 27, 1965

11518

It would seem that the only action left to those voters feeling as I do is to do what apparently we should have done last November—refuse our vote for either candidate. If the mule kicks you once, it is the mule's fault; but if it kicks you the second time, it is your own fault.

Sincerely yours,

ANN V. KING  
Mrs. G. Barr King.

SPOKANE, WASH.

FARMINGTON, PA., May 19, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We want to thank you and express our appreciation for your courageous and lonely fight during the Vietnam crisis. We were grateful for what you expressed on May 5 and 6 when the \$700 million appropriation measure was considered. We simply want to support and encourage you in your stand and we hope for both a growing awareness of the wrongness of our Government's position and a militant pursuit of peace.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL and SHIRLEY BRANDIES.

MOYLAND, PA.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I send my devout thanks for your determination for morality and reason in our Vietnam policy.

I am deeply worried. Surely there seems to be a juggernaut under way carrying the administration and with it all of us to the brink of mad actions. What do you suggest that citizens do to reverse the disastrous policy of the United States in Vietnam? The President fails to listen to friends abroad or reasoned advice from Congress, the press, and educators.

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

Very urgently,

ROBERT ANTHONY.

MAY 19, 1965.

St. Agnes School,  
Albany, N.Y., May 18, 1965.

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

DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations to you for a heroic defense of the only realistic and safe foreign policy I've heard mentioned near the White House for Vietnam.

Keep up the good work. We're on your side and we'll do our best where we live to help people understand how valuable our stakes really are in Asia and how important it is that we change our present bankrupting war for a more humane method of containing communism.

Respectfully yours,

ESETER J. LANGWORTHY.

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

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

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

I fervently believe that continuation of the war in Vietnam can only result in creating a deep hatred for the United States and with it a misunderstanding of the truly

democratic principles on which this country was built and in which the vast majority of Americans believe.

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

Very truly yours,

LOUISE SCHNEIDERMAN.

FREEPORT, MAINE,  
May 18, 1965.

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

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

God be with you.

Sincerely,

DAVID L. GHAMAM.

AUTOMOTIVE NEWS,  
Detroit Mich., May 18, 1965.

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

Senator WAYNE MORSE: I commend you for your efforts to keep the United States from drifting into war in the East.

Is it not possible to have a full-fledged debate in Congress as to what our foreign policy should be?

How can we citizens help?

Sincerely,

ROBERT M. FINLAY.

MAY 18, 1965.

Sen. WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just a short note to say that I approve of your stand on Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. It is good to know that some representatives of the American people have not been cowed by the dictatorial methods of the Johnson administration. We are not supporting freedom in the civil wars that exist in these two countries.

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

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

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

Sincerely yours,

LEE HORVITZ.

MONROEVILLE, PA.

SOCIETY OF BROTHERS,  
Farmington, Pa.

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

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

We read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from your speech on May 5. It moves us deeply to know that you stand for justice and world

peace and we support you fully in this. It is so very important that that kind of voice as yours and that of the Senator from Alaska, Mr. GRUENING, are heard. Again we want to thank you and ask that you do not feel alone, and continue to express what you feel is right.

We greet you warmly.

Yours,

ALLISTER and JUDY MARCHANT.

STOCKTON, CALIF.,  
May 14, 1965.

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

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

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

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

I wonder what this Nation would do if De Gaulle or any other foreign nation came over here with their troops and said "you can't have Senator MORSE in the Senate," just what would we tell them? I am sure you know the answer. I am sure if the President keeps on going the way he has been he will go down in history as a very much hated man. Along with him the same goes for Mr. Rusk and Mr. McNamara. When I mention to some people the things I have put in this letter they say I am either a Communist or a John Birchler and I can assure you I am neither.

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

Cordially yours,

CHARLES T. COX.

MAY 16, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been meaning to write you for a long time to advise and agree with you in your position on Vietnam. Keep up the good work.

Further, I just want to say I have high admiration for you and regard you as a man of great wisdom, courage, and honesty.

With all best wishes for your continued good health and good work.

God bless you.

Very respectfully,

I. C. KREMEN, M.D.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.

St. Luke's Methodist Church,  
Columbus, Ohio, May 17, 1965.

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

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

I am back of you 100 percent.

Yours respectfully,

CHARLES B. WHITMAN,

Pastor, St. Luke's Methodist Church,  
and Lieutenant Colonel.

May 27, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

11519

BRYN MAWR, PA.,  
May 19, 1965.Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

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

I would appreciate being sent any copies of your fine statements on Vietnam which you may have available. My address makes it clear I am not one of your constituents; but it seems to me that the Vietnam crisis goes far beyond the boundaries of any one State. Your recent speeches against the \$700 million carte blanche which President Johnson virtually extorted from both Houses were greatly to your credit.

