

leaving the partnership and going to Dublin to live, with his family, a life devoted to the jobs that he knew needed urgently to be done. The pros may not have won out all at once, but in later years they did indeed carry the day.

The rash of so-called loyalty statutes of the 1930's, calling for, among other things, special baths for schoolteachers, awakened Grenville Clark to a new internal danger—the subversion of our historic freedoms under the Bill of Rights by often sincere but misguided superpatriots in legislative bodies, local, State, and National. Convinced that lawyers generally and the American Bar Association in particular should be vigilant in the protection of individual liberties, he proposed the creation of a bar committee at the national level to guard the Bill of Rights from trespasses of all kinds. He did this in an address to the Nassau County (N.Y.) Bar Association on June 11, 1938.

Arthur T. Vanderbilt, then president of the American Bar Association, read the account of the address in the New York Times. At once he telephoned the speaker and told him that this idea of a bar committee charged with continuous concern about American freedoms and rights had occurred to both of them independently. Vanderbilt, who was soon to leave the American Bar Association presidency, arranged a meeting for himself and Clark with the incoming president, Frank J. Hogan, who agreed to such a committee of 14 with Clark as its chairman. Clark accepted on the condition that he be allowed to select members who believed with him in the mission of the committee. Clark chose all the members except one, who was recommended by Hogan. That single exception was out of tune with the committee's purposes and opposed its most important early decisions. But, on the whole, it was a remarkably unified committee of outstanding lawyers from over the Nation, including, in addition to Clark's classmate, Lemann, such staunch supporters of civil liberty under the Constitution as Douglas Arant, Zechariah Chafee, Jr., George I. Haight, Ross L. Malone, Jr., and Charles P. Taft.

As chairman, Grenville Clark moved promptly to make the new and in many ways surprising committee an effective force in American life as well as within the bar. Careful plans were laid for the publication of a journal through which the work of the committee and the issues before it could be communicated to the bar and to the public. Named the Bill of Rights Review, this excellent publication first appeared in the summer of 1940. Sustained at the outset by a grant from the Carnegie Corp., it was published by the committee with the chairman as one pro tem editor and Joseph Harrison as the other. As its reason for being, the Bill of Rights Review said both frankly and perceptively:

"A growing volume of cases in recent years has made it increasingly apparent that a distinct field of law—that of civil rights—is emerging and taking its place along with the older established fields and such newer fields as administrative law, labor law, and tax law. The subject often involves heated controversy and is intrinsically of such importance that it requires a wise and balanced treatment on the part of the ablest members of the bar. These can best help maintain the American system of free institutions by being guided by the letter and spirit of the law of civil liberties rather than by their political or economic predilections. Such an approach to this all-important subject would be timely and might well become the organized bar's greatest contribution to the preservation of the American way."

The Bill of Rights Review came out every quarter for several years. In that time it did much to resist the war hysteria against those who held unpopular opinions. If the times made the mission of the committee the

harder, so was its opportunity the greater in awakening, at the very least, some members of the legal profession, educators and editors of newspapers and magazines to the increasing assaults on the liberties of the individual citizen. It can only be regretted that this noble undertaking did not continue straight through the years. Nearly a quarter century later the Review's files are a collection of many of the finest editorials and articles ever written and published on American freedoms.

Even before it could issue volume 1, No. 1 of the Bill of Rights Review, the committee went into action as friends of the court—in two eminent civil liberties cases. First it strongly opposed Mayor Frank Hague in his arbitrary and unconstitutional deportation of Norman Thomas, from Jersey City, where the Socialist leader was prevented from addressing a public meeting. In the Hague case the committee was resoundingly on the winning side. Then, after a year of study of the compulsory flag salute issue, the committee filed a brief, prepared by Clark and Chafee, in opposition to the claims of the Minersville (Pa.) School District that it could, first, compel children to salute the flag as a condition to staying in school, and, second, that if pupils did not join in the compulsory flag salute the school board had the authority to suspend them.

Two children in the school, Lillian Gobitis, aged 12, and her brother, William, aged 10, refused to take part in the daily salute. Their parents taught them that according to their religion (Jehovah's Witnesses) to salute the flag was to "bow down before a graven image." The committee's brief argued that to insist on the flag salute in these circumstances amounted to an unconstitutional infringement of religious liberty. Here the committee, in June 1940, lost 8 to 1—temporarily. The majority opinion written by classmate Frankfurter, then a new Justice, was soon seriously weakened in the 5-to-4 *Handbills* case also arising from the activities of the Jehovah's Witnesses. In less than 3 years, the 8-to-1 decision in *Minersville School District v. Gobitis* was reversed by the Supreme Court in the 6-to-3 decision in *West Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnette*. The brief of Clark and Chafee and the Bill of Rights Committee of the American Bar Association had become the law of the land.

Oddly enough it remained for citizen Clark to perform in World War II a function very much like that which brought him the Distinguished Service Medal in World War I. The conquest of Norway by the Nazis, in April 1940, told him that the United States would in all probability be drawn into the hostilities however much we might wish to avoid involvement. And so, when the Plattsburg alumni met in May 8, 1940, he proposed that the United States begin to organize and train its manpower through a national Selective Service Act.

But the Secretary of War, Harry H. Woodring, was opposed to conscription when the United States itself was not at war. Clark's solution to this first aspect of the problem was to work for a change at the Cabinet level. He laid his plans carefully and dealt quietly with men influential in Washington. When his movements were completed, President Roosevelt had, on June 20, 1940, replaced Woodring with the eminent Republican, Henry L. Stimson, who had served as Secretary of War under President Taft and as Secretary of State under President Hoover. One of the conditions that Stimson had set as a basis for acceptance of the secretaryship (at the same time Republican Frank Knox became Secretary of the Navy) was that he have a free hand to work for Selective Service. As in World War I, Clark took the cause to the public. He set up a program to inform the country as to the need for a draft of manpower by Congress.

Then he largely wrote the Selective Service Act which, after amendment, passed the Senate, 2 to 1, and became law in September 1940. In 1941 he answered Stimson's call for help, went to Washington and was in the War Secretary's office to write the declaration of war against Japan after the dastardly attack on Pearl Harbor. Citizen Clark had done it again.

Yet he would probably say that vital though survival is, nothing he did in the two World Wars is as important as his efforts for world peace. He began to turn over thoughts about limited world government as long ago as the 1920's. In 1939, spurred by the precarious state of global affairs, he wrote out his developing ideas in "A Federation of Free Peoples." With the Second World War substantially won by July 1944, Clark quit Washington and went back to Dublin to work on winning the peace. Secretary Stimson encouraged him to raise his sights so as to devise a world constitution for the postwar era.

The result was that he produced an outline for a world government to maintain peace which the Indiana Law Review published that same year with the significant title, "A New World Order—The American Lawyer's Role." In October 1945, he assembled the meeting known as the Dublin conference. At Clark's inspiration and with Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts as chairman, a group of 40 distinguished citizens met in sight of old Monadnock to think together about the means for preventing the holocaust that could destroy civilization. Out of their deliberations came the Dublin declaration looking to the formation of a world federal government.

The essence of the Clark position on world peace is that as long as the nuclear arms race continues, the world lives with a loaded gun at its head. This, he submits, is not only dangerous to the point of foolhardiness but intolerable. And so he is for world law, legislated by a world body and enforced by a world administration, with a world police force to keep international order. Any disputes would be adjudicated or mediated by world courts and related tribunals. This comprehensive peacekeeping machinery would be supported by an adequate world revenue system.

The United Nations is good so far as it goes, but as is evident from the Clark plan, it does not go far enough. And so Citizen Clark undertook to work out a detailed revision of the United Nations Charter with a view to provoking "the worldwide discussions which must precede the adoption of universal and complete disarmament and the establishment of truly effective institutions for the prevention of war."

In the formulation of his plan's many details, he enlisted the help of Prof. Louis B. Sohn of the Harvard University Law School, whose field is international law. Their book, "World Peace Through World Law," was published by the Harvard University Press in March 1958. The first edition was soon exhausted and a revised edition came out in 1960. It has been translated in whole or in part into at least a dozen languages, among them Chinese and Russian, and serves as a basis for genuine world peace and disarmament talks wherever they are held. Then in order to propose an alternative method he and Professor Sohn published in 1962 a draft treaty establishing a World Disarmament and World Development Organization within the framework of the United Nations. The purpose was to create a compact but inclusive treaty text on which statesmen might start to work in any sincere effort at drawing the teeth of war.

In recent months Grenville Clark has been studying the probable effect of disarmament on the world's population problem. One of the fruits in this area was a provocative article which he contributed in February

1963, to a series in the Saturday Review. His encouraging expectations can be told from these hopeful words: "The release, through complete disarmament, of vast resources to raise living standards in the 'have-not' areas of the world could bring about effective population control within a few decades." Those who strive for peace and those who strive for population control should, he wrote, "strike hands in a united effort for the preservation and welfare of mankind."

How do fellow lawyers appraise the career of Grenville Clark? Judging by the widely circulated exchange of letters in 1949 on the issue of "Freedom at Harvard" between him, as a Harvard fellow, and Harvard law graduate Frank B. Ober, of Baltimore, there are those who find fault with parts of it—to say the least. But then there are countless others who regard the patient, far-seeing man with the square, strong jaw as among the greatest not only of their profession but of all America.

On presenting Grenville Clark with the American Bar Association's highest award, its gold medal for "conspicuous service to the cause of American jurisprudence," President Ross Malone spoke for many lawyers, on August 27, 1959, at Miami Beach, when he said, quoting the citation:

"Through his dedication to the discharge of the public responsibility of the bar during a long and distinguished professional career, he has rallied many others to that noble concept. He has helped keep freedom's flag flying, and by his example has ever reminded his fellow lawyers of their duty to uphold liberty and to expand support for the rule of law."

Yet more than gold medals and citations he must cherish the words of Secretary Stimson from a handwritten letter sent after World War II:

"You certainly should record your work. At almost every critical period in our history which I can remember, it was your sagacity which diagnosed and pushed forward the best remedy, and you have not had a quarter of the recognition for it which you should have had."

Among those in high place who have commended Grenville Clark's work is President Kennedy. Praising him as a man alert, in both war and peace, to vital needs, the President has well said that "his example is one for which we can all be grateful."

But let Grenville Clark speak for himself. His words come to us from the spotlighted rostrum of the bar convention where he has received the gold medal, from the study in the Harvard law library where he is hard at work, from the old farmhouse on the mountain slope in New Hampshire where he takes comfort from the serenity of the lake that greeted the pioneers two centuries ago. He says to us:

"I hope that we may constantly recall the words of Lincoln: 'As our case is new, so must we think anew and act anew.' For I wish that our thinking shall not be crippled by timidity or undue regard for tradition, but shall be as imaginative and creative as the problem is vast and new. I further wish that we may resist any temptation to avoid the hardest problems.

"I earnestly hope that we may have the insight to perceive the uselessness of talking about any effective rule of law in world affairs unless in addition to world tribunals we are prepared to accept world legislative and executive agencies equipped with adequate authority to make the judgments of those tribunals surely enforceable.

"In particular I hope that we will realize that nothing less will suffice than universal and complete, rather than partial, national disarmament, together with an adequate world police force. On no easier terms than these, I believe, can a world rule of law, how-

ever strictly limited to the prevention of war, become a reality.

"This problem of world peace under law is indeed hard. But it is not insoluble and the goal is worth the effort. There is a tide in the affairs of men. It brings us now a supreme opportunity and also imposes an urgent duty. If we can rise to that duty we shall fairly earn the gratitude of all mankind."

And so going west out of Dublin watch for that turnoff to the left into the woods. It is a third of a mile beyond the village post office which puts the cancellation, "Dublin, N.H.," on so many important letters and statements and pamphlets that go out around the world—just a third of a mile and no more. Citizen Clark, U.S.A., walking stick in hand, is waiting in the cool of the summer evening at the lane that leads up to Outlet Farm where Fanny Dwight Clark has been cultivating her prize roses. It would be too bad to miss even a minute that you might have had there.

### THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, last week, on Saturday, July 4, the convention of the Oregon Democratic Party, meeting at Coos Bay, Oreg., adopted a resolution calling for submission of the jurisdiction of the war in South Vietnam to the United Nations. At this large convention, there was only one vote in opposition. The comments made at the convention also left no room for doubt that the participants in that Democratic convention in Oregon are very concerned about the course of action that the United States is following in the foreign policy in southeast Asia.

In my judgment this is the most sensible action that has been taken by any party convention yet on this critical international conflict.

The resolution states in full:

We urge that the United States ask the United Nations to take responsibility for the settlement of the conflict in Vietnam and that the United States declare its readiness to contribute troops and military support under United Nations command upon the assumption of this responsibility by the United Nations.

There is no doubt as to the position of these Democrats in support of having other nations who are members of the United Nations proceed to carry out their responsibilities, along with the United States, in applying the rule of law, rather than American unilateral military action in Southeast Asia in an attempt to settle this dispute.

The American people everywhere, not just in Oregon, are beginning to awaken to the fact that what is happening in Southeast Asia is not the exclusive business of the U.S. Department of Defense or of the U.S. Government as a whole. They are beginning to appreciate that it is a threat to international peace of exactly the kind the United Nations was created to handle.

Even the Secretary General of the U.N., U Thant, is coming to appreciate the same thing. At long last, he has called for a new 14-nation conference on Southeast Asia, with the possibility that the United Nations could play a role in enforcing its decision. I would that the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Mr. Adlai Stevenson, would give

to Mr. U Thant the help and cooperation that is needed, rather than follow the course of action that Mr. Stevenson has been following in recent months in regard to the war in southeast Asia. The United States opposes any new agreement on Southeast Asia until the existing agreements are lived up to. But since we are not living up to them any more than North Vietnam or China, this is only a semantic objection and not a real one. It stands to our historic discredit.

The official position of the United States only raises the question of why the United Nations should not be brought in to enforce the existing agreement. If we really want it enforced, why do we try to keep the U.N. out? The American concern about living up to existing agreements will not be believable even to our own people until we seek an international, not a unilateral, enforcement of them. Until we demonstrate in good faith—and the United States in southeast Asia is not demonstrating good faith, but bad faith—the United States in southeast Asia is not living up to its obligations under even the Geneva accord of 1962, and we did not even sign the Geneva accord of 1954. The United States is not demonstrating good faith in southeast Asia until it demonstrates a willingness to sit down at a 14-nation conference table, as Mr. U Thant now, at long last—but better than never—has finally proposed in the press today.

I am proud that the Oregon Democratic convention has raised its voice in behalf of the rule of law in world affairs. As the war continues, as it becomes more widely discussed in this country, and as more information about it trickles down to the American people, there will be more voices raised along the same line.

More people in the country are speaking out through the various media of public information than there were 90 days ago. I ask unanimous consent to have certain communications that I have received in support of the position I have taken on this issue and certain newspaper articles printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, great concern is being demonstrated among our allies over our military course of action in southeast Asia. We are beginning to hear rumblings of fear and doubt in respect to the U.S. policy in southeast Asia among the people of many lands.

In today's press, our potential enemy, Russia, is making disquieting statements about her concern over what she alleges to be U.S. aggression in southeast Asia. She is beginning to make noises to the effect that she does not propose to ignore her commitments made with other countries to see to it that aggression is not carried out in southeast Asia or elsewhere.

Certainly, I agree that she ought to be the last to be discussing it. When one looks at the blood of aggression on the hands of Soviet Russia, it becomes a bit paradoxical to read her pratings today. But, nevertheless, we have placed our-

selves, I respectfully submit, in a position so that Russia can carry on that kind of propoganda against the United States. In this instance, the United States is wrong. Russia is going to take advantage of every mistake we make. She is beginning to indicate that she is not going to walk out on Red China. There are stirrings, rumblings, and propoganda announcements coming out of Peiping itself.

Red China is showing an intention not to be bluffed by the United States, not to submit to the United States as we continue our policy of making war, and not peace, in southeast Asia.

In my judgment, the war clouds are becoming more black and ugly over Asia. They are becoming so black they have caused even Pakistan to endorse a 14-nation conference according to today's press reports. Pakistan is one of the SEATO members that has refused to join American forces in Vietnam, despite the vast aid we furnish to Pakistan. I am more concerned than ever before that if we continue our unilateral military course of action in Asia, the probabilities are that there will be a full-scale war in Asia, and the United States will live to regret that we took the course of action that brought about the beginning of that war, rather than resorting, as we should, under treaty commitments, to existing procedures of the rule of law or at least an attempt to settle the dispute by peaceful procedures, rather than by American military might.

## EXHIBIT 1

TAKAPUNA, AUCKLAND,  
NEW ZEALAND,  
June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senator for the State of Oregon, Senate of  
the United States of America, Washing-  
ton, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have read in our newspapers recently your sane and balanced views on world affairs particularly with regard to events in southeast Asia, a part of the world that is of great concern to those of us that live in the South Pacific region.

Your comments as reported today (June 25, 1964) on the question of the course indicated by the United States in this vital area are listened to and understood by people from many walks of life here. To those of us that look with great concern at the march toward a conflagration in southeast Asia, your voice is an indication of wiser councils that rise above the constant barrage of talk of war that flows in an endless stream from so many U.S. spokesmen and various journals.

Please accept my thanks for your courage and humanity in speaking out on these issues which keep alive the faith that so many people like myself still endeavor to retain in the American democratic tradition of the past, despite so many blows against a retention of that faith during recent years. Whilst persons like yourself in positions of responsibility in your country still speak out on matters that they consider against the interests of peace, independence, and common humanity, we know that the best traditions of American democracy still retain some hold in these dangerous times.

Please accept my assurance based on my own experience that your words are not lost on millions of ordinary people outside the United States, we can well see what

would be the inevitable result of the policies you speak out against as a true American. Thank you.

Yours faithfully,

Mr. F. S. BALDWIN.

[From the New Zealand Herald,  
June 25, 1964]

## SENATOR FEARS BIG WAR

WASHINGTON.—Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, said in the U.S. Senate yesterday that the United States was heading for a major war in Asia.

He said he had just come from a briefing on the military situation in South Vietnam held by the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

"If the United States continues following the course indicated by this briefing," he said, "we are headed for a major war in Asia, in which thousands of American boys will die.

"We will be hated for 500 years and we will be known as the Nation that was chiefly responsible for scuttling the United Nations.

"The greatest threat to the peace of the world is the United States."

Senator Morse said the situation in South Vietnam should be put before the United Nations.