I wonder if you feel yourself as poorly covered by the mass media as I think you are. To me, there is a systematic elimination or distortion of all anti-Vietnam criticism. Senator GRUENING's excellent speech to the students who protested in Washington, D.C., went almost completely unnoticed by the press.

You may be interested to know that citizens not in your home State are following your courageous battle and are hoping that your stand for sanity and frankness will at last convert some of your rubberstamping colleagues to sense and fairness.

To me, the invasion of the Dominican Republic, with all the incredible lies and evasions that flowed from top U.S. officials—this put the Johnson administration into a very fearful perspective. I keep pinching myself to convince myself I'm not dreaming; for Barry Goldwater, not Lyndon Johnson, seems to have won the presidential election.

To me you are a "profile in courage," and your prophetic condemnations of President Johnson's antidemocratic policies will in the future be seen as the patriotic cries against political folly that they so clearly are.

Yours truly,

RICHARD C. KOHLER.

MAY 18, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

MY DEAR SIR: I want to thank you for your speech and actions of last week, May 5 and 6.

There weren't too many voices raised with respect to Vietnam, unfortunately.

The conscience of Congress seems to have fallen apart.

May I have a copy of your speeches of both May 5 and 6?

Thank you.

STANLEY ROSENBERG.

SAN BERNARDINO HIGH SCHOOL,  
San Bernardino, Calif., May 19, 1965.Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senator,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would appreciate your sending me documented material expressing your stand on the Vietnam situation and the Dominican fiasco.

I am an ardent follower of your sane approach to world affairs in an age where the majority of this Nation's leaders are wildly flaying blindly at the so-called Communist threat.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN R. SCOTT.

MAY 17, 1965.

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

DEAR SIR: We would like you to know that we stand firmly behind your Vietnam position. Keep up the good work.

JONATHAN H. HARRIS,  
ROBERT MALTZ,  
Harvard Graduate School of Design.LEONARD OSHINSKY,  
Harvard Law.COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO.,  
May 19, 1965.Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
The U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am not a constituent of your State, but must tell you I wholeheartedly agree with your views on the war in Vietnam and admire your courage in expressing them. The average citizen opposing the administration's policy in Vietnam feels so powerless to do anything. At least we feel we have a spokesman in you. If copies of your speeches in the Senate May 5 and 6 opposing the President's \$700 million request for Vietnam are available, I should very much appreciate receiving three copies so I may distribute them to friends.

Sincerely,

NANCY D. KENT  
Mrs. D. R. Kent.COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL  
RELATIONS OF THE MEN-  
NONITE CHURCH,  
Goshen, Ind., May 19, 1965.Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

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

I wish to say that a number of us were in the Senate on Wednesday afternoon when you made your eloquent speech objecting to the President's proposals. I wish to congratulate you for the stand which you have taken, and I do hope that your influence and those of others who share your viewpoint may have their influence in shaping American foreign policy in the direction of peace. I would be happy to have you keep me informed of any developments which should be shared with an informed citizenry.

With best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

GUY F. HERSHBERGER.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
May 21, 1965.The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

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

Very sincerely,

MICHAEL GELLER.

TRENTON, N.J.,  
May 21, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR: Please keep up your wonderful work. We admire your courage and foresight. I agree, we should not be in Vietnam or the Dominican Republic.

Best wishes,

JOHN A. KINCZEL, M.D.

YAKIMA, WASH.,  
May 20, 1965.Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Regarding the recent \$700 million President Johnson requested for the Vietnam war, we find words inadequate to express our thanks and deep admiration for your brave "nay" along with Senators GRUENING and NELSON.

The Pentagon computers are unable to measure the future hatred and distrust mankind will hold for the people of the United States. This Vietnam war is truly one of the gravest mistakes this country ever made.

Sadly and sincerely,

Dr. and Mrs. M. E. HERR.

MOUNT VERNON, WASH.,  
May 19, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations for your opposition to the President's policy in Vietnam and your vote against his \$700 million appropriation for that policy. How sad that those who agree with you are in such a minority.

I am sick at heart over the course of criminal folly that our Government is pursuing in Asia, and, yes, in South America, too. What can a small private citizen do, besides writing frequently to the President, Senators and Congressmen?

Keep up the good work.

Yours truly,

COLLEEN DICKINSON.

RUTHERFORD, CALIF.,  
May 20, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: After listening to an interview given by you to ABC and broadcast by short-wave on May 20, I am proud of the stand you have taken against the administration regarding our policy in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.

I agree with you and wish there were more people like you in Washington to guide and keep our foreign policy on the right track.

I feel that the President of the United States is being misinformed by the Pentagon and the State Department.

Please, Mr. Senator, keep on informing the American people of what is going on. The administration does not. They tell us half the truth.

Let's hope that some day they will realize their mistakes. I hope it will not be too late.

I am a naturalized citizen of the United States, born in France, and served in the U.S. Navy during World War I; was always proud of what America stands for.

I am now a little apprehensive of what our foreign policy is leading us to. Three wars in one generation is tiresome and our foreign policy might lead us to another war worse than the others, in which half our population might be wiped out. Think of it, Mr. Senator.

I regret that the two Senators from California have remained silent on this subject.

Thank you, Mr. Senator, for this wonderful interview, and God bless you.

Respectfully yours,

EDMUND A. MANDIN.

POWER, MONT.,  
May 20, 1965.Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We are sick and tired of the hypocrisy of the U.S. Government and ashamed of its actions which smack of Hitler tactics and imperialism, hidden and abetted by our elected representatives.

We would like to know by what right you OK'd the \$700 million for President Johnson to spend on wars and aggression? We

11520

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 27, 1965

are doing what Hitler Germany and Kaiser Wilhelm of Germany did, spending billions of dollars for wars of aggression to keep people enslaved. Under the name of "freedom" we go around the world killing, torturing, maiming, and destroying people's property—what a tragedy. It is time we faced up to what is wrong with an economic system that can't stay alive without wars.

We blame others for exactly what we ourselves are doing. No matter what we say to justify our immoral actions, they will not be justified.

We are the only active colonial power today outside of Portugal. We should stop and view ourselves as others see us. If we have the right to control southeast Asia, Russia should have the same right in South America. If it is unthinkable for us that the Russian military might should control South America, then how can we think it is right for us to do this in southeast Asia?

The present governments of Russia and China are not so brutal or ruthless. Drew Pearson attests that the Chinese method of conquering does not consider killing but mainly infiltrating with their people in business contact. Russia's method is similar. If we can't compete with them in peaceful competition, what we are doing will be the end of everything. How foolish and insane can we be? It's time to take stock of ourselves, not of others, before we commit the ultimate blunder.

Sincerely,

HAROLD and ROSINA WOODHOUSE.

WEST ORANGE, N.J.,

May 20, 1965.

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

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

I do not like to differ with our Government's views but I think it is my obligation to say when I think we have made a mistake. I hope that our right to criticize constructively will never be abridged. There are some disturbing signs that criticism is unwelcome, but I am trying to teach my children to speak out for what they think is right. Thank you for setting the good example.

Respectfully yours,

RUTH E. GOODMAN.

DENVER, COLO.,

May 18, 1965.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to commend you on your courageous stand against the war in Vietnam.

I join with you and many other people in the United States who are hoping for a cease-fire to stop the brutal killing of all people involved.

Thanking you,

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. ANNE K. ROBINETT.

CARMEL, IND.,

May 20, 1965.

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

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

You have shown admirable courage in opposing the administration's inexplicable foreign policy, especially in the face of President Johnson's efforts to silence the opposition.

I only wish there were more Senators and

Representatives to join in your protests. At least your voices are heard.

Yours truly,

Mrs. R. B. SMITH.

THE LASATER RANCH,

MATHESON, COLO., May 21, 1965.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May we congratulate you on your recent addresses to the Senate, on May 5 and 6, on the matter of our foreign policy.

We stand ready to help you in any way we can. Please call upon us.

Sincerely,

Mary and Tom Lasater

Mr. and Mrs. TOM LASATER.

MELODY FARM,

WASHINGTON COURT HOUSE, OHIO,

May 21, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: Since I heard you say on the television, "We shall not be silenced," I have wanted to write my approval of your opposition to our actions in Vietnam.

Someday you may be nominated as one example of a profile in courage.

I would like the names of the other Senators who voted against the bill to grant extra moneys to carry on the undeclared war.

Sincerely,

WILBUR W. KAMP.

SUN VALLEY, IDAHO, May 19, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is just a note to add to the many you must receive expressing my support of your strong and lonely stand on Vietnam.

Thank you.

Mrs. NAN HARRIS.

EUCLID, OHIO, May 19, 1965.

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

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

Contrary to international agreements, the United States has introduced many new weapons like napalm, and white phosphorus bombs and increased the number of American troops to a point where there are now almost twice as many American soldiers as there were estimates of Vietcong soldiers only 1 year ago.

In Santo Domingo, American troops are again engaged in aggression and violation of international agreements. American troops again outnumber the native insurgents and while they publicly cry for a cease-fire allow the rightwing generals to bomb and attack and mass troops from areas controlled by American troops.

We are fast becoming the most-hated nation in the world while the American people allow the military to tell lie after lie and suppress our own reporters at the scene.

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

Very truly yours,

MELVIN L. DAHLMANN.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,

May 21, 1965.

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

DEAR SIR: I have been meaning to write to you for some time and now must postpone the writing no longer.

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

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

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

I offer you my best wishes for the future.

Sincerely,

HOWARD RICKERT.

WOODLAND HILLS, CALIF.,

May 24, 1965.

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

Sincerely,

VICTOR and MARLYN FELDMAN.