LINCOLN PARK, MICH.,  
June 28, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: Bless you for expressing your views on Vietnam. We have urged our Senators to back you up in this. We, too, are alarmed by the appointment of M. Taylor.

Yours sincerely,

D. SPEIR.

JUNE 28, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish other Senators would be as forthright as you have been in speaking on Vietnam. Try to get them to read Helen S. Lamb's basic pamphlet on "The Tragedy of Vietnam—Where Do We Go From Here?" Surely after reading it all your Senators and Congressmen would want a peaceful settlement after reading Helen S. Lamb's pamphlet.

Yours respectfully,

Mrs. BETSY DAVENPORT.

JULY 3, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: Keep up the good work on your southeastern Asia position. We're all for you. Have written to KENNEDY and SALTONSTALL expressing my views. Maybe we can start them moving in the right direction, too.

Best of luck,

Yours,

SIDNEY DORFMAN.

ITHACA, N.Y.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your speech of June 22 on the war in South Vietnam. I agree completely with what you said. Keep up the fight.

WILLIAM DUELL.

SHEFFIELD, MASS.,  
July 4, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: On this July 4, we want to thank you for speaking out on be-

half of commonsense and humanity, and against our policy of spreading or continuing the war in Vietnam. Yours is a courageous voice, and there are plenty of people who appreciate.

Sincerely,

JOAN and LES LASKOFF.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,  
July 6, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been so thankful for what you have been saying about Vietnam and southeast Asia. I think you have made three speeches on the topic recently. I should be very grateful for a copy of each of them. If I should pay for these, please let me know.

With greater faith in America because you are in our Senate.

HENRY S. HUNTINGTON.

BERKELEY, CALIF.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your effort to fight the bad American policy in southeast Asia. There is no reason for unilateral action by the United States.

Yours truly,

GEORGE GOLDMAN.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You are so right, all the trouble in Vietnam is our fault, why did we not go to the U.N.? Why were we not kinder to Castro when he came here in 1958? That is Eisenhower? Who is setting our foreign policy under the Republicans and the Democrats? The governments of the world must be by the individuals for the individual and of the individual, give the principles of the declaration both at home and abroad even when we do not wish too, such as to every child.

BRIDGEVILLE, PA.

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

DEAR SIR: I want to express my great appreciation and admiration for your discussion on the program "Issues and Answers." I have written to ABC in New York to inquire if copies can be obtained.

It seems so important that such a sane, intelligent presentation of our international conduct (especially with reference to the U.N.) should be given the widest possible distribution.

Thank you again for your inimitable performance,

Very truly yours,

Mrs. ALICE G. HARRIS.

JUNE 30, 1964.

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

HON. SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: I commend you on your courageous stand on the situation in South Vietnam and its terrible possibilities of war. We appreciate your services to the cause of peace.

Yours truly,

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

SYLVIA HILL.

JUNE 30, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your interview with the press Sunday was outstanding. How I wish your advice would be acted upon immediately.

GLENDALE, CALIF.

FLORENCE S. REED.

July 9

NORTHAMPTON, MASS.,  
July 2, 1964.Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is to commend you on your stand concerning present U.S. policies in Vietnam. I think our relations with China and southeast Asia have reached a dangerous point and that every effort should be bent, not to extending the war there, but to negotiating its end.

Sincerely yours,  
ALICE A. LAGEROWITZ.Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I should like to add my approval of your stand on our involvement in South Vietnam. Keep up the fight. There are countless U.S. citizens who agree. I hope you hear from them.

Mrs. ROBERT SCHON.

BERKELEY, CALIF.

JULY 3, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for speaking out on the Vietnam situation. What are we ordinary citizens to do when our leaders tell us this situation can only be resolved through "brinkmanship." I would very much appreciate it if you could send me a transcript of your speeches on Vietnam.

Sincerely,

Mrs. EDITH ALTERMAN.

CLAREMONT, CALIF.

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

I strongly support your efforts to change our unilateral military policy in Vietnam. I heard your forceful TV speech when you urged that the United States get the free world to organize behind the U.N. Charter. I have sent the President a night letter which several others signed and am writing my Senators.

With gratitude for your courage and forthrightness in presenting the situation to the country and stressing our obligation to international law.

Mrs. ELIZABETH P. STEINER.

JULY 4, 1964.

Senator MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is to declare my strong support of your courageous stand against the U.S. policy in southeast Asia which I agree is politically disastrous and morally wrong.

I am writing to President Johnson to this effect.

Sincerely yours,

JANE M. CHASE.

ALBANY, N.Y.

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

SIR: Bravo Senator MORSE; it takes a real A-1 American citizen and statesman to tell off the warmongering racketeers that have for too long a time brainwashed the average American citizen. The United Nations is our only salvation for survival for the entire conflict areas of dispute.

Let's go, U.N.O.

J.J.C.

SALEM, OREG.,  
June 13, 1964.Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

rapidly growing number of concerned citizens

who feel as you do—that it is time some sanity be brought into the American policy in Asia. The stand you have taken on what we have done and are doing in Vietnam (and now in Laos) shows that you believe we have the moral obligation to practice what we "preach." Are we so drunk with power that we believe we are justified in working with the United Nations only when doing so furthers our own selfish interests?

Your protest makes me feel that the America I was taught about in school is not altogether dead. I still believe too strongly in the greatness of our ideals to look upon most of our actions in Asia with anything but a feeling of hopeless horror. The future of our Nation, and therefore of the world, depends upon you—and the others of your persuasion—whose eyes are not in the backs of their heads, and whose moral values compel them to weigh America in the same scales with which America weighs the actions of other nations.

Sincerely,

Mrs. MARTHA FOLLENWIDER.

CHEEKTOWAGA, N.Y.,  
June 27, 1964.Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Would you please send me a copy of your interview on "Issues and Answers," Sunday, June 27, 1964.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD R. ROMAN.

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

SIR: Please send me copies of your speeches on Vietnam, Laos, and southeast Asia.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

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

Could I please have a copy of your speech on Vietnam—by the 28th if possible.

Thank you very much.

JOAN RAWLES.

CLAREMONT, CALIF.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please keep on talking against our foreign policy in Asia. If you speak often and loud enough the newspapers, radio, and TV have to report it once in a while.

According to State Secretary Rusk, we are the only ones who belong to Vietnam and Laos, the natives should leave it or like what we order for them.

Thank you,

J. HIRSCHFELD.

WHITTIER, CALIF.,  
June 27, 1964.Senator MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thanks for being a modern Paul Revere on the "Today" show this week. I believe your alarm is greatly needed just now.

We published some of your statements recently in the daily press. What more can we do?

Sincerely yours,

ED H. RUNCORN.

RACINE, WIS.,  
June 28, 1964.Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Heard you on the "Issues and Answers" program. You are right; the U.N.

W. A. NORSTROM, Sr.

JUNE 29, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Good for you. My husband and I heard you on the "Today" program, the other day.

Indeed, it is high time we withdrew our troops from Vietnam and let the U.N. decide its fate. The poor Vietnamese people must be plenty tired of the war, and a civil war at that.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGINE C. MOLNAR.

EASTCHESTER, N.Y.,  
June 29, 1964.Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: "Wars can be prevented just as surely as they are provoked and we who fail to prevent them must share in the guilt for the dead."—Gen. OMAR BRADLEY.

I agree with your position on southeast Asia, and South Vietnam in particular, as expressed on TV yesterday. But how can you support President Johnson?

I believe we need a third party more than ever before. It seems the Democrats and Republicans are competing in saber rattling (occasionally atomic and hydrogen bomb rattling). I don't feel I can trust either one of them.

I hope you will continue to tell the truth.

Yours very truly,

L. PACH.

ARCADIA, CALIF.,

July 2, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I can no longer resist my urge to thank you for the magnificent insight and courage you have so long displayed—and particularly for your forthright position on Vietnam. Every sane citizen of our country must be indebted to you, whether he knows it or not.

I am taking the liberty of enclosing copies of our two latest issues of the Churchman, with a few things marked which might be of special interest to you. I am also asking our Florida office to place you on our subscription list, thinking that you may be interested in seeing a liberal religious journal 180 years old but not entirely dead on its feet—I hope. We shall keep on cheering for you. If at any time we can be of service through our pages, please let me know.

Cordially and gratefully yours,

GUY EMERY SHIPLEY,

Editor.

[From the Churchman, June 1964]  
WHO IS FIGHTING THE VIETNAM WAR?

In spite of propaganda to the contrary, it is obvious that the United States is fighting in the Vietnam war, and using some modern techniques in doing so. Several times General Hester had pointed this out in his articles in the Churchman, in which he has quoted many authorities. Life magazine deserves credit for printing the letters of Capt. Edwin Shank, 27, to his wife, in its issue of May 8. The captain was killed in Vietnam 2 days after his last letter, dated March 22.

In a letter of December 4, 1963, written following one of their night attacks, we read: "After the first two bombs, we spotted the bad guys shooting at us. So Frank directed me in and I burned them with napalm." Please note the "I." In a letter of January 4, of this year, Shank wrote: "Napalm is gasoline which is jelled into a mass about the consistency of honey. When you drop it, it ignites and spreads fire about 200 to 300 feet. With charcoal in it, the charcoal is thrown another 200 feet, like a burning baseball, and does further damage to Vietcong houses." On January 7 he wrote: "I don't know what the United States is doing. They tell you people that we are just in training situations. But we're at war."

We are doing the flying and fighting. We are losing." And on January 15: "We can no longer save face over here, for we have no face to save. We are more than ever fighting this war." On January 20: "What gets me most is that they won't tell you people what we do over here. I'll bet that anyone you talk to does not know that American pilots fight this war. We—me and my buddies—do everything. The Vietnamese 'students' we have on board are airman basics. They don't even know their own serial numbers. The only reason they are on board is: in case we crash there is one American 'adviser' and one Vietnamese 'student.' They are sacrificial lambs."

So—we send our boys to Vietnam under orders to burn innocent people, including mothers and children, with napalm—and to be killed. Senator Morse, member of the Foreign Relations Committee, who has persistently denounced our Vietnam policy, declares that "millions of Americans are beginning to realize that it is time for us to get out of South Vietnam." And he told the Senate "all of South Vietnam isn't worth the life of a single American boy." At this writing the count of Americans soldiers killed is 225.

[From the Churchman, June 1964]

WHAT KIND OF FREEDOM?

(By Hugh B. Hester)

The American people have been shown two pictures in their daily newspapers recently which depict the situation in the world better than many thousands of words. One shows the bloody, cruel, and utterly insane war the U.S. Government is waging against defenseless, innocent, and poor men, women and children—in this instance, halfway around the world. It is of a Cambodian father holding in his arms his badly burned napalm-bombed child. The other picture shows the abysmal poverty of the "have-nots" in Latin America.

To state, as did the late John Foster Dulles and many others, that the presence of Communists among the people of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia pose a threat to the interests of the mighty United States is fantastic; to claim that the U.S. Government is not responsible for the war in this area is false; and to call this a defense of freedom is literally obscene. This is coldblooded, senseless murder, worthy only of the heirs of Hitler's Nazi Germany, her concentration camps and crematories.

The picture of a village in northern Brazil illustrates more clearly than anything else possible the reasons for discontent and turmoil in this continent south of us. The recent coup d'etat in Brazil which deposed President Joao Goulart will not solve this problem of poverty. The continued use of U.S. funds for the arming of the feudal forces in Latin America will not solve this problem either. The causes of instability in this vital area can only be achieved through the eradication of the worst features of poverty. Unless the leaders of the United States are willing to attack the causes instead of the symptoms of this deadly malady, they would be wise to completely disengage the United States from this area.

A real solution, of course, would consist of a vast program for agricultural reform and for industrialization for education and medical care. Only when these people have adequate food, clothing, shelter, medical care, and education, can democracy, as we think of it in the Anglo Saxon world, be cultivated.

It is vitally important, it seems to this writer, that the leaders of the capitalist West recognize that the conditions in most of the undeveloped world are fundamentally different from those in the developed world. Democracy and freedom as prated about in the capitalist West, have no meaning to hungry,

naked, and homeless people. Their order of freedom consists of the freedom to eat, to have shelter, clothing, medical care, and education. Unless our leaders can understand this, no amount of military aid, no amount of "economic" aid ala Western style can solve the problem. You can't shoot an idea with bullets or bombs and you can't fill the empty stomachs of hundreds of millions of hungry people with the crumbs from the capitalist table.

STATEN ISLAND, N.Y.,

July 6, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have just written to President Johnson, congratulating him on passage of civil liberties legislation, and protesting foreign policy in Vietnam and expressing thorough agreement with positions taken by you and Senator GRUENING.

It is alarming to me that so few people in key positions seem aware of the dangers of escalating war in southeast Asia and the importance for the country that we extricate ourselves, before we bog down deeper and precipitate major catastrophe.

We seem to be trying to control the life and politics of these people against their will. We just can't indefinitely play God to the whole world—and get away with it.

I wish I knew how to use my small voice more effectively. At least I can also write to New York Senators—and will.

Sincerely,

FLORA M. DAVIDSON.

P.S.—I congratulate you and Senator GRUENING for commonsense and courage to speak up.

WORCESTER, MASS.,

July 2, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: In a letter from the organization PAX I read an excerpt from your letter to Norman Thomas concerning the growing willingness in the Pentagon and the State Department to go to war with Red China.

I am writing to tell you that I am in agreement with you about the immorality of this attitude. Please do your utmost to make your views heard.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. ANNABEL WOLFSON.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,

July 6, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: I am enclosing a copy of a letter which I sent to President Johnson. This will serve to convey my views on the war in southeast Asia. I wish to add to that an expression of gratitude for your many forthright statements in opposition to that war. It is reassuring to know that there are a few men in Congress who dare to ask, "Where are the emperor's clothes?"

Very truly yours,

Mrs. IDA G. KLINGSBERG.

"DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: For several months I read with a growing feeling of ease and reassurance your many statements in favor of finding peaceful solutions for the world's problems. Recent developments in southeast Asia, however, point in the direction not of peace but of war. American lives continue to be lost; Laos is bombed; a military man serves as our ambassador to South Vietnam; talk increases of expanding the war. These things are most alarming.

"Can we not learn from history? After 9 years of warfare in Indochina, the French suffered a quarter-million casualties. Despite billions of dollars in U.S. aid, they surrendered at Dien Bien-phu with a half-million troops still under their command. Do we aim to emulate that record? Or are we

headed for the point of no return?—a nuclear conflagration? There is a third choice, Mr. President. In a nuclear age it is the only choice: the conference table. Two frameworks for such a conference already exist: The United Nations and the Geneva Conference.

"As a lifelong Democrat I have not enjoyed hearing the repeated charge that the Democratic Party is the party of war inasmuch as the three wars of this century have occurred in Democratic administrations. In the past I have regarded this charge as fraudulent and politically motivated. But I pray, Mr. President, that it will never be possible to make such an accusation again."

CARLISLE, MASS.,

July 4, 1964.

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

MY DEAR SENATOR: Since I feel that your position concerning the war in southeast Asia and its inevitable consequences is correct and commendable, I would like to pledge my support to you in your efforts to encourage a more sane policy there. Until the U.S. Government recognizes the necessity of working within the U.N. and adhering to international law, it will continually jeopardize the peace of the world, as it has during the past few years. It is surprising that this Nation which began with a struggle for its own independence from a colonialist power should now be falling into the same errors as its earlier opponents.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. KATHERINE HARAMUNDANIS.

MILLERS FALLS, MASS.,

July 4, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to quote part of a book review from the New York Times which was partially reproduced in an article by A. J. Muste in Liberation. It was written by Prof. George Kateb of Amherst College:

"There is already evidence of a new statism which makes of international relations a Renaissance game; which spends inconceivably large sums of money on redundant or artificial projects; which so encloses our leaders in their struggle with the enemy that one day they could have more in common with their counterparts in the enemy country than with their own people; which can speculate on thermonuclear casualties in the scores of millions and still speak about the survival or victory of the Nation."

Brief as it is this statement clearly indicates the present trend of U.S. policy in southeast Asia. Vietnam and Laos have now become the focal points in a struggle against Communist aggressors while they should really be treated as signs and alarms of the increasingly complex political, economic, and social situation which exists in southeast Asia.

I applaud and wholeheartedly support your opposition to our Government's war-hawk attitude. To be certain, peacekeeping, and not warmongering, is the central task for the United States in southeast Asia.

For the first time in our Nation's short history, when and if the administration calls for more overt action, there will be opposition from representative officials like you and some of your colleagues.

I have already written a letter to President Johnson voicing my opposition to the present trend of military and political affairs in southwest Asia, but I urge you to keep the voices of opposition strong and creative enough to offer an alternative of peaceful conciliation in Vietnam and Laos.

The President made an unfortunate choice in appointing General Taylor to the ambassadorial post in Vietnam. I sincerely hope that this trend of action can be coun-

July 9

tered by creative proposals for a turn toward peace.

Yours truly,

PHILIP SZENHER,  
Clark University.

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

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

Our great admiration and strong support for your June 29th speech about peace in Asia.

H. KONINGSBERGER.

SAUSALITO, CALIF.,  
July 6, 1964.

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

We owe undying gratitude for your opposition to U.S. policy in Vietnam.

ROBY FRICK.

DEDHAM, MASS.,  
July 4, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your stand in regard to the war in southeast Asia. It is heartening to know that a few of our leaders want to keep us from suffering the fate of France in that area.

Please don't let us be drawn further into that quicksand.

Sincerely,

ANNE E. STEPMAN.

NEWTON, MASS.,  
July 6, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to express support of your criticism of our present southeast Asia policy. I am in favor of beginning immediate negotiations for a neutralization of the area rather than extending a war that doesn't have the support of even the South Vietnamese. I hope more Senators will be as truthful and outspoken as you.

Yours truly,

EVELYN GRINSPOON.

JULY 4, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: Thanks so much for your uniquely courageous stand on the South Vietnam war. It is so rare and rewarding to hear the blunt truth spoken out. I am sure many Americans support both your views and your crusading spirit. It is merely a sad commentary on our times that to speak out should be so extraordinary. I am glad that on this historic date I can write to a real patriot, and pay honor to at least one man's dedication to truth.

Yours,

Mrs. JEANNE S. BAGBY.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
July 3, 1964.

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

DEAR WAYNE: Enclosed is a copy of my column on Vietnam. It goes to the Denver Post which may or not print it and also to the Socialist paper, New America.

Thanks for your draft.