THE FIRST UNITARIAN CHURCH

OF COLUMBUS, OHIO,

May 20, 1965.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: From the bottom of my heart, thank you for your tireless and courageous insistence upon providing leadership for what small loyal opposition exists in the consensus society our beloved maximum leader has created.

It must seem sometimes that you have "lived out your life talking to scolding men," as Vanzetti said, but those of us who shudder from the insane escalation of this new hip-shooting Barry Johnson deserve a voice also.

Trust for us is, of course, irrevocably destroyed in Latin America; no change in policy can undo that catastrophe. We have succeeded in making certain that the Vietcong government will indeed be Communist—as we always said—and that Laos and Cambodia will follow.

Thank you, sir, for your voice of sanity amidst the cries of "Ave Caesar."

Sincerely,

Rev. J. FRANKLIN CHIDSEY.

EXCELSIOR, MINN., May 19, 1965.

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

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

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

Worse, however, is the bludgeoning that the people are being subjected to by your office. This treatment, so far, has been in the form of a stream of "information" that is, in fact, a compound of evasion, wistful prognostication and patent lies. We feel buried under the weight of platitudes and half-truths to the point where our urge to protest is suffocating; as, apparently, our Congress is now stifled. It is this suppression of dissent under the guise of "consensus" that will bring us either to ruin on foreign ground or to a dangerous reaction at home; or, more likely, to both.



May 27, 1965

Approved For Release 2003/11/04 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300190015-3

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

11521

Like millions of others, I suspect, I am quite disturbed by the pretensions and apparent megalomania of our executive. Our present expansionist foreign policy will succeed in doing nothing but isolating this country and eventually, one fears, bringing us to a level of frustration where the only solution will be an explosive, annihilating one.

Social revolution is necessary, desirable, and will continue to occur throughout the world despite the icy hysteria and armed evangelism of this administration. Our late President had recognized such a reality and had begun to deal with the world rather than to browbeat and subject it to his will. Anything else, such as our present policy, seems madness.

Yours,

ALLEN F. HARRISON.

FIRST METHODIST CHURCH,  
Redding, Calif., May 18, 1965.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You have my vote of confidence for your vote of "no confidence" in the program of mounting military requirements in Vietnam.

Keep up the position.

Sincerely,

ROBERT J. HAWTHORNE.

GARDENA, CALIF., May 17, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your efforts on behalf of the American people is greatly appreciated. We admire your courage and stamina to stand by your convictions with regard to our foreign policy. Although we are unable to vote for you we would like to thank you for representing our opinion.

Yours truly,

DOROTHY and ARTHUR Y. KOBAYASHI.

AMHERST, MASS.,  
May 21, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I applaud your courageous remarks on our foreign policy. But I fear that we are being headed toward a showdown with China, and protest will become more and more difficult or unpatriotic. Please continue to speak out against U.S. militarism in Asia and in Latin America. Your voice is essential.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN A. ALLEN.

FRESNO, CALIF.,  
May 20, 1965.

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

DEAR SIR: Thank you very much for your stand in the opposition to our Government's policy in Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic.

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

Yours very truly,

Mrs. HANS E. FRANOSCH.

PARIS, ILL.,  
May 19, 1965.

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

DEAR SIR: You may never see this letter but at least it can be added to the ones in the basket marked "for." I appreciate the stand you have taken on our foreign policy, you are right all the way. It is hard to believe that you and Senator FULBRIGHT are the only ones who believe as you do but what holds them back. I feel sorry for Mr. John-

son, he inherited this mess and in trying to get out of it he seems to get in deeper every day. However he did not inherit Santo Domingo.

They say the good we do lives after us, maybe so but there can be no question about the mistakes we make, they grow and grow. Our country is suffering from the mistakes of John Foster Dulles and Joseph McCarthy. I believe that we should recognize China and that China should be admitted to the United Nations. Communism in Russia has changed and it will change in China but our present policy will not help bring that about. If we are the country we think we are we do not have to be afraid of communism.

If we are the Christian nation that we like to think we are, we should take care of our needy at home and feed hungry children the world over to the very limit of our ability and forget guns and bombs.

Yours sincerely,

MAE L. EADS.

NORWICH, CONN.,  
May 23, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I join those nonconstituents who appreciate your courageous stand on Vietnam, and I have so notified Senator RIBICOFF and Senator DODD.

With much gratitude,

CLIFTON W. GRAY, Ph. D.

COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY,  
Fort Collins, Colo., May 19, 1965.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your courageous opposition to recent American policy in Vietnam. At a time when the President is attempting to stifle free expression of opinion your stated position becomes not simply a critique of foreign policy but a defense of democracy here at home; everyone, whether or not he agrees with you, must be in your debt.

Your characterization of our Government as "drunk with military power" is most apt. Would that more officials of our Government had your appreciation of the fact that one does not win friends among people by dropping bombs on them.

Sincerely yours,

IRWIN WALL.

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY,  
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE,  
May 16, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR: I, with many of my colleagues, admire your firm stand for consistency, justice, and commonsense in opposing our administration's policy in Vietnam. We take courage from you, and continue to speak up for a peaceful settlement through negotiations with the belligerents involved—and this includes the obvious \* \* \* the Vietcong—whom we are fighting and shooting, not only the North Vietnamese whom we are bombing.

Do not fall us, the Nation, and the world by backing down now—continue to speak for your earlier proposals.

With admiration and respect for you.

Sincerely yours,

S. MEDORF, M.D.

SEPULVEDA, CALIF.,  
May 17, 1965.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to commend you on your courage and good commonsense on your views on Vietnam. Especially for your courage to speak out against the overwhelming majority who do not share your views.

I'm sure there are many average house-

wives like myself who agree with you, but how can we be heard?

I thank you so much. I would be very proud if you were our Senator from California.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. HILARY WEAVER,  
Mother of Three.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.,  
May 20, 1965.

Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON,  
President of the United States.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: I am one of the many millions who worked hard and voted for you in the last election. Most of us did so because we felt so strongly that Senator Goldwater's foreign policy proposals were: dangerous, immoral, likely to achieve the precise opposite of their professed intentions.

Why do you insist, by your bombings in Vietnam, and invasion of the Dominican Republic, in proving just how wrong Barry Goldwater was?

We already believed it before the election. We are more convinced now than ever. I, and many others I know who supported you, are determined to work against, and vote against, any public official regardless of party, who supports this incredibly inflammatory and discredited policy that assumes our military might obliges us to slaughter people worldwide (and get many of our sons slaughtered in the bargain) in the hypocritical guise of aiding self-determination.

Very sincerely yours,

HUGH MACCOLL.

SENATOR MORSE: Allow me to express my sincere gratitude to you for your position on foreign policy. Please keep up the good work.

HUGH MACCOLL.

CHAPEL HILL, N.C., May 20, 1965.

Senator MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I feel sure you will be interested in this clipping from the Durham Herald of today showing that a spokesman for the State Department excuses the bombing of North Vietnam on the ground of necessity.

As I recall it, this was the excuse of the Germans in their illegal invasion of neutral Belgium in 1914.

Yours truly,

PHILLIPS RUSSELL.

NORTH VIETNAM BOMBING TERMED AS  
NECESSITY

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

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

"Let us speak in simple candor," Shelton said. "These bombings are not pleasant; they are not by choice, they are of necessity."

Evidently alluding to the American criticism of our Vietnam policy, particularly from segments of the academic world, Shelton said, "We cannot obscure the facts by engaging in wishful thinking."

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

Noting the Communists' reaction to our bombings, Shelton said, "The fact that all this is so distressing to the Vietcong Com-

May 27, 1965

11522

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

munists gives the lie to their claim that they are an indigenous South Vietnam group engaged in civil war."

Asserting that we and the South Vietnamese "are engaged in the pursuit of the basic right of self-defense," Shelton added that "It is an action totally consistent with the spirit of America."

America has pledged itself to aid the South Vietnamese, Shelton said.

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

—  
DOWNEY, CALIF.,  
May 18, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

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

We unalterably oppose the deplorable trend which seems to say that only brute force can preserve our way of life. If this be so, then democracy is already lost—why pour blood over the corpse?

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

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

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

Sincerely yours,

JOHN N. VON RAAPHORST.  
NAN VON RAAPHORST.  
MRS. J. N. VON RAAPHORST.

—  
SAN GABRIEL, CALIF.,  
May 20, 1965.

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

DEAR SENATOR: May I commend you for your courage to vote "no" on President John's request for \$700 million more. It is good to know that at least a few want to take a second look and may wish to try to solve problems by other means than the military or war. Keep up your courage.

Sincerely,

ROLLAND THOMPSON.

—  
MENASHA, WIS.,  
May 25, 1965.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have wanted to write to you for a long time to commend you and thank you for your fearless expression of your views on our current wars.

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

In admiration and gratitude,

EBBE BERG.

—  
DENISON UNIVERSITY,  
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH,  
Granville, Ohio, May 22, 1965.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to commend you for your two speeches in the Senate, on May 5 and on May 6, in which you severely criticized American involvement in South Vietnam. Our involvement there is indeed cruel, for Asians now and, as you point out, for Americans in the future. In my opinion there can be no justification for our inter-

vention in what is essentially a civil war—as substantially the war is in the Dominican Republic—and I think we ought to withdraw immediately from both Vietnam and from the Dominican Republic—withdraw militarily, that is, for I think we ought to give nonmilitary aid to the emerging countries, where there is a need and whether they profess to be our friends or not. The Biblical injunction, "If thy enemy hunger, feed him," seems more appropriate now than ever.