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN THOMAS.

[From the New York Times, July 1, 1964]  
ASIAN POLICY ASSAILED—NORMAN THOMAS  
SAYS HOPE LIES ONLY IN NEGOTIATION

To the Editor:

On June 21 you carried an editorial on the situation in southeast Asia which ended: "Military victory is not possible for either side in this struggle, but the danger of a

global conflict seems to be advancing with fearful speed."

On the next day in the Senate WAYNE MORSE made a bitter and documented attack on the administration's policy. I didn't see it reported in the Times and he tells me that it seems to be the policy of newspapers, television stations and so forth throughout the country to let the administration lead us to war without reporting important dissent even in the Senate by him and Senator GAVERING. Administration supporters have not yet bothered to answer them.

Like him, I am one of those who believe that "in the State Department and Pentagon are men who think Red China will never be weaker than she is at the present time, and therefore now is the time to finish her off if she resists a U.S. takeover in southeast Asia."

Even in the name of the most righteous anticommunism, it is madness for us to embark on a course that may lead to world war. The world in general would not think us champions of righteousness but of a neo-imperialism, and even if we could and should crush China in a military sense, we would lose.

We cannot thus organize Asia, much less the world, for democracy. We should be accused of white imperialism pretty much around the world. One shudders at the cost we might have to pay in money and in lives. Even if our present threats, delay or hinder action by Communist forces, it is nonsense to think that we can get a settlement in Communist Asia, halfway around the world, and hold it simply by military power. Any hope there is lies in negotiation for neutrality. When will the public begin to speak out?

NORMAN THOMAS.

NEW YORK, June 23, 1964.

NEW YORK, N.Y.—In Minneapolis on Sunday, June 28, President Johnson warned the world that the United States, "when necessary," would not hesitate "to risk war" in southeast Asia. Of course, in order to preserve peace. On Wednesday, July 1, Secretary Rusk asserted his belief that peace can be achieved without further extension of fighting. This sort of talk is characteristic, probably of doubt in the administration itself of what it will do and certainly of the great desire to juggle the issue of peace or war until after the election.

Senator GOLDWATER will have none of that. He, who does not believe it is the business of Federal Government to guarantee ordinary rights of human beings in Mississippi, wants a tougher policy in southeast Asia. That is, a government, which can't protect its own citizens, should play policemen around the world, using the most diabolical forms of war in that role. The House Republican Policy Committee went along with GOLDWATER, not Lodge, when it argued that we must repeal today's complacent commitment "to prevent a Communist victory" and substitute a commitment "to insure victory for freedom."

Under no circumstances shall we insure a victory for freedom by the indefinite continuance of our present confused policy in southeast Asia, much less by any expansion of war. In purely military terms this is not a war that we can win any more than did the French. It is the irony of our present military power that we can't use our weapons of total destruction to preserve people or freedom anywhere. Neither can we win in a civil war such as that which we face in South Vietnam. There is extraordinarily little evidence of direct Chinese or North Vietnamese military help of consequence. Most of the Vietcong's guns are American, captured in guerrilla war. Vietcong's leader is a Vietnamese who is said not to be a Communist. In the new nations, communism can do nothing but gain by a long, dragged

out war in which we will be represented as the neo-imperialists and the white racists.

The situation will become infinitely worse as soon as the war is expanded as it doubtless will be if it should long be continued. Sooner or later, China would be drawn in. There is reason to believe that Senator MORSE is right in charging that important figures in the State Department and the Pentagon want to fight China now while she is relatively weak. This, among the other disastrous consequences, would take Russia off the hook. We could weaken China for her while she could still profess loyalty to the Communist cause and even render some service to it. To the nonwhite world we should be made to appear as racial imperialists. There is no better way to a third world war as the eventual end of our policy. In any case its costs would be catastrophic.

We must negotiate. Any solution of the problem must be political, involving the 14 nations which made the Geneva agreement on independence and neutrality. It should also involve the United Nations and most certainly Communist China. It is not to deny that it will be difficult to deal with China to say that we have made it impossible to deal constructively with her so long as we insist that Chiang represents the country out of which he was ingloriously driven.

One of the more rational spokesmen for the State Department in a recent debate with me in Detroit argued, first, that we could not deal with the Chinese Communists because of the nature of their communism, and, second, that we did not need to recognize Chinese Communist government and were in fact dealing with it without giving it recognition. It may be that Peiping will prove so intransigent that the end will be war no matter what Washington does. I don't believe this, partly because of China's present relative moderation in southeast Asia. But the United States has no right to fulfill its own prophecies of Chinese intransigence by its absurd policy of nonrecognition and the exclusion of the real China from the U.N. Peace, all too probably the world's peace, depends upon political solution of southeast Asian problems in terms of negotiation and neutralization.

NORMAN THOMAS.

BROOKLINE, MASS.,  
July 5, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: This letter is to let you know that I stand with you in any further extension of the war in Vietnam.

I am particularly disturbed by the replacement of Lodge as Ambassador by General Taylor. I fail to see how a man with a military mind like Taylor can fit into what is essentially a delicate political situation.

What can be done by you and your other four constituents in breaking what seems like an almost conspiratorial silence on the part of the press and television in reporting your remarks? Could the National Committee for an Effective Congress (of which you may be a member) come up with some answer on this?

I have written to Senators KENNEDY and SALTONSTALL, and they both say the same thing; i.e., if we lose in South Vietnam, then the famous domino theory will prevail; one by one the nations of southeast Asia will fall to the Communists.

I am not subscribing to wholesale American evacuation of South Vietnam. As the orientals, we would not or could not lose face. There must be other political ways that have not been pushed or explored to ease the explosive situation.

Thank you for your efforts in behalf of us all, and I hope your views will receive greater publicity.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT SOBOFF.

CHICAGO, ILL.,  
July 6, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I salute you and say "Bravo" to you for your forthright stand on Vietnam and Mississippi.

How ironic that we can send troops thousands of miles away where we are not wanted by the people and can find only 400 sailors to search for three courageous young people. You must know that many, many Americans applaud you even if they haven't written.

Please "hit the road" and stump for your position. Americans need to hear your voice and position.

Once again—I salute you.

Respectfully yours,

TOBEY S. SCHEIN.

OAKLAND, CALIF.

Mr. MORSE: I am terrified at the proportions the war in southeast Asia is taking. Your position deserves my support. I am aware that you have San Francisco's Representative PHILIP BURTON and New York's Representative WILLIAM FITZ RYAN, calling for negotiations in economic trade and peaceful elections.

But, sir, the ambiguity arises out of press coverage as to whether there is Communist infiltration of South Vietnam and Communist supplying of the national liberation front. From one source I understand the army itself has stated that the infiltration and alleged supplying of rebel forces is negligible, yet from the mass (or is it mess?) of others the cry goes up of Communist infiltration, conspiracy, armament, atrocities. I ask you sir, which is it, what was reported by Mr. Rusk and Mr. McNamara and the Army intelligence. Sir, I with a multitude of others thirst unquenchably for information, good honest information, of the situation and receive none. I have written to Senator KUCHEL but I have received no answer, I suppose the letter was discarded as pressurized by the activities of groups here in the bay area. I ask you to inform me as to what the Army's report was, if possible.

Also I volunteer you my support in any way possible.

Thank you sir.

GEORGE EWART.

JUNE 23, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: It is wonderful to hear you talk from time to time protesting the things that makes one wonder if most of the people in the Government who tolerates CIA who refuses to see what is happening to many countries, especially our attitude in South and North Vietnam, also Laos and Cambodia, besides Cuba, Germany, etc., we must realize that our attitude must eventually lead to atomic war.

Also peace seems to be a dirty word. How can one possibly get the people to realize our only hope for survival is peace—and a strong movement that can force the Government to recognize their wishes. Or will peace topple the capitalist system?

Thanks again for being a dissenter. We need more of them in Washington.

PEGGY KLEMPFUER.

STATEN ISLAND, N.Y.,  
July 4, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want you to know that I support wholeheartedly your position on U.S. involvement in South Vietnam. Please continue your efforts to get the United States out of this cruel war as well as prevent further involvement and the risk of war with China.

Sincerely yours,

NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
July 1, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I enclose a carbon copy of a letter I am sending President Johnson today on Vietnam.

As you see, a copy goes also to Senator GRUENING, with whom I have been in converse.

Please keep up your good stand.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT MELTON.

JULY 1, 1964.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: I have just heard the halting and not very credible or creditable speech of your recent Ambassador to Saigon before the National Press Club.

It was evasive, when not actually mendacious, on Vietnam.

It was a rather disgraceful performance.

But, in its being so, it unfortunately echoes the position of our Government on the civil war in South Vietnam—for it is a civil war, and not an international conflict (except insofar as we are making it so), which our Government represents it as and is apparently trying to escalate it to.

I see the role of the NLF as indistinguishable from the forces that fought to get rid of the French—to get rid of all foreign power and make Vietnam self-governing.

This, by the same logic, means getting rid of all puppet dictators like Diem and Khanh, who continue under different forms the oppressive aims of a colonial power.

We have seen to it that we succeeded France as the colonial power in southeast Asia, and have acted rather more rapaciously than the French, more murderously.

Our aim there is immoral because it is to prevent the self-determination of a people.

And, as could be expected with an immoral aim, our methods are equally immoral, what with defoliation, napalm, and torture and terrorism directed toward the ordinary citizenry, to say nothing of death.

As a reflection of this immoral aim of ours, the NFL has the allegiance of 70 percent of the area, 50 percent of the population, has its own government, issues its own postage stamps, collects taxes from U.S. Government contractors in Saigon itself, can have its military forces operate within 5 miles of Saigon, can have its agents operate freely within Saigon, and has the secret sympathy of a large number of foreigners.

In addition to the immorality of our aims and methods in South Vietnam—or as a consequence of it—we are threatening to run the risk of a world war in the course of which we as a nation, as well as many others, would most likely be wiped out.

Sir, are you really unaware of these things?

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT MELTON.

Copies to Senators GRUENING and MORSE.

VALRICO, FLA.,  
July 1, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I heard your remarks on "Issues and Answers" last Sunday and I heartily agree with what you said.

I did not think we had any straight-and-honest-thinking Senators left any more, but I find we have a few, such as you, Senator FULBRIGHT, and a few others who think as Senators should.

I certainly wish the southern Senators thought like you. I am sure there would be less trouble throughout the world.

I hope you are fortunate enough in convincing more of our Senators and others of your views.

I think like F.D.R. did, and I am sure Mr. Roosevelt was more right than those who opposed.

I think F.D.R. one of the best, if not the best, President. He was the only President I ever voted for. I sure hope Mr. Johnson

Wishing you every success in your efforts to make America a better place to live.

Respectfully,

ARTHUR C. EVERHART.

WARWICK, R.I.,  
June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
State House,  
Oregon, U.S.A.

SIR: Moments ago I watched, with intense interest, an interview you had with a news reporter, and shown on the "Today" show this date.

I hold with you that our President either declare war or, as you suggested, turn future action and decisions over to the U.N.

The purpose of my letter is to ask what we the people can do in an effective way to so move the powers that be?

I personally feel that the present situation is a travesty to "right" and atrocious to our GI's.

Your suggestions shall be carefully considered. Best to you in your continued fight for right.

Sincerely,

CHAN.

FOREST HILLS, N.Y.,  
July 2, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: Deeply alarmed about the turn of events regarding southeast Asia. I am sending you this message in support of your vallant stand against any extension of the war—or wars in these parts, and begging you to continue your efforts. It is a great consolation that there are people like you in our governing bodies.

May your struggle be blessed.

Yours sincerely,

MIMI ZOFF.

JUNE 29, 1964.

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

SENATOR MORSE: I heard your views on Vietnam as expressed in an interview with newsmen that appeared on one of our local stations. I am very happy to see there are indeed thinking and informed Senators representing us.

My thanks to you for taking a strong stand. You have earned my respect. And I think you will find more support for your views than either the administration or the Republicans think exists.

HAYWARD, CALIF.

RAYMOND J. LAFLEUR,

BOSTON, MASS.,  
July 2, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to let you know of my support in your stand on the U.S. policy in southeast Asia.

I have written to President Johnson urging him to begin immediately negotiations to end this war. I have also written my Senators, EDWARD KENNEDY and LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, urging them to support you on this critical issue.

Sincerely yours,

PATRICIA MCKENNEY.

SCAPPOOSE, OREG.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I saw the television program "Issues and Answers" yesterday and almost died of pure joy listening to you. They had the issues and boy did you give them the answers. And I couldn't agree with you more. At the last meeting of the executive board of the YD's of Oregon, we passed a resolution which encompassed much of what you said.

I sometimes disagree with you on matters of foreign policy, but as far as I'm con-

July 9

cerned you are one of the only honest men in Government today. I always like Mr. Stevenson, that is up until the Cuba Bay of Pigs issue came up. I felt sorry for him because of the position he was put in but I still didn't like the way he handled himself. The more I get into politics the more people tell me I am naive to believe in honesty in politics and in Government. Perhaps I am, so you seem all the more like a breath of fresh air on a very muggy day.

As a member of the team setting up the dinner for you on the 10th, I am looking forward very much to meeting you.

Thank you again for a half hour of refreshing truth.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. Gretchen Fuller,  
Executive Secretary, YDCO.

SEAL BEACH, CALIF.,  
July 1, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I keep wondering what there can be about the soil, climate, or water in Oregon that makes voters up there intelligent enough to elect a Senator like you.

Your courageous recent words about the wicked, bloodthirsty interference by U.S. State Department in Vietnam were like clean air coming into the poisonous, hypocritical statements usually coming out of Washington.

Yours very truly,

PAYSON MARSH.

BACON BASKETWARE, LTD.,  
Toronto, Canada, July 2, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I was very interested to read of your opinions on the war in Vietnam as stated in the enclosed article taken from the Toronto Globe and Mail.

I think you are entirely correct in your views and would like to take this opportunity of expressing my full support of them.

Yours very truly,

SYDNEY BACON.

[From the Globe and Mail, June 26, 1964]

U.S. OPPONENT OF VIETNAM WAR

(By George Bain)

WASHINGTON.—In the U.S. Senate it has become almost a daily occurrence that Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, rises in his place to denounce what he calls McNamara's war in Vietnam.

He says that the United States cannot legally justify its presence there, that it is following a policy which is likely to lead to a long drawn out and costly war with China, and that if the fighting in Vietnam endangers the peace of the world—as he thinks it does—the place to take the issue is to the United Nations.

He says that the United States has acted not only unwisely but improperly, and points out that South Vietnam as well as North Vietnam has been accused by the International Control Commission of violating the 1954 Geneva accords—South Vietnam by receiving U.S. military assistance.

He has made public answers given him by experts appearing before the Senate foreign relations committee, of which he is a member, to the effect that very few North Vietnamese, or Chinese, or other foreigners have been found among the Vietcong taken prisoner in the fighting in South Vietnam.

The foreigners in South Vietnam today, he has said, are Americans.

He looks upon the war in South Vietnam as a civil war, in which each side has its backers outside, rather than as an aggressive war waged from North Vietnam. He believes, however, that North Vietnam, with

China beyond it, has been the greater offender against the Geneva accords, and that the case could be proved in the United Nations, although to do so might be to expose the mistakes of the United States.

In a recent speech he said: "Peace is more important than U.S. face. Peace is more important than a temporary loss of U.S. prestige, if we lose prestige by seeking to right a mistaken course of action, I believe the opposite would be true."

In his long campaign, Senator Morse has had several associates—most notably Senator ERNEST GRUENING, of Alaska. They are both Democrats. Both from time to time have criticized the U.S. press for the scant attention it has paid their other-side-of-the-case argument at a time when Vietnam and Laos rarely have been off the front pages. Not all the attention that has been paid them has been favorable.

The Washington Star in an editorial this week said:

"It must be that Senator WAYNE MORSE stands on his head when he looks at the international situation. \* \* \* The latest of (his) attacks accuses President Johnson of carrying out an illegal and immoral Asian policy 'making the United States the world's leading threat to world peace.' This is an outrageously irresponsible statement. It does violence to the realities, and it certainly lends more than a little aid and comfort to the Communist enemy in southeast Asia."

Whether or not the conclusion complained of by the Star editorialist was warranted, the Senator's attack on the legality and morality of the U.S. policy can hardly be called irresponsible. Both are open to question.

The losing war which France waged to maintain its Indochina colonies—a war substantially assisted by the United States at the end—was brought to an end with the signing of the Geneva accords in July 1954. What had been Indochina was divided in four—Cambodia, Laos, and North and South Vietnam.

The United States did not sign. Senator Morse says: "It is my view that we did not sign the Geneva agreements because we did not intend to go along. We have not gone along. Therefore we stand here today in this ugly, shocking posture of the United States before the eyes of the world, engaging in McNamara's war in South Vietnam."

It is part of his thesis that, after encouraging France not to give up the fight, then sounding out Britain particularly to see if a joint venture could not be launched to keep up the war against the Communist Viet Minh, that John Foster Dulles, the then Secretary of State, reluctantly accepted the work of the Geneva conference and with reservations.

"Why did not our representatives sign that treaty?" Senator Morse asks. "Why did not South Vietnam sign it? I think the answer is that their refusal to sign it was based on the fact that the United States had already decided to step into South Vietnam at least, and carry on where France had left off—to keep South Vietnam as a Western protectorate and toehold in Asia."

Whether or not that was the intention, the fact is that while withholding its signature from the accords the United States issued an independent statement to the effect that it would observe them.

But as early as January 1955, Mr. Dulles was referring to the Geneva agreements as a major setback. And even before that, in September 1954, he had pasted together the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization as a response to the new situation in southeast Asia.

Its members were Australia, France, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines, Thailand, Britain, and the United States. A protocol to the treaty extended to Cambodia, Laos, and South Vietnam the protection of clause

4, which says, among other things, that an attack upon one will be regarded as an attack upon all.

It is upon this shaky foundation that U.S. involvement in the fighting in South Vietnam rests. Ostensibly, the United States is there—and has been since 1955—at the request of South Vietnam to assist it in its defense against aggression from North Vietnam.

What Senator Morse says is this: "Today South Vietnam does not run the war against the guerrillas. She does not make her own foreign policy or military policy. The United States does. The U.S. Air Force is fighting in South Vietnam. Its planes and men are providing the air support and air transportation for the Government ground forces. Americans numbering at least 15,000 are fighting with the ground forces. When they are shot at, they shoot back."