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

Sincerely yours,

JAMES MISSEY.

—  
BELLWOOD, ILL.,  
May 24, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just a note of approval of your good, sound political policies. Keep up the good work. Wars only bring misery.

Sincerely,

JOHN SKOJOU.

—  
MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY,  
Houghton, Mich., May 23, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thanks for your reports, May 14, 1965, which are always welcome and for including a copy of the RECORD—"The undeclared war in Vietnam." Very good, and double thanks for your fine, revealing statements. Keep up the good work.

Best regards,

MILTON E. SHERER.

—  
MEMPHIS, TENN.,  
May 22, 1965.

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

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

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

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

certain basic criteria of competence for such appointees.

Yours very truly,

C. W. SHEPPARD.

—  
STANFORD UNIVERSITY,  
Stanford, Calif., May 21, 1965.

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

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

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

Sincerely,

DAVID S. JACOBSON.

—  
THE REAL ROLE OF VIETNAM TEACH-INS

EDITOR: The teach-in debates are good for what ails us—complacency at the top and conformity below. We cannot afford complacency in times like these and conformity atrophies the precious right of dissent. Debates are less useful, however, if they focus exclusively on the hot local issues and we lose sight of the larger questions of which the local issues are symptoms.

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

Have we lost sight of recent shiftings in the alignments of nations and assumed that communism has become so menacing that the United States has the duty to prevent its further establishment in Asia or Latin America regardless of our agreements and the wishes and policies of friendly governments?

We claim that we are not only protecting our own national security which every nation has a right to do, but are protecting the national security of all nations not under Communist rule, which they have not asked us to do. Many of the presumed beneficiaries would feel more secure if we were not so trigger happy. And the Communists naturally allege that we are not protecting but endangering general security just as imperialists are supposed to do.

Conflicts of national security interests are not new; and they have led to war when one country has followed the advice of its practical realists who believe in the efficacy of preemptive violence. After two wars of mounting scope and destructiveness, world opinion seems to have recognized that in one matter there could no longer be a conflict of national security interests. The overriding security interest of all mankind has come to be the prevention of a third world war in which for the first time man has the nuclear chemical and biological weapons to impose an eternal peace on this contentious planet.

Global and regional peacekeeping arrangements are now in some disarray when, perhaps, we need them more than ever. The basic issue at this moment is do we serve the security interests of ourselves and the rest of humanity by adding to this disarray by repudiating our commitments to these organizations? Resort to armed intervention in violation of treaties, which we have loudly condemned ever since the Germans tore up that "scrap of paper" and invaded Belgium in 1914, has always been done to force an opponent to mend his ways and come to the conference table, preferably to surrender unconditionally. We are violating, and not in the exercise of the right of self-defense, our pledges to both the United Nations and the Organization of American States "to re-

May 17, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

11523

train from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state." The effect, regardless of our motives, can only unify our enemies, shake the confidence of our friends, discourage collective security with us and stimulate collective self defense against us.

We take this risk because, so we are told, the Communists must be stopped at all costs from expanding in Latin America and taking control of all Asia, and there is no one else who can do the job. The administration does not seem to recognize that the conditions in Western Europe, where containment was so successful, do not exist in the developing countries of Asia and Latin America. Nor do the bipartisan supporters of our present policies seem to suspect that the splits between Russian and Chinese and other styles of communism can have any bearing on the world conspiracy or on how to deal with it. Nor is any significance attached to the appearance in several developing countries of single party dictatorships using Communist totalitarian and organizational methods but not Communist ideology, as the most effective way to achieve modernization. The spread of polycentrism, this loosening of alignments is bound to be a growing obstacle to Communist ambitions unless we continue to help the national Communist Parties to minimize their differences with each other while we cause our allies to exaggerate their differences with us.

As the President has said, there is a job to be done and there is no one else who can do it. In this he is certainly right, but he is mistaken in his priorities.

He has acknowledged that it is not just a matter of trying to contain communism by force. His excellent proposal of multilateral development aid is a necessary part of the job. But another part of the job has, under present circumstances, a higher priority. This is first, to recognize that the security of the world's most powerful nation is linked with the security of both friendly and unfriendly nations, and secondly, that in the long run, the security which is the common interest of all peoples can be strengthened only if we, the strongest, uphold and use the global and regional institutions of peaceful change and pacific settlement.

H. H. FISHER.

PALO ALTO.

CHICAGO, ILL.,  
May 17, 1965.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We wish again to commend you for your courage and for your forthright speeches in the Senate on May 5 and May 6. It must feel lonely to take such a stand in the Senate which, in abdicating its powers to declare war is surrendering to an aggressive President and leading our country to destruction.

We sincerely hope enough Americans will support your position so that we may yet be saved from a worldwide holocaust.