U.S. participation on this order is not in keeping with the Geneva accords, article 16 of which says: "With effect from the date of entry into force of the present agreement, the introduction into Vietnam of any troop reinforcements and additional military personnel is prohibited."

It was in 1957 that the International Control Commission, composed of Indian, Polish, and Canadian members, complained of violations by South Vietnam involving U.S. troops. The most serious incident involved the introduction of 290 U.S. military personnel into the country even after the Commission had said that their entry should be held up by pending further study by the Commission.

There were complaints of North Vietnamese violations then and have been since. Senator Morse accepts that assistance has been given the Vietcong in the training of men and the equipping of them—although much of the Vietcong equipment is American-made, having been captured—but that what North Vietnam may have done does not warrant the United States matching it.

LEBANON, OREG.,  
June 21, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

SENATOR MORSE: We are deeply concerned over the recent decision of the Government in risking total all-out, hopeless, war in southeast Asia. Another stalemate like Korea is all that can be hoped for, in Vietnam, land of political indecision and Communist bounded. Various reports over newspapers, from time to time, have made known your fight against this contemplated action. Keep it up, by all means. The peace of our Nation and the lives of the young men are at stake. And if you who represent us do not cry out against this foolhardy thing, who can?

We are writing each of our Congressmen from Oregon, to begin at once, in earnest to decry this thing that is sweeping our Nation toward another hopeless conflict. (Which the Communist world gleefully anticipate, etc.)

Also we have written the editor of the Oregonian, to urge the readers, to beseech the President and Congressmen by telegram and letter to protest against the proposed, further intervention in such a hopeless, far-off war. Also, did ask the editor to contact other editors of the Nation for such an effort, that the voice of the people might be heard in protest against such foolhardiness. Only the united voice of the people can hope to stem the tide, from all indications of the rash action being taken by those in authority. And concern is all but smothered out, by the complacency and harangue over the political issues (and candidates) of the day, etc.

Therefore, continue to stand strong and sure for those things which are right and true regardless of men's words and actions.



You have stood, time after time, for the right, in the face of great opposition, and many of us have cheered behind the scenes, and now we want you to know we are behind your efforts by word and by prayer, and when our life's work is finished the only thing that will really count for time and eternity, is "Have we obeyed and striven to do those things, that God hath put into our hand to do, for His glory and men's good." As we obey His voice to our hearts day by day, "The steps of a good man are ordered of the Lord," Psalms 37: 23 (if that man will hear and heed). How can they be, if he won't? We can move by word and deed in the will and way of the Almighty, and what better way is there to move? None, I daresay. God says, Psalm 119: 105: "His word is a lamp unto our feet and a light unto our path." But what if we ignore God's lamp and light unto men? We do walk in darkness without His help, His guidance, His presence along the way. How well I know, I have walked both paths. And again, "As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God," Roman 8: 14. But if those who bear His name (regardless of church affiliation) neither listen nor pay heed when that Spirit of the Almighty ("God is a spirit" John 4: 24) strives to urge and prompt the spirit (or heart of men) to lead and direct their steps, their words, their actions, in the best way, for their good and God's glory, they do not walk in all the privileges of "sons."

May God bless and direct you day by day, is my prayer.

We plan to send the following telegram to the President, concerning the Vietnam issue:

"Mr. PRESIDENT: Do the leaders of this Nation seek another Korea? How foolhardy. "Mr. and Mrs. OTIS BEARD."

These words of encouragement to stand firm and strong, in and with Gods help and guidance, are from the heart of some friends of the home State.

God bless you,

Mr. and Mrs. OTIS BEARD.

GREEN, RICHARDSON, GREEN &  
GRISWOLD,

Portland, Oreg., June 21, 1964.

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

DEAR WAYNE: Permit me to congratulate you, on your stand on Vietnam, and also your stand on the civil rights bill. Keep up the fight.

We enjoy your Washington letter, and since you have admirers in New Hampshire, we send copies on to them.

Best regards to you and your family.

B.A.

JUNE 26, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are business and professional people living in the San Francisco Bay area who are deeply concerned about the critical situation in southeast Asia. We believe that the increasing involvement of American men and arms is immoral and is disastrous to world peace and American prestige.

You are performing the most valuable kind of service by presenting the unembellished facts about this situation to the American public. However, there has been a virtual blackout of your speeches and statements in all communications media in this area.

There are many people in San Francisco who wish to be acquainted with your position. We believe that a speech delivered by you personally in San Francisco would be attended by a significantly large audience and would break the news blackout.

Could you possibly make room in your busy schedule to speak on a public platform

in San Francisco, at a time most convenient to you? Specific arrangements can be made well in advance for your convenience and approval.

The deepening crisis in southeast Asia and its dangerous consequences has prompted this letter from us. Sponsorship of the proposed meeting would be by the undersigned and other interested people. We are not members of any organized group but rather individuals of differing political views who agree that your position on southeast Asia demands the widest possible exposure.

Very truly yours,

(For your information, a list of those whose signatures appear on the preceding letter:)

Merton Dushkes, northern California manager, Berney Insurance Agency, San Francisco, Calif.

Hal Dunleavy, prominent California political pollster and housing consultant, San Francisco, Calif.

Mel Krantzler, importer, San Francisco, Calif.

Mara Alexander, director, Actor's Lab Drama School, San Francisco, Calif.

Victor Honig, certified public accountant, San Francisco, Calif.

Allen Brotsky, attorney, San Francisco, Calif.

Morton M. Garfield, physician, San Francisco, Calif.

Alfred Barauch, electrical engineer, San Francisco, Calif.

Hans Feibusch, consulting engineer, San Francisco, Calif.

Henry Mozesson, insurance broker, San Francisco, Calif.

Richard Liebes, research director, building service, international union (AFL-CIO), San Francisco, Calif.

L. B. Delaney, vice president, San Francisco Carmens Union, Transport Workers Union (AFL-CIO), San Francisco, Calif.

Sam Pichey, real estate builder and developer, San Francisco, Calif.

Ralph Aron, toy wholesaler, San Francisco, Calif.

BEACHMONT, MASS.,

July 2, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I hope with all my heart you succeed in your heroic efforts to prevent escalation of the war in southeast Asia.

Sincerely,

MAY BRAUDE.

NORTHAMPTON, MASS.,

July 2, 1964.

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

My DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want you to know that we thoroughly support your policy of opposing further involvement in southeast Asia.

I trust you will do all in your power to bring this most unhappy situation to a close.

Most cordially,

EDWARD J. MANWELL, M.D.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,

July 4, 1964.

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

HONORED SIR: I write on our national holiday to wish you well on your course. I believe the policies you espouse in connection with southeast Asia will keep the peace, whereas those of the administration will bring on war, whether by inadvertence or by design. It seems to me the appointment of General Taylor will all the more convert the American troops into the Hessians of Asia. I admire the force of your statements.

Appreciatively yours,

MURRAY LEWIS

KENDALL PARK, N.J.,

July 5, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As an old China hand, formerly on the faculty of West China Union University, please allow me to congratulate you on your courageous stand concerning Vietnam.

There is no need to go into details. Independently I have reached the same conclusions.

It is imperative that the Fourteen Power Conference be reconvened to deal with this matter.

The refusal thus far to agree to the calling of that conference is in itself an admission of guilt.

Sincerely yours,

Rev. J. SPENCER KENNARD, Jr.

HASTINGS, N.Y.,

July 3, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: First let me express my deep gratitude for your outspoken attack against our role in Vietnam and the recent appointment of General Taylor.

This is a most frightening situation. I have urged our friends to write and try to talk about the truth in this dangerous position we hold. However, what more can we do to stop this threat to the peace.

My young son who has just graduated from college has gotten many of his schoolmates to write. I hope the American public will be aroused and will bring the President to act in behalf of stopping forever involvement and getting out of Vietnam.

Sincerely yours,

ANNE WEEROPOL.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.,

July 1, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are proud of you. Thank you for enunciating our views on Vietnam to the American television public. We hope that the war hysteria that is focusing on southeast Asia won't prevent you from continuing your vociferous and courageous stand.

Sincerely,

Dr. and Mrs. STANLEY MOSS.

ORWELL, VT.,

July 2, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are very much opposed also, to extending the war in southeast Asia. We support you in your stand, along with Senators AIKEN, FELL, GRUENING, and BARTLETT. I hope others soon join you and that you gain the ear of the State Department and the President in urging them to begin negotiations to end the war.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. NATHAN SENFT.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I know that you oppose any spread of the war in southeast Asia and I heartily endorse your stand. The war there is impractical as well as immoral, victory is impossible, negotiations are the only solution. Please keep on trying to bring Secretary Rusk back to a saner point of view.

Yours truly,

PRISCILL B. GRACE.

JULY 1, 1964.

NORTH HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.,

June 30, 1964.

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

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: Speaking for those who seek honor for their country rather than vain glory—who assume vigilance of mind over tyranny—who feel to implant integrity for temerity into the body of the lawmakers is rightful.

We are indeed grateful for the voice of Mr. WAYNE MORSE, Senator, and are cognizant of

July 9

his precarious position in speaking alone for fairplay, with honesty and justice his modicum.

We are mindful of his moral courage, his veracity, and his attitude in assuming we have not all forgotten the qualifying factors that distinguish men from beasts.

I personally am hopeful Senator Morse speaks long and passionately for the qualities we, as a nation, had put behind us for the sake of expediency and self-aggrandizement.

May the blessings of the Spirit who is the essence of all our highest aspirations open the mind of our Nation's governing body to beneficence, good will, and a tolerance for political and economic parties not their own—for people throughout all history have chosen (when allowed to choose) that which is beneficial rather than detrimental to mankind; and even on an individual level—through personal selection, we come out more on the credit side of the ledger than the debit.

My regards to yourself in allowing the people to influence your dictums in what is needful to their general and particular well being—and let us fervently hope that "a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth"—neither of mind from without or decay from within.

Yours most respectfully,

SOL VEC.

(Copy to Mr. WAYNE MORSE, Senator.)

NORMAN, OKLA.,

June 27, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is to commend you for suggesting that there should be an exploration of peaceful alternatives to the conflict in Vietnam. The risks incurred by escalating this war far outweigh the risks of attempting a negotiated settlement.

Truly yours,

MARGARET E. SALMON.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,

June 27, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It has been a revelation to all of us to hear you voice your opinion against the wasteful and useless money and lives we are sacrificing in South Vietnam.

Keep up the good work.

Truly yours,

B. H. YOUNG and FAMILY.

GENEVA, N.Y.,

June 28, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been watching the TV program on which you are appearing "Issues and Answers." As a wife and mother, may I say I agree with you, and am thankful you speak out. May you continue to press for peaceful solutions to our foreign problems, and to criticize the administration's talk of war in southeast Asia.

As a New Yorker, I am unable to vote for you, but want to let you know you are representing us, and all thinking, responsible people.

Sincerely,

MARGERY BROWN

Mrs. Roger Brown.

FAYETTEVILLE, N.C.,

June 28, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Democrat, of Oregon,  
U.S. Congress,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Let the people speak. Please print this in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as soon as possible. My son, Jim, went into service June 17, intending to get it over with, so he could devote himself to a career.

chessboard, on which fate moves us, the pawns, at nebulous whim.

Meaning: hardly in service (861st Airborne Unit) a week, my son is now chosen for OCS. Proud as I am of, this, you can appreciate its possibilities for placing my son in imminent danger, so far as Vietnam is concerned.

Senator Morse, the potential for slaughter of our fine young men is not only very real, but appears more imminent every day. I cannot sleep lately. Being astute and strongly intuitive, I can only see wanton waste and irreparable loss ahead for parents (if the present administration continues on the course it's chosen). I concur with you, sir.

No young man is going to be called "chicken," so, if he's ordered to Vietnam, he'll go, quietly. It is time we parents let the proper authorities know that we did not raise our young men to die for the likes of such a God-forsaken country. Why do we always jump in, ready to bristle our armor, and "show our strength" for, any country that yells (and now, for one who didn't?) It's sickening.

A mother who lost her only son in Vietnam the other day was interviewed on TV yesterday. "Until the day I die, I shall see her pitiful face with the large, haunted eyes. I shall hear her ask, over and over again: "Why? You tell me, why did my son have to leave the United States, and go to Vietnam to die? What good did it do?" From her appearance, I do not believe she'd slept nor eaten since. But she'd wept. For what? The truth was proven in Korea. No one ever wins a war. The crosses are mute testimony.

In Jim's name, tell me what we parents can do to stem this tide? Had Johnson two fine young sons (same age as his girls), I wonder if he would not listen less to McNamara and more to his heart? Yes.

I love my son. He has had a tough life and only lately, after graduation, has Jim even been able to have a suit, shoes when he needs them, a little happiness at last.

We parents are not ready to sacrifice our sons for Vietnam. Please tell me to whom I can write to get this across? Soon. I'm a former Oregon constituent of beautiful Oregon.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH WILLIAMS.

VERO BEACH, FLA.,

June 28, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Mrs. Denning and I heard what you had to say on the Vietnam situation the other morning and were greatly impressed by what you had to say on the subject. Your vigorous and forthright approach to this highly dangerous situation is encouraging. We hope your views prevail with the administration. We have written to President Johnson to this effect.

You have plenty of fire and the courage of your convictions. Power to you.

Sincerely,

MR. and MRS. LEON J. DEMING.

GENEVA, OHIO,

June 28, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I enjoyed hearing you on TV "Issues" very much. I am a former resident of Oregon.

The following article of mine appeared in the Plain Dealer of Cleveland on June 1, 1964:

"The rightwing coup in Laos was probably promoted by the Central Intelligence Agency, in line with their past policies.

victories, we fell back upon neutralism. So why not neutralism for all southeast Asia, rather than insisting they be our satellites? Cambodia, in order to get rid of our CIA, and plots for another rightwing military coup, refused to accept any more U.S. aid. So instead of aggression against Cambodia and threatened aggression against North Vietnam, why not have a Geneva conference to establish neutralism to be safeguarded by U.N. troops, so our CIA and our American boys can come home? We are not winning friends in the Orient by firebombing villages suspected of harboring a few Vietcong."

J. PAUL CORTON.

JUNE 29, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have taken the liberty of quoting you in the attached letter-article to Judd Arnett of the Free Press.

May I also congratulate you on your fearlessness and strength of your convictions.

Sincerely,

TOM KIZER.

JUNE 28, 1964.

MR. JUDD ARNETT,  
The Detroit Free Press,  
Detroit, Mich.

DEAR JUDD: Edwin A. Lahey, in his June 25 headline story in the Free Press said, "At first it seemed like a political story. Henry Cabot Lodge was coming home from Saigon \* \* \* but this is a war story."

And war story it apparently is—may God help and forgive us.

Further in his news article, Lahey said, "Administration leaders for many weeks have been getting the public ready for the news that the only way he can avert disaster in southeast Asia is with a show of force that the Communist Chinese will respect.

"This theory, if taken to its next logical step would escalate the southeast Asia war to a point where the Chinese themselves will have to decide whether they want to take on the United States in another Korean-type action."

Now, what is unsaid but follows as inevitably as death follows war, is that the escalated war to avert what they call disaster in Vietnam will bring heartbreaking disaster to thousands and thousands of American homes through lost, killed, and maimed American sons. What about that disaster? It's great to talk about saving Vietnamese but someone neglects to tell us that in the saving we sacrifice thousands of our own sons, fighting a war for a people who don't seem willing to fight their own and in a country so far away the average American doesn't know where to look for it on the map.

The people of the country never wanted any one of the last three wars we have had and they don't want this one. Then who does?

It seems Mr. Johnson, Mr. McNamara, and Mr. Rusk are credited officially with the decision and behind it all is the soporific reason "to save face" and "give freedom to the Vietnamese". Poppycock.

If it costs the life of your son or mine it is not worth it. If the Vietnamese want communism, let 'em have it. If they don't want it, let them fight against it. It looks like in all these situations a majority want what they get and we are siding with a minority. I'm sure that if a majority of any nation didn't want communism, they will eventually rebel and overthrow it just as did our small rebellious colonies with England. The principles are the same today, only the tools of war have changed. If we could and did do it with England, Vietnam can do it with communism if the majority want to desperately enough. If they don't, to hell with it—don't send my son to do it for them. I'm positive 99 percent of all American parents and perhaps an equal percentage of eligible draftees feel we have too many sol-

dier graves in foreign lands and too many Veterans Hospitals here filled with broken minds and bodies from foreign conflicts. We want no more. Only WAYNE MORSE seems to have the courage to speak out and in doing so he speaks for millions. He said of the Vietnam affair, as reported in Mr. Lahey's column, "The United States is headed for war in Asia and will be hated for the next 500 years by the majority of mankind."

MORSE told the Senate that this country "will go down in history as the nation chiefly responsible for scuttling the United Nations." He said he told McNamara and Taylor at the committee briefing that they had convinced him that "the greatest threat to peace in the world is the United States."

If the officials of this Nation need their "face saved" in Vietnam or anywhere else, let them save it by some other means than war and the waste of young American lives. One way might be as suggested by Eric Remarque in "All Quiet On the Western Front," put the officials who want war in a ring with the Communist officials and let them scrap it out. I doubt it.

Yours very truly,

T. J. KIZER.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.,  
 June 23, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to commend you for your forthright statements on Vietnam and Laos. Having viewed "Issues and Answers" this afternoon, I found your comments refreshing and helpful. You have obviously studied the problem thoroughly and are standing by your conclusions. To find a man of your courage and convictions is rare in these days of wishy-washy thinking and talking. I salute you, Senator.

I am also writing Senator HART, my Senator, this evening to ask if he will not join you in your efforts to prod the administration into recognizing their United Nation's commitments—to stop this waste of human life. We, a nation of peace, should not be setting a bad example all over the globe, billions for arms and other instruments of war; we should be leading a peace race and the place to start is the U.N.

As a concerned citizen, mother of two young boys, and eager to be of help, please let me know if I can be of assistance to you in your quest for peace. I remain,

Your admirer,

NANCY K. WEBSTER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,  
 June 29, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Again I must thank you for your splendid wisdom and courage in speaking out against our insane policy in southeast Asia. You give strength to the American people who are, as you say, deliberately kept in ignorance as to the terribly dangerous action, which involves the peril of nuclear war, that the United States is carrying on. I urge you to continue to oppose the madness of our Government. I would much appreciate a copy of your last speech.

Yours truly,

JULIET GREEN.

CLAREMONT MEN'S COLLEGE,  
 Claremont, Calif., June 30, 1964.