Please send us copies of your most recent speeches in the Senate.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

Dr. and Mrs. ALFRED STEIN.

THE VALE METHODIST CHURCH,  
Fairfax, Va., May 21, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for those good statements in the Senate May 5 and 6. You are most intelligent and courageous. God bless your worthy endeavors.

Sincerely yours,

EVERETT DORR.

P.S.—Have you seen this statement by James P. Warburg?

NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
May 22, 1965.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you very much indeed for having sent me the reprint from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as I am on your mailing list.

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

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

As I spent considerable time in southeast Asia generally and in Vietnam particularly throughout 1963 I am in fullest agreement with both the views you so forcefully express and fight for as well as with the conclusions you have reached about the eventual outcome of the war in Vietnam.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely,

GEORGE H. CORD,  
Journalist.MERZIFON, TURKEY,  
May 14, 1965.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It must be difficult to maintain a position such as yours over Vietnam and the Dominican Republic in the face of the apparently widespread support for these policies in Congress and the Nation. If you were as concerned with consensus as the President seems to be, you would have to tailor your ideas accordingly but you seem more concerned with the correctness of your ideas than their popularity—it's good to have you where you are, raising the intelligent

objections to this new American indulgence that ought to be raised.

I doubt that the President has all the support for his policies that it may appear he has at first glance. Consensus has some unpleasant connotations and one is that it's a fine companion for apathy. Consensus seems to be assumed wherever there are no contrary voices to be heard which is a negative definition of a term that ought only to be used when positive agreement can be found. The lack of objection from an essentially passive public that tends away from stringently independent thought has perhaps led Mr. Johnson to suppose he has backing where merely silence prevails.

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

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

Very truly yours,

THOMAS DEMERS.

SAN RAFAEL, CALIF.,  
May 17, 1965.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My profound gratitude for your courageous "No" vote on President Johnson's demand for \$700 million and a "blank check" re the mounting Vietnam and Dominican fiascos. But for you and your small number of brave and honorable colleague dissenters, the resemblance of Capitol Hill to the old Reichstag would be more horrendous than it is.

Respectfully,

SAM HENZEL, M.D.

LEESBURG, VA.,  
May 23, 1965.

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

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

Sincerely,

AGNES SAYLER.

RIO DE JANEIRO, GB, ZC 07 BRAZIL,  
May 22, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations for your courageous criticisms of the Government policy in Vietnam.

Let me assure you, as an American living abroad, that the United States is breeding a horrible hatred among the peoples of the

11524

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 27, 1965

world. Our actions in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic are no less than infamous.

Yours truly,

ALLEN YOUNG  
P.S.—U.S. residence: Glen Wild, N.Y.

RIVERDALE, N.Y.,  
May 24, 1965.

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

DEAR SIR: I was heartsick that your efforts and your brilliant speech of May 5 opposing the President's \$700 million request for Vietnam, failed to stop the Senate's ratification.

I believe with you that continued escalation of the war in Vietnam by our Government, can only lead to disaster for us all.

Will you and your colleagues continue to try to persuade the President to stop the bombing, seek a cease-fire, and press for negotiations without conditions with all concerned, including the Vietcong—before it is too late.

Gratefully yours,

GERTRUDE GOTTLIEB.

WEST HARTFORD, CONN.,  
May 24, 1965.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing you in appreciation for the courageous stand you have taken regarding U.S. policy in Vietnam.

As many others have stated, "We have Barry Goldwater in the White House." President Johnson seems to be committed to the same reckless foreign policy that Barry Goldwater advocated in last year's campaign. He appears to desire a "blank check" to commit the United States to any military action he desires. He has already put the power to wage war in his own hands, rather than place it in the hands of the U.S. Congress, as our Constitution requires. The recent White House suggestion that Congressmen not voice their objections to U.S. foreign policy in public is a massive strike against our system of government.

Americans must stand up and reject the Johnson foreign policy. Although we are now in a minority, I know that some day this country will honor you and your distinguished fellow Senator, Senator GRUENING, of Alaska, for standing up against these illegal acts of President Johnson.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL BASCH.

GREENFIELD, IND.,  
May 22, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: I appreciate your passionate plea for the Senate to retain its valuable control over warfare. Let us all work to convince enough Americans that we can have a candidate in the next presidential election who will actively promote a foreign policy run to promote freedom everywhere.

May I please have a copy of your comments on May 5 and 6?

Very sincerely,

Mrs. KATHRYN PARNELL.

ST. AUGUSTINE, FLA.,  
May 23, 1965.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: While there is still time, I want to express my respect, and admiration, for your undaunted courage; standing for what is right—nearly alone, among the lame ducks—and southern fossils.

It is indeed tragic, that the President is taking the advice from the wrong people—the military. It is horrible to contemplate;

that we who thought we voted for peace, got more war; and more gunboats.

There should never be any interference, in another country's civil wars; except by the United Nations; the brutal dictators we have supported in the past, doesn't speak well of our democracy.

I wish you, and Senator GRUENING, more power, and more strength; and peace for all of us—before it is too late.

Yours sincerely,

AGNES AANES.

GREAT FALLS, MONT.,  
May 20, 1965.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have wanted to write to you for a long time to commend you for your fearless stand on U.S. involvement in southeast Asia. Unfortunately, yours is an unpopular position with too many Congressmen and the White House. I only hope that serious, global tragedy does not confirm the wisdom of your position.

While unafraid (if one can be) to go to Vietnam himself, and this is quite possible, I am willing to go to be of service to our young Americans there. However, on a national scale I do fear a ground war of attrition with the Communist Chinese or, what is worse, a nuclear war on a worldwide basis. Please continue to speak your mind despite the reactionary trend in Washington.

As a Catholic I would like to go on record as saying that in no way is William F. Buckley, Jr., a spokesman for the Catholic Church. Though I disagree vehemently with his ideas, I must grant his liberty to express them. However, there is little danger of his not doing so, his wealth, power, prestige and magazine enable him to; but, his Catholicism being well known, by some he may be regarded as one of the Catholic Church's spokesmen despite the fact that his ideas do not reflect current thinking in the church and still less the teaching of the gospels.

Eventually the Boite legislation will reach the Senate and I do hope that you will vote in favor of that legislation.

With all due respect to Senator ROBERT KENNEDY's feelings on the sale of mail-order guns, personally I do not think this sale is a serious menace to national well-being. Stolen guns do far more damage and even worse is the slaughter we can expect a week from now on the highways over the Memorial Day weekend.

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

Having expressed some of my thoughts, I again want to commend and thank you. Continue your courageous fight against bad thinking.

Respectfully yours,

Father THOMAS J. ENDEL,  
U.S. Air Force.

#### CASTRO'S SUBVERSION IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, on Cuban Independence Day, May 20, 1965, I spoke in the Senate, as did my colleague from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and other Senators, to point out the desperate condition of freedom under the present Castro government. I placed in the RECORD that day the first part of the American Security Council's report on Castro's inspired subversion, dealing with subversion in the United States.

The second portion of that report, dealing with such subversion, is now available. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD and thus be available for study by Members of Congress and the American people in general.

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

#### CASTRO'S SUBVERSION IN THE UNITED STATES—PART II

At a recent State Department briefing on Latin American affairs, the briefing officer concluded his remarks with the observation that the Communists had a chance to make a showcase out of Cuba but they had failed miserably. This conclusion was first offered by President Kennedy 3 years ago and it remains today as the accepted State Department attitude toward Castro and Cuba. Such an attitude fails to take into account that communism has never been a social or economic success anywhere; but as a showcase from which to spread subversion, it has done admirably—and Cuba is an excellent example.

Our Washington report of last week illustrated the point by outlining the activities of the Cuban General Directorate of Intelligence. However, Castro's greatest success against the United States has been in the area of agitation and propaganda.

Sad to say, almost all his field workers here are U.S. citizens. They are citizens who follow the Moscow, Peiping, or Trotskyite line. They range all the way from hard-line Communists to soft-line dupes.

A 2-year investigation by the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security into the activities and membership of the now defunct Fair Play for Cuba Committee, organized in April 1960, proved that FPFCC had been heavily infiltrated by known Communists and fellow travelers. Some of the ads it ran on behalf of Castro were actually financed in large measure by the Cuban Government. Following State Department's issuance of travel restrictions to Cuba on January 16, 1961, many Fair Play for Cuba Committee members traveled illegally to Havana and, upon their return to this country, gave lectures on behalf of the Castro regime.

One of these was James Jackson, a member of the national committee of the Communist Party, U.S.A. Another was James O'Conner, whose lecture was advertised in the Communist Daily Worker, as were the lectures of at least a dozen others. Jean Pestana, Rose Rosenberg, and Helen Travis—all identified as Communists before the House Committee on Un-American Activities—were indicative of the Cuban guest list which numbered in excess of 150 U.S. citizens in a 2-year period.

The best known member of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee was President Kennedy's assassin—Lee Harvey Oswald. He formed a chapter of the organization in New Orleans in April 1963 and discontinued it in September following his failure to reach Cuba.

The FPFCC was a Communist front. Its effect on the American public was negligible. But through its activities and the close contacts some of its members formed with the Castro regime, there grew up in its midst other more militant groups. The most important of these was the Progressive Labor Movement.

PLM was organized in January 1962. Its president, Milton Rosen, and vice president, Mortimer Scheer, had both been expelled from the Communist Party for disruptive activities. In December 1962, PLM attempted to send a group of "students" to Cuba and failed because the Canadian Government refused clearance to a Cuban plane to pick them up. A year and a half later, PLM succeeded.