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

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I write to tell you how much I admire you for your wise and statesmanlike remarks about the pending war in Vietnam which I heard you make over the radio a few days ago. You seem to be one of the few people who talk sense about this matter, or are there many people in Washington who talk sense privately but

keep quiet in public because of the chauvinistic trend of sentiment in the country. I assure you that I know many people even here in California who view the trend of developments in Vietnam with dismay.

Am I not correct in thinking that General MacArthur viewed our entry into a war on the mainland of Asia with grave misgivings? Should not his name be invoked in the present circumstances? Surely he knew more about that situation than (say) Senator GOLDWATER.

An English observer of the United States once observed that we have the illusion of omnipotence. He was quite right about this. Anyone who knows anything about history knows that such an illusion gets a country into very serious trouble.

Thank you for speaking out courageously and intelligently.

Sincerely,

WALTER B. SMITH,  
 ENCINITAS, CALIF.,  
 June 30, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We saw and heard you on television "Issues and Answers," and I believe you presented the most sane and intelligent ideas we have heard. Please try to influence others in Government in the direction of peaceful attempts at resolving disputes. I hope you receive a letter from every citizen in America.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. OAKES.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,  
 June 30, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I agree with you that we should get out of Vietnam. We had no business there in the first place.

Yours truly,

C. E. HOIGAARD.

GATES MILLS, OHIO,  
 June 29, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We write in somber appreciation of the position you have taken against the unwise and dangerously immoral belligerence of our Government in southeast Asia. We trust this will help to convince you that commonsense and common morality are not so unpopular in the country at large as they are among high officials and the news media. In spite of the formidable apparatus of opposition and informal censorship we entreat you to continue speaking your mind and ours on an issue of life and death to so many Vietnamese and Americans and possibly most of the world.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT ZEVIN.

(Copy to Senator STEPHEN YOUNG.)

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As you can see, this is a fan letter. May God Bless your honest efforts on our behalf:

"JUNE 24, 1964.

"K. P. O. J.  
 "Editorial Department,  
 "Portland, Oreg.

"Sirs: In answer to your request for listener reaction to your "editorial" against Senator WAYNE MORSE, may I say that I disagree completely. You abuse him because he speaks out clearly on our foreign policies even when his views have to be critical. You suggest that he ought to tend to strictly Oregon State affairs—such as the Dunes bill, etc. Surely you cannot believe that Oregonians would have elected him as often as they have if they were not con-

vinced that he serves them well. I love those dunes and all the rest of the scenic wonders of Oregon and want them preserved for all to enjoy. But I also care very much that America is, by pursuing this cruel, illogical and illegal war in Vietnam, losing the respect and trust of the world's people, as well as recklessly inviting destruction of the whole world, as we know it now. Admitting that there is no easy pat solution to the problems, it seems inexcusable that we have not brought the whole matter into the United Nations long ago. It would have been embarrassing to disclose just how wrong and blind we had been in supporting Diem's every action. We desperately need to hold up a full length mirror to our policy in Vietnam, accept the ugly truths it would disclose, and set about remedying them as would befit an enlightened government.

"Sincerely,

"Caroline Schnoor

"Mrs. CAROLINE A. SCHNOOR.

"PORTLAND, OREG."

P.S.—I watched the "Today" show where you spoke; was, of course, in agreement and amazed that Senator CHURCH, of Idaho, who was to have taken the so-called opposite view did not do so. However, Ray Shearer told Senator CHURCH that you had called President Johnson a warmonger. I did not hear you say that and if you did not perhaps you should advise Ray Shearer to rerun the tape and find out what you did say. Senator CHURCH actually brought out very clearly that Asians would unite against us if this Government did try all-out war in Vietnam.

RUTLAND, VT.,  
 June 30, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have just read in a Canadian newspaper that you said in a recent speech that the greatest threat to peace with the resulting possibility of bringing about a third world war in the world is the United States.

I agree with you 100 percent. I note that none of the U.S. newspapers I read are reporting truthfully this fact to the people. They aren't telling the people how this could be prevented.

Yours truly,

IRVING H. REYNOLDS.

STATE COLLEGE, PA.,  
 June 29, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This continues my expression of appreciation and thanks for your efforts to have the Vietnam situation handled by a United Nations deliberation and possible presence of some kind. I wrote you longhand on the 26th, on hearing part of the interview by NBC with Senator CHURCH to follow up your presentation the day before.

After reading the various insertions and speeches in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the 23d, the 25th, and 26th, I decided that a letter to NBC to include suggestion that more views be given how to get the United Nations into the scene might be in order. I enclose copy of my letter to let your office know that at least one person is asking for more TV appearances to get this U.N. idea out in the open.

I do think that it is alarming to read, as you pointed out in your remarks, page 14301 in RECORD of the 23d, that after Senator CHURCH's convincing speech on the United Nations, his views that it should be used in Vietnam situation, then that a series of Senators gave general tones of favor for the United Nations, but then went on to hold

July 9

fast to a decision being made by the administration by other advice, it seems.

The tone of the NBC interview in asking about possible use of U.N. was perhaps sincere, but it had the air of skepticism which I would prefer left out of an objective search for views from the guest. You are up to meeting this mood; I wish you continued effort and more appearances.

Sincerely yours,

MERWIN W. HUMPHREY.

STATE COLLEGE, PA.,  
June 29, 1964.

Mr. AL MORGAN,  
Producer of "Today" Show,  
National Broadcasting Co.,  
New York.

DEAR MR. MORGAN: The "Today" show on TV is to be congratulated on seeking out last week the views of two Senators on what most of us agree is a topic of highest concern to the peace of the world—our policy in Asia. Senator MORSE on Thursday, the 26th of June and Senator CHURCH on the next day, Friday, the 26th combined to bring before your vast audience some of the issues and the concern they each hold for efforts before the United Nations to bring about peaceful solutions.

This kind of attention to issues of the day which has been heightened, it seems to me, in recent weeks, is good for the viewer's advantage in watching the "To-day" show.

I trust that the seemingly critical note in some remarks in the course of interview with Senator CHURCH, charged to Senator MORSE (per his entry in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 14714, of June 26) will be corrected in some subsequent statement. I had taped most of Senator MORSE's interview and on playing it back I could not detect any basis for criticism of President Johnson as a "war-monger". Yet in listening to the interview with Senator CHURCH I have the impression that some such implication was unhappily given. We are all aware that Senator MORSE in his entries in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has confined himself to views and opinions; similarly Senator CHURCH in his address on the United Nations on June 23, 1964, gave such a detailed analysis of his views in reasoning for more use of U.N. peacekeeping machinery of the U.N. (especially column 2 of page 14290, June 23) that many viewers might wish more extended time on TV by these two Senators who to the reader might seem good choices for more explanations to American audience of the possible advantages of use of the United Nations.

We hope that "Today" show will continue to try to give its close attention to the efforts toward use of United Nations for peacekeeping authority and influence.

Sincerely,

MERWIN W. HUMPHREY.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, June 29, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your magnificent TV talk of June 28. Would that other respected and influential Government officials would have the courage to bring the true state of affairs to the people. Neither do most of our newspapers live up to their obligation to inform the public by printing any background news such as the why and how of happenings. For several years such magazines as the New Republic, Christian Century, Progressive, and even Newsweek have said that we have no business to be in Vietnam and that we were in violation of the 1954 Geneva agreement. But since a very small segment of the people read these magazines they were voices crying in the wilderness, I'm afraid. But I am hopeful that your TV interview was seen by a great part of

the "Today" show will rouse up millions and millions of Americans. When Judgment Day come how will our President justify his sending our boys to their deaths and Harry Truman for the war in Korea. How can he justify for the many he sent to die in Korea. But at least he as you said turned it over to the U.N. Today our President told of sending 500 more guerrilla fighters. But he should know as you and I know a guerrilla war they are experts at that type of fighting over there. This type of warfare is extremely difficult to win and even if it was won where would it leave us if Johnson pushes us into full scale war. If he is prepared to face our people, the parents of our men and explain to them why he made us face the loss of perhaps 50,000 to 100,000 of our young men plus the enormous cost to our Nation not only in lives but money. It would also mean a loss of face for us before the rest of the world, then how do we know Red China may not feel there is nothing to lose in even a more direct challenge to America? We Americans may soon find we are faced or must make a drastic decision on Vietnam, and we better get used to it or toughen our thinking. Our efforts to train and add them has brought no decisive results.

Sincerely yours,

HELEN S. MONCE  
MRS. H. J. MONCE.

FALLS CHURCH, VA.,  
June 29, 1964.

DEAR SIR: I agree with you and Senator FULBRIGHT's foreign policy views 100 percent. I admire you so because you're more outspoken and not afraid to put your political future on the line and speak out regardless of vote (not many Senators dare do this). I'm not from Oregon but you would make a great President of the United States. You are too sophisticated for the average American. Oregonians know and vote for a great man like you.

LOU DORIAN.

P.S.—Our baby wrote on card, too.

SHREVEPORT, LA.,  
June 28, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Listened to your interview tonight on "Issues and Answers" and was extremely pleased and enlightened by your analysis of the problem and with your solution. As you may well imagine such a philosophy as yours is very unpopular in the Shreveport area, and, for that matter throughout most of the South, but that's just the object of my card. For the first time tonight I've heard an intelligent discussion of the situation and a well-thought-out and far-reaching plan for the eventual easing of tension and a return of the Government to the hands of the South Vietnamese. I know you'll continue to speak your mind on this vital issue and I just couldn't let this opportunity pass without adding what small encouragement I can.

Very truly yours,

B. SHAW.

WYOMING, MICH.,  
June 30, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This one American who agrees with you, and wholly. As you said Sunday, we usually assume a superior position that allows us the use of the principle of any vile, dishonest, corrupt, or atrocious means are permitted us so long as we can attain our ends. Few know that the opponents of Vietnam, and others, are natives, not aliens, fighting for what they think best. Few have any foresight at all and so cannot see the ill feelings, hopes for vengeance, retaliation, etc., in store for us. We would fight like mad, hate, if anyone put his foot into our business. No one knows or sees that the Communist nations change their policies faster through experience than we.

Sincerely,

DOROTHY REBENTISCH.

PENFIELD, N.Y.,  
June 25, 1964.

DEAR SIR: I heard you today on "Today" show. Keep fighting to get our boys out of Vietnam, Laos, Korea. Let's work to keep this land of ours as it is, I'm for helping them with supplies to do their fighting with, but not our boys. Our boys belong here at home with their families and parents.

I believe Johnson will not remain President long if he makes this war a general war. He should be made to lay it before the United Nations. I hope by your time spent on

the "Today" show will rouse up millions and millions of Americans. When Judgment Day come how will our President justify his sending our boys to their deaths and Harry Truman for the war in Korea. How can he justify for the many he sent to die in Korea. But at least he as you said turned it over to the U.N. Today our President told of sending 500 more guerrilla fighters. But he should know as you and I know a guerrilla war they are experts at that type of fighting over there. This type of warfare is extremely difficult to win and even if it was won where would it leave us if Johnson pushes us into full scale war. If he is prepared to face our people, the parents of our men and explain to them why he made us face the loss of perhaps 50,000 to 100,000 of our young men plus the enormous cost to our Nation not only in lives but money. It would also mean a loss of face for us before the rest of the world, then how do we know Red China may not feel there is nothing to lose in even a more direct challenge to America? We Americans may soon find we are faced or must make a drastic decision on Vietnam, and we better get used to it or toughen our thinking. Our efforts to train and add them has brought no decisive results.

MRS. JOHN HERMENET,  
An Invalid Mother and Grandmother.

PONTIAC, MICH.,  
June 29, 1964.

DEAR SIR: Please let me congratulate you on your Vietnam stand as I watched on "Issues and Answers," Sunday on TV. Sincerely, all the best wishes in the world.

MRS. MARIE EVANS.

DALLAS, TEX.,  
June 29, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We heard your TV interview Sunday, and agree with you wholeheartedly. In fact, President Johnson has just lost my vote, because I certainly would not vote for GOLDWATER, and because President Johnson is talking war. Because both President Johnson and ex-President Kennedy are not stopping this Government interference into the States. Governor Scranton will get my vote.

The colored race should be given an education. You can only force education, religion, etc., just so far. They can be given the opportunities to learn, and should have them—but let them go from there. I am not with the Council of Churches, and many of our ministers are not, either. You cannot force me to like my neighbor. I must want to. You cannot make a student do anything but obey the laws of the school, but cannot force them to go to a library to learn more. There must be a line drawn.

Our Government, our schools, and our churches must have laws. But they must only go so far. The people revolt—a natural thing.

One the other hand, the Negroes must be made to understand, and should be made to understand (instead of giving into them) that the white race came up to where we are by hard work—by education—nothing has been given to us except our heritage from our ancestors. Now, they want it handed to them. Let them make it—instead of all this hullabaloo that is going on, dangerous as it may become—start working. Our working Negroes are not in this line of march.

I blame the white people for what they are doing too. All of this force is no good—it will explode some place. I think what may happen down here is the fact that some businesses will be forced to close. We have some eating establishments that have hostesses—they will seat the colored, to be sure when it is law, if it is law—but where they want them to be seated. Education—both church and

school—should be given them, but nothing else. And this is the opinion of the majority. No American wants to hear anything about war. President Johnson should be patient and work for peace—war out of the question. He should be winning friends and influencing people all over the world. America doesn't need to be divided amongst its whites—it is—thanks to the Kennedys. He will find that no one is behind him even taking a risk of war. Win the people over, all over the world, and if that cannot be done, let them lose their freedom. Of course, attention at home should come first.

Americans are so busy living, I feel certain they do not stop to write but we are not behind President Johnson in many things. Therefore, my vote is going to Governor Scranton, if he can get elected. I think Texans will show how much they are against GOLDWATER, if at the coming convention Governor Scranton can make it, this late date.

America must have a man in the White House who respects State's rights. My great-great-grandfather left Virginia for Tennessee, for the unknown lands, to have freedom of religion and be free of England's rule. That is what has been handed to us—we have worked for the rest. We must keep it.

Sincerely,

Mrs. W. H. Cook.

P.S.—Mrs. Binkman, Hinsdale, Ill., is working hard for this constitutional freedom.

NEW YORK CITY,  
June 28, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This looked like something you should have and should share with Senator GREENING. Should even insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

McNamara's war is Johnson's war now and the idiocy is incurable.

Sincerely,

HORACE CASSELBERRY.

P.S.—The "power of the idea whose time has come" is "light years" beyond the comprehension of these idiots.

SINCE WHEN WAS DYING FINE?

(By Henry J. Taylor)

"I think the military situation is coming along fine now," U.S. Gen. Paul D. Harkins stated June 22 on his return to Washington from command in South Vietnam. This was apostasy, tragic to observe.

Fine. That's Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara's line. And it's utterly heart-breaking to see a distinguished officer peddling that kind of pap under McNamara's censoring eye. God help us. This is what happened to the prewar armed forces in France.

Any of about 16,000 Americans in South Vietnam could tell you how fine the situation is. Our entire position is just a long, drawn out Bay of Pigs all over again.

In another sense—an even more basic sense—the truth about a war is known only to a soldier under the gun, there or anywhere, ever.

It's easy to confuse morale with a desire to fight. I've never known one soldier in a thousand who wants to fight. Most fight for a dozen other reasons combined; but, oh, no, not that one.

Along with hunger, fear is a universal emotion. It has nothing to do with bravery. Anybody with any sense is afraid.

Fine? Nothing's fine when you're getting shot at.

Nothing's fine when you start to count the missing and the dead, and you do not know how it could happen that one of them is not you.

Nothing's fine when the road blows up and your eyes go blind because something smashed them closed. You're afraid to open them, because you may not be able to see.

Or it's pitch dark anyway and your face—do you still have a face?—is flat down in the mud.

Nothing's fine when you hear a sharp, hard "ping"—a single shot—and you feel the man next to you in a jeep or helicopter suddenly strain his body against yours. A moment ago he was your friend. Now he is dead.

He is lost, to everyone who loved him, and to the world. He will never see morning again, write a letter or sing a song. He has no hope and any hope of this world in him is gone forever.

It's easy to discuss the problem of war—in South Vietnam, Laos, anywhere. But this is different and it is the essence of war. One man. Men in their prime, dying one by one.

General Eisenhower once said in a letter to Ernie Pyle: "I get so eternally tired of the general lack of understanding of what the frontline soldier endures—the acceptance of unendurable conditions—that I become completely inarticulate."

Or listen to Ernie Pyle himself.

We were in Italy. An infantry column was coming out of battle. All ranks were 50 feet apart, for dispersal. So were Ernie and I. The wounded were lying with the dead because the Germans had shot our litter bearers when they stood up and walked over to get them. That night this is what Ernie wrote:

"The line moves on but it never ends. All afternoon men kept coming around the hill and vanishing eventually over the horizon. There is agony in your heart. The sag of their bodies speaks their inhuman exhaustion. They're just guys from Brooklyn and Main Street, but you wouldn't remember them if you saw them. Their world can never be known to you."

Each day in South Vietnam armed Americans die quietly, tragically, unknowingly, obediently.

Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, who personally takes over in South Vietnam now, recently admitted to the Armed Forces subcommittee that we control nothing there.

Fine? As at the Bay of Pigs and the give-away of Laos, the United States is defeated again. But not a noisy debacle, mind you, nothing noisily noticeable. General Taylor's task is to see that the collapse stops short of that.

On June 24 able Washington Insider James Reston wrote in the New York Times: "This administration is not prepared to accept any spectacular defeat in South Vietnam, particularly in an election year."

In short, Americans are just to die quietly, tragically, unknowingly, obediently—while nobody rocks the political boat until November.

Isn't there anything—anything, anything, anything—that can bring conscience into politics?

GOLETA, CALIF.,  
June 24, 1964.

Senator THOMAS KUCHEL,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, is reported in today's newspapers as saying that there is no justification for the U.S. course in Vietnam, and that the only way a major war can be averted is for the American people to stop it.

I agree with Senator MORSE. I agree also when he says that the greatest threat to the peace of the world is the United States.

U.S. military action in any part of Asia is inexcusable. We have here on our own continent problems of greater magnitude when it comes to matters of social justice and malignant behavior.

I am requesting that you support Senator MORSE and oppose escalation of U.S. military action in Asia. The situation in South Vietnam—and other areas of southeast Asia—

should indeed be put before the United Nations.

Very truly yours,

L. A. LAUER.

SEATTLE, WASH.,  
June 30, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have followed your speeches in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with great interest and heartily agree with you and your colleagues who are opposed to the dangerous American adventure in South Vietnam and now in Laos.

It is appalling that the administration is supporting a government that does not have the backing of its people and steadily moving toward a potential world war.

Even worse is the virtual blackout in our press of views such as yours. If more Americans have access to the facts as raised by you there would be more opposition.

I would appreciate receiving copies of your speeches so that I could inform others.

Your courage is commendable.

Sincerely,

LYLE MERCER.

ANAHEIM, CALIF.,  
June 27, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Amen, and amen to what you said a couple of mornings ago over the TV program, "Today," relative to Vietnam, and relative to the United States functioning through the United Nations.

Thank you for speaking for many fellow citizens, among whom I am one.

God sustain you, in your forthright words, and your forthright deeds.

Sincerely and respectfully,

ARTHUR M. STEVENSON.

BROOKVILLE, OHIO,  
June 30, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: Someone should tell you, I think, that your views as expressed on the "Issues and Answers" program on TV Sunday, June 28, were very much appreciated.

As you suggested—if we keep on moving down the blind alley that we are in now there may not be much to boast about after the smoke clears away.

While to be sure I don't want Russia arming Cuba against us as they were doing at the time of the "missile crisis" it sure still beats the ham out of me to figure out how we could justify the bellowing we did at that time when we just stop to consider that we had men and military supplies in many areas of the Far East for years before Russia slipped into our hemisphere.

As you said Sunday, war and especially nuclear war is unthinkable as a sensible means of settling disputes. Let pride be damned if it must but there is just no sense in saving face at the reckless expense of a ruined future for millions of people including ourselves quite likely. My mother had four sons and one daughter and ended up with five of us in the armed services at one time or another and I'm telling you that if I feel any more secure today than I did before the first one of us went, it is simply because I've learned not to let the state of international affairs worry me so much as it once did. All our armed might, mighty as it is, has merely, so far as I'm concerned, made our problems greater instead of our world safer.

Incidentally, wouldn't that BARRY GOLDWATER be a reckless reuben in case he should get charge of things in an emergency? I really believe he stands out as a freedom smasher.

Mr. MORSE, I hope I haven't been too distasteful for your digestion and may God

July 9

15672

make this country a real shining light in the world as I once thought we were meant to be.

Sincerely yours,

RUSS MONTGOMERY.

LA MIRADA, CALIF.,  
June 28, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for your thoughtful and courageous talk on "Issues and Answers." We wholeheartedly agree. The United Nations must be the peacekeeping force in the world and the United States must live up to its charter.

Respectfully yours,

D. D. KELLOGG.  
G. PEARL KELLOGG.

SEATTLE, WASH.,  
June 28, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I heartily agree with you in regard to our present policy in Vietnam.

I have asked the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson why the United States is going it alone in South Vietnam, why a U.N. force isn't there, but have not had a satisfactory reply. Also, what has happened to SEATO?

I am extremely worried that the war in Vietnam may lead to World War III. God forbid.

How can the United States glibly talk peace while spending enormous amounts of money for arms and interfering in civil wars?

I object having my tax dollars (I'm 63 and would like to semiretire) handed out to South Vietnam or any other country where we have no right to be. My heart aches for the poor Vietnamese who have endured untold suffering for so many years. How heartless can we get?

I am proud of you, Senator MORSE, and agree with your statement to the Senate "that this country will go down in history as the nation chiefly responsible for scuttling the United Nations." It appears our faith in the U.N. is badly shaken.

Do you suppose that one of these days before it's too late that others in Washington will come to their senses? Or, are they enjoying the cold war and interfering in the self-determination of other peoples?

Thank you for your courage. My hope and prayer is that soon others will join you in protesting the continuation of the war in Vietnam. It's our men who are losing their lives needlessly.

Respectfully,

Mrs. MARY O'NEILL HAYES.

P.S.—I saw you on "Issues and Answers" Sunday and you were great.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,  
June 28, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As an American, and a concerned supporter of the United Nations, I wish to state my agreement with your views on Vietnam as stated on ABC's Sunday program "Issues and Answers." This agreement also stands for your views on Laos.

I am not an Oregonian, but were I a constituent of yours, I would proudly wear a WAYNE MORSE campaign button. Good luck to you and the Democratic Party from another reconstructed Republican. My wife, apparently somewhat brighter than both you and I, has been an intelligent, loyal Democrat since her first vote, and sends her greetings.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL E. GRODEKY.

PALM SPRINGS, CALIF.,  
June 30, 1964.

Senator MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am inclined to support you in your attitude of the policy toward southeast Asia.

I am inclined to fear any nation that is all powerful, and that includes our own.

I fear a "prevention" war toward Red China on a national policy under the guise of a forced peace.

"Peace" yes—but "peace on our terms" could lead to war with a nation such as Red China. We felt we were entering on her internal affairs.

You have a tough job in combating the Pentagon-industrial complex.

Sincerely,

LA MCGELLINARY.

St. Louis, Mo.,  
June 29, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your appearance on TV was very enlightening to me, as I had not understood what was going on in Laos, and I only wish that the administration would take as sensible an attitude. The American people actually are not given much information as to what choices are possible in such situations. Our leaders make the decisions without consulting the people, although this is supposed to be a democracy.

We do not have any more genuine leader in public life today than you have proved yourself to be over a considerable period of years.

SPENCER WILLIAMS.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,  
June 30, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I had the good fortune of being present in the Senate gallery on June 29 when you made your speech criticizing the U.S. foreign policy of military intervention in southeast Asia. I applaud both your stand against the United States policy in Vietnam and your suggestion for the establishment in troubled areas of a peace force under the direction of the United Nations.

A specific issue which I as a professional botanist am concerned about is the use by the United States of chemical defoliants on the Vietnam flora. Use of chemical defoliants is a form of CBR warfare which we (the United States) categorically deny using. I suppose it is argued that economic crops are not sprayed and therefore the people are not affected. Nevertheless severe damage to the local flora will quickly lead to an imbalance in both plant and animal communities and eventually will have a direct affect on the inhabitants. The ultimate magnitude of the destruction of such a defoliation program cannot be imagined.

The responsibility that you show by making public the important issue of the military situation in southeast Asia is greatly needed. I can only hope that other ears were tuned to your speech.

Sincerely,

PETER K. HEPLER, Ph. D.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,  
June 29, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I commend your courage in speaking out against our involvement in South Vietnam.

If, indeed, intervention is necessary, I believe it should be handled through the United Nations.

It frightens me to know that Mr. Lodge is being replaced by a general; this seems to indicate to me that we are heading toward a full-scale war.

It is my hope that enough thinking people will seek a more peaceful solution in these troubled areas.

Please keep your voice heard, Mr. MORSE; many of us are listening.

With every good wish from myself and our many friends,

Sincerely,

EDITH WILLIAMS.

MESA, ARIZ.,  
June 28, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I just listened to "Issues and Answers" and was so pleased with your answers. Surely we do not want war in Asia, and for a long time I have wondered why this had not been taken to the United Nations. Have not liked the way Mr. McNamara has taken over. He is apparently so sure of himself. Is there any way to change the President's attitude, so that a peacemaking force could take over?

Have long admired your stand.

HELENA SANDERSON.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,  
June 30, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I can't tell you how pleased my wife and I were regarding your stand on the problems confronting this country in southeast Asia and its existing war. We were glad that through the "Today" TV show, you were able to reach many concerned, though confused Americans: concerned by the press, concerned with the peace of the world.

Please continue your peaceful fight to keep America informed, uphold the U.N., and maintain the peace. War is very unpopular to sensible people.

My best wishes.

Sincerely,

STEVE WEISS.

PROVIDENCE, R.I.,  
June 29, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I listened to the interview with you on "Issues and Answers" program yesterday, and I want to commend you on the stand you took of the United States-Vietnam situation.

It is heartening to find someone with the courage to speak out in opposition to the stand being taken by some of his own countrymen in places of power—especially since this in the United States at present might be construed as being on the side of the Communists.

I feel your views make sense and are in line with principle. I thank you for expressing them so well and I pray our fellow countrymen will pay heed to them.

Yours respectfully,

Mrs. GRACE LAMB.

HONOLULU, HAWAII,  
June 27, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your forthright stand against aggressive U.S. policies in southeast Asia. Urge you and colleagues of similar mind to continue to press for peaceful rather than military solution. We have no right to be there.

Sincerely,

JOHN M. KELLY.

LEXINGTON, KY.,  
June 30, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am as disillusioned as you are regarding the situation in Vietnam.

When is the United States going to get out of there?

Sincerely,

ROBERT L. ZIMMERMAN.  
P.S.—Also when is the United States going to have a decent medical care program?

NORTHRIDGE, CALIF.,  
July 1, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have asked the President and Senator HUMPHREY to consider your proposed policy for Vietnam. Also I have asked Republicans to discuss it constructively. Thank you for getting on television and giving the public the facts. I took notes.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. T. M. STOUT.

PHOENIX, ARIZ.,  
June 28, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Have just been listening to the program "Issues and Answers." I agree heartily with every word you said. I have long wondered why the United States does not lay the whole question before the United Nations. I am so glad that someone has the nerve to speak out, as you have done.

Incidentally, I am so glad you joined the Democrats. We can certainly use a little commonsense.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCES L. DIX.

NEW ROCHELLE, N.Y.,  
June 30, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: All mankind is in your debt for the intelligent, reasonable, and humane stand you are taking on southeast Asia. We are involved in an ugly and brutal war and no slogans or platitudes can alter this fact. We hope you will continue your courageous efforts in behalf of peace. I want you to know that you have our wholehearted support.

Very truly yours,

Mr. and Mrs. ELIAS TANENBAUM.

AVON PARK, FLA.,  
June 30, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You are 100 percent right on southeast Asia. A war there on the scale proposed by the President would only escalate into a nuclear war—and no sane man or woman wants that.

Americianly,

HENRY STONER.

P.S.—Please try to defend the great June 15, 1964, U.S. Supreme Court reapportionment decision as any good Jeffersonian would do.

WESTERN SPRINGS, ILL.,  
June 29, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: This is to thank you for speaking out and calling a spade a spade in the southeast Asia situation.

Will our leaders never learn? Again we are getting ourselves completely involved in

a local struggle on the other side of the world, as in Korea, where we wasted thousands of young lives and have poured billions of dollars into a country, only to end up supporting an unpopular dictatorship.

Keep up the good work—maybe in due time our people will wake up to the fact that we are indeed the greatest threat to peace in the world today, not because we want to help oppressed peoples, but because we can't stand competition.

Sincerely,

FRED L. CRAWFORD.

MORSE HITS OUR ASIA PUPPET SHOW

WASHINGTON.—Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, charged again yesterday that the United States is an outlaw nation fighting a unilateral war in southeast Asia.

The Senator called South Vietnam this puppet of ours.

MORSE said it may be true that Red China and North Vietnam are violating the Geneva accords on Laos, but that two wrongs do not make a right.

He charged the United States is pursuing a course of action outside the charter of the United Nations.

Speaking on a television program, MORSE said that a peacekeeping operation supported by U.S. SEATO allies ought to take the place of unilateral U.S. action until such time as the United Nations can move in with its own force.

He rejected the notion that in the time it takes to set up such operations the Communists can move in. He said it would not take as much time as most people claim.

MORSE said he had faith in President Johnson, "But I think he's being ill advised."

MORSE, a Senate Foreign Relations Committee member, said Mr. Johnson doesn't want war, but American policies in South Vietnam and Laos are escalating the fighting against Communist forces while Red China has 200,000 troops poised on its borders nearby.

P.S.—I agree with you completely, Mr. MORSE.

CARLSBAD, CALIF.,  
June 28, 1964.

DEAR Mr. MORSE: We approve of the stand you have taken concerning the United States in southeast Asia.

We sincerely hope that your voice and voices of others who have the same feelings about the terrible danger that present U.S. action is creating will be heard and heeded.

This country must use organizations established for the purpose of keeping peace.

Yours truly,

FLETCHER A. CARR.

CARLSBAD, CALIF.,  
June 28, 1964.

Senator MORSE: We have listened to your interview on "Issues and Answers."

Your stand is just and wise. Certainly the United Nations should be used and every possible way and means used to mediate in Vietnam.

Sincerely,

Mrs. F. D. CARR.

SANTA MONICA, CALIF.,  
June 27, 1964.

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

MY DEAR Mr. SENATOR: I want to express my deepest gratitude to you for being the strongest voice among the very few sane voices in our legislature, our Government, who is speaking out against our crime in Vietnam. It is indeed a sad truth that we are today "the greatest threat to the peace of the world."

Continue working for an end of our role in the Vietnam war. You have the support

of millions in our country and all over the world.

Gratefully yours,

Mrs. T. I. TOMASH.

LA JOLLA, CALIF.,  
June 30, 1964.

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

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am appalled by the threats of unlimited war if China continues to help the Communists in Laos and South Vietnam. I know that you will do all that you can to reach the President and to alert the country to the dangerous turn in our foreign policy. There is no one else in the Congress who has shown so much courage in speaking out against the war in Vietnam, and on whom we can so hopefully rely to mobilize others for sanity and responsibility.

The following is a copy of the telegram which I sent to the President and to Senator KUCHEL last evening:

"I do not believe that either honor or commonsense are served by U.S. military involvement in southeast Asia. Threats against China may deter temporarily but they will increase enmity. This is the road to war, now or in our children's time. It may put the human race in jeopardy. Real responsibility to mankind requires that we act through the U.N. and set our own house in order."

Is it not strange that we are willing to risk a nuclear war to defend the freedom of Asian peasants who want nothing so much as to be let alone, yet we cannot defend the right of many of our own citizens to vote, or the lives of our idealistic young people who are willing to sacrifice so much for freedom here?

Yours respectfully and gratefully,

HELEN M. BEARDSLEY.

LA JOLLA, CALIF.,  
June 30, 1964.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I also want to thank you for your sponsorship of S. 1500 and S. 1501 which will eliminate some of the injustices suffered by foreign born under the Walter McCarran Act. It was courageous of you to introduce these bills.

Yours sincerely,

HELEN M. BEARDSLEY.

NORMAN, OKLA.,  
June 29, 1964.

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

DEAR Mr. MORSE: Your comments on our Far East policy made on TV this past Sunday were indeed refreshing and swelled me with pride. Thank goodness for an alternative position—regardless of right or wrong. The important thing is that your views, in contrast to a general policy of escalated war or one of "let's get it over with now," provides a real choice between peace and war. I salute you for speaking out as you did. Also it was indeed a pleasure to listen to a politico who said substantially what he believed rather than the usual hedging, high-sounding and patronizing speech one has become so accustomed to hearing.

My best wishes,

MICHAEL KULLA.

FORT WORTH, TEX.,  
June 28, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: All I could say after listening to you today on "Issues and Answers" was, "Love that man." That is my way of expressing appreciation for your courageous facing up to reality in the area of foreign policy.

Through bits of information in the newspapers and more details in periodicals such as New Republic and Progressive, I have followed your career. But you were much less

July 9

a stranger after a full half hour on this program.

I do hope that soon a few other Senators will rally to the cause of peacekeeping, as you have. Senator CHURCH was effective, I thought, on the "Today" program last week. Senator FULBRIGHT's two speeches have not been given proper publicity in his conservative stronghold. What Senator MCGOVERN has to say on the floor of the Senate never makes the newspapers here. But I must admit that you emerge as a forceful, colorful personality in my mind. So I dare say the press has quoted you more than I realized.

Thank you very much. Everything you said I have been writing in letters to the editor, a lone voice in a wilderness of super-patriotism. That makes me a "Comsymp." I can imagine what kind of mail you receive, so decided to offset the negative with a fan letter

Yours truly,

STELLA MAE HUNTER.

JUNE 30, 1964.

MY DEAR SIR: We sincerely trust that you will pursue your stand re Cabo Lodge's opinion of Vietnam situation. It is our opinion that he does not and has not given a

Also President Johnson appointed Maxwell Taylor. American military or Vietnamese have little use for him there.

You know this most vitally important situation far better than we, and we ask that you please use your influence to do what you can to terminate the falseness and coverup that has been going on for so long.

Respectfully yours,

L. HEDDES.

DULUTH, MINN.

June 29, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wonder if you are aware of the CBS brainwashing broadcasts that are being put out this week to sell the radio audience on the idea that all we seek in the Vietnam and Laotian areas is peace and liberty \* \* \* that if war should come in spite of our peaceful bombings and strafings and general forceful interference in the affairs of these unfortunate people, it will be because the Chinese people want to pick a fight with us.

Not only this but deliberate intent exists to pin the label of communism on anyone who feels that we should get out of that area and turn the problem over to the U.N.

I am satisfied that this is not just CBS but is a Government (State Department) broadcast worked out with CBS in the best style of Adolph Hitler who proclaimed his peaceful intentions as he moved into Czechoslovakia, and Austria in the days when he was telling the world that he didn't seek war \* \* \* didn't want war, was hellbent on peace, even if he had to put people into stockades and shoot their official leadership to achieve it. It seems to me that it is news when a Senator from the great State of Oregon, a member of the governing party, breaks with the President and the military on a major question of foreign policy. If so, it is a reflection on our so-called free press that there is little or no publicity given to your effort to save not just our good name, but the lives of many, many fine young Americans. Why are not the newspapers and the radio and TV facilities that claim to give us the whole truth and nothing but the truth burying your efforts and doing everything in their power to paralyze the intelligence and commonsense and Christian feelings of the Nation?

I have written HUMPHREY and MCCARTHY and BLATNIK on this score. MCCARTHY promises his efforts. HUMPHREY is full of weasel words that don't mean a thing except that when the chips are down, he will find good and sufficient reason to support the State Department. Who is running this Government anyhow, when we go to war without

I am proud to be represented by the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Alaska. We are bypassing the U.N., and going it alone, into a boobytrap that will make Korea look like a Sunday school picnic.

With warm regards,

HERMAN J. GRIFFITH.

DREXEL HILL, PA.

June 30, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to tell you that I thoroughly agree with your comments about southeast Asia. Please keep saying over and over that we must refer this situation to the United Nations and try to ease tensions by conference and discussions, not by a buildup of U.S. military forces.

Sincerely,

JEAN F. LESTER.

HEMET, CALIF.

June 28, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

DEAR SENATOR: Again I waited anxiously to hear your talk about the Vietnam situation. Your calling it McNamara's war does not mean it's not Mr. Johnson's war—he is President—not McNamara.

I know he wants to prove to the Republicans he is not weak in foreign affairs—but all he proves is that he must take responsibility if he is the President—and get us out of the Vietnam war.

Sincerely,

PEGGY KJEMPNER.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

June 29, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Just heard you on TV and we were with you on the Vietnam situation and the U.N., etc. You were fine.

Now for some questions and answers, please.

Politics in both parties are going full blast now, viz the "war on poverty" and unemployment, and more economy. Seems of much concern to our Government and the President at this time. While at the same time the House passed an outrageous pay raise to Cabinet officers, Supreme Court Justices, district justices, House Doorkeeper, postmasters, Federal civil service. Federal civil service employees also enjoy fringe benefits, vacation pay (generous), sick leave, retirement benefits, and provided maximum job security; also a great percentage of District of Columbia Federal workers are colored. Last but not least the House voted themselves and the Senate a nice raise also again, since last year. Where is our dollar? "An indefensible raid upon the Treasury," so states the Human Events—a weekly Washington report. "Our Government debt is sky high."

Where do the retired and "over" age (limit) come in these days? Some living on very small pension or social security. Going back to 1958, what have the House and Senate given our retired personnel and officers, especially the military?

Too many of World Wars I and II had hard and brilliant careers in Army, Navy, and other services, with disabilities, unable to work out a full life, small pensions only. Why shouldn't these retired, capable men and women deserve some raises also? Last year they were the forgotten ones and again this year. So far the one or two raises since 1958 have been pitifully small. This year again, nothing for the retired military man. One of our living heroes, Sergeant York, has existed on \$60 (and less at first) for many years, and not even a plaque in memory of his heroism.

My husband was in both wars—in its worst places—and when he retired with a pension—not enough in return for his service—

Senators, for instance, reach ripe old age and still in service with a good salary even in retirement.

How about the Senators and the law-making honorable bodies making the laws instead of allowing the honorable Supreme Court to reign supreme—and get back to the Constitution of our country.

Thank you for listening.

Very truly and respectfully yours,

SUSAN P. JONES.

OTEGO, N.Y.

June 29, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It was very gratifying to see and hear you on TV the other day. It's about time that someone got on the floor and told the truth about South Vietnam and the whole Asian question. Are we the police department for the whole world, I thought we had the U.N. for these trouble spots.

I agree with you, this administration is bent on escalating the war or wars in Asia and it looks to me and to others, that a behind-the-door deal has been made. The Russians are pulling out of Cuba; for what reason? Is it a deal in which we are to clip Red China's wings, to save the Russians the job, I wonder?

Any way, it certainly would be the height of folly for this country to start to tangle with Red China. Our boys would just be put down the drain, sacrificed for nothing, as no matter what manpower we put in Asia it would be swallowed up and nothing accomplished.

Was no lesson learned from France's dismal record in Indochina? The same man that beat the French is now doing it to us. I say Asia for the Asiatics, keep our boys and our tax money to home. I hope you get up in the Senate and howl good and loud; maybe it will penetrate up to high what we want. It took Senator KEATING to expose the Cuban fiasco; you can do the same with the Asian one.

Another thing, these Negroes should be gotten off the streets with their fake passive demonstrations. It's all bunk. They are not too interested in civil rights; when they finally get them by law, they will not use them to advantage. Their big interest and major aim is intermarriage; they want to be white, that's their major aim. I ought to know how they think. I've lived with them for a time. If demonstrations are not stopped, there will be much bloodshed, I am sure.

Good luck to you on Vietnam.

A. G. BARWOOD.

ST. PAUL, MINN.

June 30, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I support your point of view on the situation in Vietnam.

I think that talk of expanding that war is insanity.

I share the opinion of the French Foreign Minister that this war is primarily an internal political war.

It appears to me that we are again backing a strong man against the will of the local people.

Information seems to be coming out now that the CIA is behind much of our foreign problems. Even going so far as to override Presidential decisions.

I think the CIA should be curtailed at once.

Sincerely,

FRANK B. SCHWARTZ.

MCHEMRY, ILL.

June 28, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I believe your stand on the South Vietnam question is absolutely correct. The United States is guilty of breaking international law just as the Communists are. It appears that we are just as desperate to gain control of this piece of property for the sake of prestige as they are to set up another Communist country. Being 17 years



old it scares me to think that I might have to serve my country in an undeclared and illegal war.

The answer, of course, is the United Nations. It was created to handle this type of situation. If the United States has no faith in its power to settle this dispute, the U.N. is doomed. You must continue to fight. We can't continue to turn our backs to the truth much longer. I know you have been criticized on your stand. Well, keep in mind that there must always be men like you around to blast some sense into Uncle Sam—keep it up. I am now going to write Senator DOUGLAS on this matter. I think he can be one of your helpers.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL LIEBMAN.

ORMOND BEACH, FLA.,

June 30, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I listened to your opinions on Vietnam over "Today" and got great satisfaction out of what you said. I was in China 1915-37—taught at the University of Shanghai and deprecate our isolating ourselves from that nation. I inclose an article from Eastern Horizon published in Hong Kong which confirms some of your ideas about "aid." We often help the wrong people. I met you at Paul Raymond's when you spoke at the Daytona Beach forum.

Yours sincerely,

GEORGE POTEAT.

BUFFALO, N.Y.,

June 25, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: This morning I heard you talk on the "Today" show. You were wonderful and expressed my sentiments exactly. I agree 100 percent with what you said regarding sending U.S. troops to Laos.

Would it be possible to have a copy of your speech? I should like to read it to all my friends. What can we poor citizens do about this? I hope I hear from you. Thank you.

Most sincerely,

RUTH FRUCHTBAUM.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,

June 28, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have just heard you on television on "Issues and Answers" and want to tell you that my husband and I agree with your views wholeheartedly. It is a dreadful mistake for us to be escalating the war in Vietnam as we surely are doing and seem to be about to continue doing. It can only lead to a real major war. NATO and SEATO are our only hope and we must call upon these in as forceful a way as can be managed and now. I have just written to President Johnson to express these same views. I hope a lot of other people do the same, so he can realize the people are not supporting this dangerous new policy. Thank you for speaking out.

Sincerely,

EDITH WEAVER.

HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.,

June 28, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Foreign Affairs Committee,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: After hearing your interview on television, I am hastening to write you and applaud you from the bottom of my heart. What you had to say was so true, so logical and to the point. You seem to be one of the very few brave souls left. Our treatment of South Vietnam and Cuba has been a disgrace and has lost us respect and friends.

I do hope that President Johnson, whom I believe, as you do, really wants peace and the welfare of mankind in general, will take

and others who have selfish interests in keeping animosities alive.

I lost all respect and confidence in Adlai Stevenson when he lied about our part in the Cuban affair. I have never been so disillusioned in a man as I have in him. He has no stamina or principle left.

How I wish that there were more men like you among our politicians. We could then look forward to a brighter and safer future for these United States.

God bless you.

Yours sincerely,

ELENITA LINDI.

P.S.—Would there be any possibility of getting reprints of the above interview? I should certainly like to pass them out so that people might be better informed.

GREENVILLE, S.C.,

June 29, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It seems you are in the right on Vietnam, as usual. Charles Wells in Between the Lines has good material. Can you have a copy of your remarks from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD sent me at once? We may get out a small paper on it locally, taking off from the recent war speech of the President.

I hope to get back to Eugene for a time this summer. I trust all is well with you and the family and interests.

Cordially,

ROSS ANDERSON.

WESTMINSTER COLLEGE,

Fulton, Mo., June 25, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,

U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I happened to catch your appearance on NBC's "Today" show this morning and feel compelled to write of my agreement with your stand on the Vietnamese question. This is the first time I have ever responded in this way to such an interview, but you said quite well those things which I have felt strongly for some time. In the days ahead as escalation seems an eminent danger in southeast Asia, I trust that you and others in positions of prominence will continue to speak out.

I teach American history here including a course in recent U.S. history. The latter is a discussion-type seminar course, and I am constantly looking for materials to give my students a variety of viewpoints on current topics as well as those others over the past 50 years which still exert their influence on us today. If your views on southeast Asia are available from a Senate speech or other presentation, I would appreciate receiving 20 copies for use with these students.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. PARRISH,  
Professor of History.

DALLAS, TEX.,

June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

The Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I heard you on the "Today" show this morning and am writing you to ask you what I can do to get the administration to take the Vietnam war to the United Nations. I have selfish reasons as well as moral reasons for not wanting a war. My son finishes 6 years of service in the Navy this October and I want him to be able to go to college and live a normal life. Besides, war is no solution as well we know. My older son served the Army 2 years and is married and living happily in Kellogg, Idaho. I have a 20-year-old daughter. I should know what to do to help to make this a better world at my age, but one feels so helpless in the face of politicians. You certainly seemed well informed and you were a forceful speaker. You seemed so sincere and I liked you very

Enclosed is a self-addressed envelope to save the Government's money. Thank you for your stand and any help you can give me.

Sincerely yours,

ANN HEARST.

COLLEGE OF GUAM,

Agana, Guam, June 28, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We warmly approve your efforts to bring about a more sensible and more hopeful policy in Vietnam. We have just written to Senators AIKEN and GRUENING to applaud their efforts in a like direction.

A friend of mine has a relative who has been a career officer in the lower ranks of the officer class. This officer served in Vietnam for a good many months. Finally he was transferred to the United States of America. He immediately gave up his career in the military forces because he was so ashamed of what the United States was doing out there.

Keep up your struggle. I would appreciate having copies of your speeches on Vietnam.

Respectfully yours,

Prof. E. LEWIS B. CURTIS.  
CATHERINE S. CURTIS.

COLLEGE OF GUAM,

Agana, Guam, June 28, 1964.

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

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: We so heartily approve of many things which you do and hope to do. We are, however, deeply perturbed at the direction our policy seems to be taking in Vietnam. We believe that our national interests will be better served by going to the conference table as soon as possible. To extend military action will not make us friends. Napalm bombs and defoliation procedures, quite understandably, seem to increase our opponents.

May a concerned couple recommend to our President some bedside reading? We urge you to reread our Tokyo Ambassador's (E. O. Relschauer) "Wanted—An Asian Policy."

We enclose copies of letters to Senators AIKEN, MORSE, and GRUENING.

Respectfully yours,

Prof. E. LEWIS B. CURTIS.  
CATHERINE S. CURTIS.

CLEARWATER, FLA.,

June 25, 1964.

HON. SENATOR MORSE,  
State Chambers,  
Salem, Oreg.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This morning I heard your interview on the "Today" program originating in New York City. I was very much impressed with your knowledge and ability to size up the situation we find ourselves in, in Vietnam.

I would appreciate it, if you could send me a copy of your interview or would tell me where I could secure a copy.

With the wish that all patriotic citizens might have a chance to hear your views, I am

Sincerely yours,

LAURA PHILLIPS.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX.,

June 25, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I just heard your interview on the "Today" program this morning and I am deeply impressed with your stand on the position of the United States in South Vietnam.

I have been looking for the exposition of the "other side" and you provided it.

July 9

In order that I may study your position more thoroughly and be informed on the facts you presented, will you please send me printed material giving me the facts on your position, including such items as the Geneva Accords, SEATO and the approach to the U.N. Your cooperation in sending this material will be deeply appreciated.  
 Many thanks.

Sincerely yours,  
 FAUL KULICK.

BOYNTON BEACH, FLA.,  
 June 25, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: Since hearing your views on the war (to be) in Laos, Thailand, etc., let me strongly urge you to see to it that it does get into the U.N.'s hands, and out of the U.S. military's hands. I talk from firsthand information, because I have a son in Hawaii, who has already been to Thailand twice, and because I know he would perhaps be among those slaughtered for what? The problem there should be left to Vietnamese. We would resent Russia coming here to take charge of our colored problems, wouldn't we?

A war there would last such a long time and what would we gain? Many hungry people here would appreciate getting \$10 more a month social security, but instead our loose money is to go to Vietnam. Why?

I have read item after item on the situation, and know it must be the Pentagon, or McNamara, that wants our sons killed, in some far away country that has no bearing in the fight for our freedom.

Will appreciate hearing from you very soon.

Very truly yours,  
 Mrs. R. KINNE.

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

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Let me take this first opportunity to congratulate you on the stand you have taken on U.S. policy on South Vietnam. I agree completely with your belief that American troops should be withdrawn from Vietnam—on legal grounds, their presence violates the 1954 Geneva accord; on moral ground, the United States has no right to force the regime of our serpentine satrap Khanh down the throats of the Vietnamese people; and on military grounds, as a U.S. Army veteran, I feel pretty sure that our military program is hopeless.

Your courage—and foresight—on this issue are commendable, and your speeches and statements are in the finest tradition of American politics. Just as we (rightly) criticize the police state that the Russians have imposed on the East Germans, we must also have the candor and courage to criticize a program that has led America to become what you have correctly called "a threat to world peace."

If your office has copies of the major speeches you have made on Vietnam, I would be most grateful if I could be sent 10 copies, which I shall send to my friends. I will be glad to bear any expense that this entails.  
 With best wishes.

Sincerely yours,  
 GEORGE W. PHILLIPS.

PROJECT CITY, CALIF.,  
 June 22, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I had to read in an obscure periodical your position against war the daily press, and controlled wire services

suppress anything but the mildest criticism of war. Can't even get a "letter to the editor published." Thus I write you to help stop this insanity.

The warmongers and industrial-military complex General Eisenhower warned against have gained control of this country. I understand every nation but this wishes to arbitrate or negotiate neutralism in southeast Asia. But they prefer countless thousands of our youth be slaughtered and mutilated defending another corrupt military dictatorship in Asia. How many thousands were killed and maimed to produce the dictatorship in Korea with recent riots against its corruption? Were hundreds of thousands of the flower of French youth slaughtered before they were driven out? I would appreciate as an American citizen your answering me the above and the following questions:

1. Has Congress given up its sole power to declare war, thus making this country a military dictatorship?
2. What is the authority of this country for establishing protectorates in Asia backed with military occupation and the power of one man to send the country to war?
3. Is the enclosed statement, that appeared in a San Francisco newspaper true?
4. In the "aid to South Vietnam bill" will you include free passage to the frontlines for these warmongers so anxious to defend corrupt military dictatorships to relieve them of sitting comfortably in front of their TV sets listening to the news of hundreds of thousands of our youth and sons being butchered, to keep their prestige and interests?
5. Is the foreign policy of this country to encourage, aid and abet, and protect military dictatorships throughout the world even at the cost of thousands of our youth killed? Are they afraid to use nuclear weapons as they might get hurt themselves? No wonder we have to go it alone.

The world will love this country when it invades Asia, and you can count on me to expose the butchers from the top down. Hundreds I've talked with feel the same.

WILLIAM COYLE,  
 Member, Shasta County Democrat  
 Central Committee, Five Counties  
 Central Labor Council, etc.

[From the San Francisco Examiner, June 9, 1964]

Is it moral to slaughter peasants for a corrupt dictatorship engaged in a brutal and hopeless civil war?

Do U.S. security interests, as defined by the cold warriors, have a priority over the rights of self-determination of the southeast Asian peoples? Do the former, in fact conflict with the latter?

Perhaps a partial answer to these questions lies in the conduct of U.S. foreign policy in Laos in 1958. From 1955 to 1957 in accordance with the Geneva agreement, the neutralist government under Souvanna Phouma had stabilized itself and demobilized most of the Pathet Lao armies. In 1958 elections were held and resulted in a substantial popular victory for the Pathet Lao and other leftist forces. The United States thereupon suppressed the democratic elections by supporting, politically and militarily, a right-wing coup.

ARTHUR DI QUATTRO.

BALTIMORE, MD.,  
 January 29, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to commend you for your realistic position concerning our involvement in South Vietnam's civil war. I have discussed this issue with many religious, educational, business, and civil leaders in my community.

the great majority, completely support your position.

I realize that President Johnson must be careful how he handles this controversial issue, this being an election year. I am sure that our President would like to wash his hands of this mess, as much as any of us, providing it wouldn't hurt him politically.

However, I sincerely believe that if you could persuade President Johnson to be honest with our citizens and to make known to the public the true facts that you have been courageously revealing about our involvement in this war, the great majority of our citizens will support your position.

The failure of President Johnson to reveal these realities will encourage our cold war politicians to utilize this issue for their political advantage. I hope that you can persuade President Johnson to see this danger.

I would appreciate any material you have on this issue so that I can help support your stand.

Very sincerely,  
 LEON SHAPIRO.

NORTH MIAMI, FLA.,  
 June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: I scan the newspapers and I am extremely dissatisfied with information about the U.S. policy in the Indochina area of east Asia.

Today I read Edwin Lahey's article on your speeches on this subject. I am deeply alarmed about our policy in this area. I feel our policy violates the United Nations Charter. Also as a practical matter I believe President Johnson is trying to prove he is tougher than Mao Tse-tung with the fate of mankind in balance. Mao is probably the toughest, shrewdest opponent he has faced.

Will you please send me all your speeches you have made on this subject this year and any other material you can send. Please reply. This is my third letter I have written to you without response.

Yours sincerely,  
 LOUIS FLUM.

P.S.—I heartily endorse your position on Indochina, Viet, etc.

GREENBANK, WASH.,  
 June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We strongly support your stand on South Vietnam and would like to have a copy of your speech if it is available. We have not been able to read it in our papers.

It is regrettable that we do not have more Members of the Senate with your courage.

Yours very truly,  
 M. M. ANDERSEN.

DELRAY BEACH, FLA.,  
 June 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to congratulate you on your very frank and very apropos discussion of the Vietnamese situation, or should I say disaster.

It is very heartening and encouraging to hear a Democrat dare to criticize the President's policies in Asia. I thought you were magnificent and couldn't help but laugh at the way you said everything you wanted to say, instead of being interviewed and led into answering the questions Ray Scherer and Nancy had evidently prepared to ask you. It does my heart good every time a real red-blooded American patriot stands up and speaks the truth fearlessly. You are right about the people not being behind "McNamara's War." I have felt ever since he was appointed that he was a ruthless, opinionated pip squeak and that we have consistently lost face and ground since he was put in charge of our defense. I also agree that General Taylor should never have been in Henry Cabot Lodge's place. It is

rattling sabers in the faces of those Red devils.

As long as we have men of your caliber and principles, Senator, I feel our chances of survival as a democracy have a fighting chance.

Senator, may I have a copy of this telecast of the "Today" show, June 25?

Bless you.

LILLIAN WOOD.

UNITED PROTESTANT CHURCH,  
Duluth, Minn., June 25, 1964.

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

DEAR MR. MORSE: Congratulations upon your analysis and expressed convictions on the Vietnam situation. I saw you on the "Today" show June 25 and I thoroughly concur with your views that the United States should make a desperate effort to have the United Nations handle the situation rather than try to deal with it militarily on a unilateral basis.

I am president of the Head of the Lakes Chapter of the Association for the United Nations and am greatly concerned for peace and feel the U.N. is our best hope for keeping the peace. For years I have talked and preached more solid support of the U.N. on the part of the United States.

How do your fellow Senators stack up on this issue? Do you have much support there?

Would it be possible to have a copy of your presentation of June 25, or another address in which you have dealt with this subject?

May your tribe increase and rapidly.

Cordially yours,

G. TRUETT HIGH.

CHARLESTON, S.C.,  
June 25, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been watching your interviews on television several times. I am very much impressed with your realistic views on the different political issues pertaining to the foreign policy of our great country.

During World War II I was in Greece. We suffered under the German-Italian-Bulgarian occupation and finally we had the civil war against the Communists. I have a bitter personal experience of war.

I could not help to write to you and express my admiration for your healthy and realistic stand on American foreign policy.

I will appreciate it very much if you send me your periodical newsletters.

Respectfully yours,

C. ANTONATOS, M.D.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH,  
June 28, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Is it possible to obtain several copies of your debate that was given today by ABC news on TV? I should like very much to have these copies—you were excellent. If obtainable, and if any cost, please enclose bill.

Vietnam and our war there is the topic under discussion.

Sincerely,

Mrs. W. P. DUNN.

GREAT NECK, N.Y.,  
June 25, 1964.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I was very much touched by the report of the New York Times covering your recent speech on the situation in Vietnam. But there was nothing in the paper the next day.

No. 136—10

I would much appreciate it if you will be good enough to mail me copies of some of your latest foreign policy speeches for distribution to my colleagues at Fairleigh Dickinson University.

Thank you and with kind regards.

Yours cordially,

CHANG HSIN-HAI.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,  
June 22, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been doing my best to follow American policy and action in southeast Asia. From what little I have been able to find in the newspapers (New York Times and Washington Post) about your position, I support it fully. Please keep up your good work. We appear to be at the brink with no room within the present policy to turn to new means to resolve our conflicts. It is very disappointing to read today's Post and see them all but declare war on China and North Vietnam.

Since I have found it so difficult to find your Senate speeches reported with any detail in the press, I would like to know if you could send me copies of your major speeches on Laos and South Vietnam for the last few months? If it is available, I would appreciate earlier speeches too.

Please continue your efforts and please keep reporting your views to the American people.

Sincerely yours,

PETER HUNT.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
June 25, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: Your interview this morning on the "Today" program was so honest and straightforward. It gave facts which needed to be brought to the attention of the American people long before this. I hope it is not too late.

I am sure that my friends and neighbors who did not hear and see you this a.m. would very much appreciate having a copy of this interview. Might it be possible to have some copies of it?

Thank you so much for your most worthy contribution to the American way at this very crucial moment.

Respectfully yours,

REBECCA S. LEVINE.

CLEVELAND, OHIO,  
June 24, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: For months, I and many of my acquaintances and friends have followed the lonely battle that you and others, though much too few, in the Senate have been waging against the brutal and dangerous policy of the United States in Vietnam. Your courage and your honesty are among the brightest spots in the morass that our Congress seems to be sinking in.

As I write, I almost feel that I am writing to someone I am close to personally, and a typewriter is a most inadequate instrument to convey my admiration for you through. I hope it is important to you to know that there are individuals like myself, and many others, who share with you an intense revulsion against our policies in Vietnam. This is an issue that I believe must be carried to the American people, one which, I believe, might be able to prick their collective conscience if the facts were known. With this in mind, I would like to ask you to send me as much of your materials on the Viet-

name situation as you can: speeches, inserts into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, articles, fact sheets, etc. To the extent that I can, I will use these materials to publicize the issues and your own activities. I am chairman of a campus organization called Voice on the University of Michigan campus, which is a chapter of Students for a Democratic Society, a growing national student organization which is very concerned about American policy throughout the underdeveloped world. We believe that Vietnam may be all too typical of a pattern which may be developing.

You may be interested to know that this letter was immediately prompted by the appointment of General Taylor to replace Mr. Lodge as Ambassador to Vietnam, a move which I feel bodes further ill to that beleaguered country and to the Americans who, I fear, in increasing numbers, may be sent there to fight and perhaps to die. It was also prompted by an article I read in the Cleveland Press yesterday in which you were quoted as saying that the United States "is heading for a war in Asia and will be hated by a majority of mankind for the next 500 years." I am ashamed to have to say that I fear you are right. Any help I may be to help you in your battle against this senseless war is at your disposal.

Looking forward to hear from you and receive your materials, I am,

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD F. MAGDOFF.

P.S.—If you might be interested in more information about Students for a Democratic Society, and particularly our activities regarding Vietnam, please let me know.

AKRON, OHIO,  
June 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: I heard you this morning on the "Today" program. I do not know how widespread that program reaches. Relatively few men hear that program, because it comes at a time when hundreds of men are on their way to work. I wish you would put the substance of your remarks on paper, so that your views could be given wide currency.

The people must be aroused to the danger we are now facing.

Yours very truly,

G. A. WIEDEMER.

SAN PEDRO, CALIF.,  
June 24, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE.

MY DEAR SIR: I read a small portion of your magnificent speech in the Senate in our local newspaper, and I find it difficult to conceive of words which will adequately describe your brilliance of mind and magnanimity.

Sir, I would very much appreciate knowing how I can obtain copies of your recent speeches deploring and admonishing the evil forces in our society.

Sir, I hope you will never tire in your efforts to make the blind open their eyes and their minds to truths. Thank you.

Your friend and admirer,

MAX MAZSICK.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,  
Post No. 33,  
St. James, Minn., June 25, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please accept our sincere thanks and congratulations upon your sage observations, which are born out by conservative and liberal German and

Swiss newspapers and magazines still available for reading to the writer (NBC "Today"). We are fast "losing face" as well as the best of our young manhood in uniform due to our lack of proper diplomacy and statesmanship. I would appreciate your sending me the substance of your courageous remarks with documentation as to the parts of treaty, U.N. regulations, etc., so I may factually inform the members of our host and other friends.

Most gratefully and respectfully,  
 HAN S. KRUGER,  
 Past Second District Commander.

HOUSTON, TEX.

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

DEAR SIR: I had the privilege of being present in the visitor's gallery of the Senate Chamber on the morning of June 25 and listened to your speech on the situation in Vietnam and our involvement. I wish to say that I agree heartily with you in this situation.

I would appreciate very much if you would send me a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing your speech.

Thanking you for your kindness and assuring you of my high regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,  
 JACOB RUDNICK.

PEACE PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE,  
 San Francisco, Calif. June 30, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Our thanks and congratulations to you on your remarkable contribution in warning the people of the United States against the great danger of continued military operations in southeast Asia.

If you will send me copies of your addresses (especially the latest) or any articles you have written on this important topic, we will make full use of them.

Please place my name on your mailing list. All good wishes,

HOLLAND ROBERTS.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN,  
 Ann Arbor, Mich., July 3, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You deserve the gratitude of every one of us for your leadership on both issues of NATO and Asian policy. You must realize how important it is to those of us trying to organize grassroots opinion, that there be eminent outspoken dissenters. I hope that in this election year, when the center and the right will be busy conversing, we can muster support for your position enough to bring Fulbright-minded people to your position.

I am preparing position papers on Vietnam for several Democratic primaries in Michigan. I would be grateful to get four or five copies of your major policy remarks during 1964 on the Senate floor and elsewhere. Please keep me on your list for any of your new statements during the summer.

Sincerely,  
 WILLIAM PAUL LIVANT, Ph. D.,  
 Associate Research Psychologist,  
 Mental Health Research Institute.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,  
 July 4, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Yours is like a voice in the wilderness of the war being promoted by the present U.S. policy in south Asia. I am glad to know that some of my fellow citizens, men and women, are protesting. The methods used by our leaders are more equal than murder because there is no way they

can be put on trial. The pretenses expressed in the cause of freedom are either a figment of imagination or the perpetration of evil for the purpose of gain. I cannot believe that they can succeed against forces for the preservation of mankind.

I am deeply grateful to you for your bravery and enlightenment in the face of blindness and mistaken ideas promoted by both major political parties in their foreign policy pronouncements. I want to add my voice to strengthen those of men of good will which you epitomize. If you will send me copies of some of your recent speeches I shall be glad to circulate them. Thank you for your continuing efforts for the benefit of all peoples.

Very sincerely,  
 RUTH B. CAMERON.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.,  
 June 21, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would appreciate receiving your speeches concerning the Vietnam war as well as on other vital topics. Your recent remarks on our participation in the southeast Asia hostilities are most welcome. Please continue your courageous struggle.

Yours sincerely,  
 VICTOR H. MARTELL.

CHAGRIN FALLS, OHIO,  
 July 2, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: I heartily applaud your opposition to our Government's aggressive policy in Asia as reported by Norman Thomas in yesterday's New York Times. However, like him I did not have the pleasure of seeing your documented comments reported in it or any other newspaper; and wonder, accordingly, if you would favor me with a copy or summary of your remarks.

I have the honor to remain,  
 Yours very truly,

JOHN SAYRE MARTIN.  
 LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,  
 June 30, 1964.

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

SENATOR MORSE: We read an article in the Los Angeles Times which quoted you as saying that the present course in Asia is leading toward a major war. I am greatly concerned about a war of any kind.

I am very interested in your opinion on this matter and the course you suggest in order that we may exert what little pressure we have on the Senate.

ALLYN E. MORRIS.  
 WHITTIER, CALIF.,  
 July 1, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to express my complete support for your position on Vietnam and to further tell you of my admiration for the brave stand you have taken. It takes much courage to speak out and it is people like yourself throughout our American history who have in the long run been the true heroes, who have molded the ideals that many Americans still believe in. I am enclosing a copy of a letter expressing my protest against our role in Vietnam which I have sent to two newspapers.

Sincerely,  
 Mrs. JUNE S. RIAVE.

P.S.—I do hope that you will come to Los Angeles to speak on Vietnam—the American people must learn the truth. Would appreciate your sending me copies of the comments

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—containing your speeches on Vietnam. Thank you.

LOS ANGELES TIMES,  
 LETTERS TO THE EDITOR,  
 Los Angeles, Calif.

The U.S. Government would have the American people believe we are fighting for "freedom" in South Vietnam, when actually we are intervening in a civil war. I agree with Senator WAYNE MORSE that the United States has violated the U.N. Charter, making us an outlaw Nation. Are we fighting for American freedom 10,000 miles from home? Are we protecting the people of South Vietnam by consistently supporting a succession of corrupt, repressive, dictator regimes that have never had the support of the people? Reliable sources tell us that the Saigon government has the allegiance of no more than 30 percent of the people. We are not being told the truth about Vietnam. By labeling the Vietcong Communist we overlook the fact that the Vietcong, or properly called the National Liberation Front, is a coalition of many groups, peasants, certain Buddhist sects, the Cambodian minority and ethnic tribes, students, intellectuals, several political parties including the Communists. The NLF has the support of 70 percent of the Vietnamese people. The \$10 million that General Khanh boasts about came out of our pockets. We continue this immorality by giving Khanh \$1.5 million additional daily to fight a war that even military experts say can't be won. If the United States is a moral Nation, we should be negotiating a peaceful settlement, instead of sending more Americans to be killed, instead of rattling our sabers at China and the whole of southeast Asia, instead of threatening to carry the war into North Vietnam and risking the possibility of a full-fledged nuclear war.

Mrs. JUNE RIAVE.  
 LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,  
 June 29, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,

DEAR SIR: I want to commend you for the stand you have taken upon the action of our Government in southeast Asia.

It is high time that more of us get behind you and some others who are trying to save the people of the world from atomic war.

I understand you had read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some disclosures by the magazine "Aviation Week" in regards to a policy attributed to President Johnson.

Would you be able to send me a copy of that number of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—or better, several if you can.

With many thanks,  
 Very truly yours,

JOHN C. BLAIR.  
 ITHACA, N.Y.,  
 July 1, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In a letter to the New York Times today Norman Thomas refers to a critical statement which you made on the floor of the Senate concerning the administration's policy in southeast Asia. I would be grateful if you would send me a copy of this statement.

Mr. Thomas also indicated that your remarks had received little or no publicity. If this is true, do you have any reason to believe that it reflects a deliberate suppression of criticism by our news media?

Sincerely yours,  
 CHANDLER MORSE.  
 NEWBURGH, N.Y.,  
 July 2, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to congratulate you for your continuing opposition to

the administration's folly in southeast Asia. I agree with you that our present course is heading toward disaster.

However, I find it difficult to follow your statements since the newspapers and radio do not carry your remarks.

Therefore, please send me a copy of your "Bitter and Documented Attack on the Administration's Policy" made in the Senate on June 22, or the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 22 if it includes that speech. Thank you.

Yours very truly,

SAVI CLOUGH.

ORINDA, CALIF.,  
July 1, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am belatedly writing to thank you for your marvelous and courageous statement on a recent television interview.

It is disheartening to witness our country arming and financially supporting corrupt dictatorships all over the earth in the name of combating communism. It is logically safe to assume from what has gone before, that our bloody and expensive struggle against communism will ultimately triumph in a world without a trace of democracy or even of a breathing, living man. What we are doing makes no sense whatsoever.

I especially fully share your indignation over our illegal war in southeast Asia, where, reportedly, 250,000 Vietnamese have already died since 1954 as a result of our highly efficient techniques of mass murder in a country without modern means of defense or offense except as they capture these from our forces. Here too, it is evident, in the unlikely event that we win the war for "democracy" there will be few natives left alive, outside the well-protected members of the puppet government, to practice it.

To me you represent the best traditions of American statesmanship and character. I wish you health and long life.

I would very much like to have any copies of your recent speeches or copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in which your statements appear. Inasmuch as the press and radio do not give the same coverage to a viewpoint such as yours as is devoted to the congressional rubberstamps, copies of your statements would be useful for circulation among my acquaintances.

Very sincerely,

BENEDICT B. SOBLER.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY,  
Boston, Mass., July 3, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I was pleased to hear from a colleague that you have expressed concern over the growing crisis in South Vietnam and Laos.

Unfortunately, I have not heard your statements reported on radio or television, nor read them in the newspapers. I hope you will continue to speak out, and that you will find a larger audience for your comments.

Should our present policies result in war, the moral responsibility would be ours. Please continue to encourage the President to negotiate for a just peace.

Very best wishes,

ROBERT R. SMITH, Ph. D.,  
Assistant Professor, Communications.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would appreciate your sending me a copy of the speech described in this letter from Norman Thomas. Thank you.

ARTHUR H. KAHN.

ASIAN POLICY ASSAILED—NORMAN THOMAS  
SAYS HOPE LIES ONLY IN NEGOTIATION

To the Editor:

On June 21 you carried an editorial on the situation in southeast Asia which ended: "Military victory is not possible for either side in this struggle, but the danger of a global conflict seems to be advancing with fearful speed."

On the next day in the Senate WAYNE MORSE made a bitter and documented attack on the administration's policy. I didn't see it reported in the Times and he tells me that it seems to be the policy of newspapers, television stations and so forth throughout the country to let the administration lead us to war without reporting important dissent even in the Senate by him and Senator GRUVENING. Administration supporters have not yet bothered to answer them.

Like him, I am one of those who believe that "in the State Department and Pentagon are men who think Red China will never be weaker than she is at the present time, and therefore now is the time to finish her off if she resists a U.S. takeover in southeast Asia."

Even in the name of the most righteous anti-communism, it is madness for us to embark on a course that may lead to world war. The world in general would not think us champions of righteousness but of a neo-imperialism, and even if we could and should crush China in a military sense, we would lose.

We cannot thus organize Asia, much less the world, for democracy. We should be accused of white imperialism pretty much around the world. One shudders at the cost we might have to pay in money and in lives. Even if our present threats delay or hinder action by Communist forces, it is nonsense to think that we can get a settlement in Communist Asia, halfway around the world, and hold it simply by military power. Any hope there is lies in negotiation for neutrality. When will the public begin to speak out?

NORMAN THOMAS,  
New York, June 23, 1964.

CAMP HILL, PA.,  
July 1, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have read in the papers lately that you are in disagreement with our policy concerning South Vietnam. Would you please send me detailed information on how you believe this operation should be conducted? Thank you.

Respectfully,

J. RICHARD GRAY.

MOUNT KISCO, N.Y.,  
July 2, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to join those who have applauded you for the series of forceful speeches you have delivered on Vietnam and the entire southeast Asia problem.

Your position is a rather lonely one, but I think that sometime hence when the balanced history of this period is written, and American policy in Vietnam coolly appraised, you will have an honorable place in it, even as those who went against the tide on such occasions as the Mexican war, now are deemed to have been closer to the truth than their detractors.

Since the New York Times and most other newspapers do not find much space for your addresses, I have not been able to read your argument as fully as I would like and have been dependent on excerpts and summaries.

If you have available any of your major speeches on Vietnam, I would indeed be grateful to receive them.

Very truly yours,

HUGH DEANE.

UNION, N.J.,  
July 2, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Regarding your contention that the southeast Asia problem be turned over to the United Nations, I am in complete agreement.

Would you be kind enough to send me a reprint of your speech regarding this matter. Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

BERNICE FISCHER.  
NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
July 3, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I read in the New York Times of last Wednesday, July 1, on page 34, "Letters to the Times," in Norman Thomas' letter, "Asian Policy Assailed," that you made "a bitter and documented attack on the administration's policy" (namely in southeast Asia).

In view of the fact that I have been to southeast Asia most of last year and spent considerable time traversing the length and breadth of South Vietnam and as I fully concur with the statements you, Sir, made in the past, I would be keenly interested in reading your utterances of June 22, I believe. Would you therefore be so kind as to let me have two transcripts of your remarks in the Senate as I wish to forward one to a friend of mine while keeping the second one.

Thank you in advance for your kindness. With all good wishes.

Yours sincerely,

GEORGE H. CORD,  
Former Foreign Correspondent.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,  
July 2, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your remarks regarding the Vietnam situation. However, the TV item was brief. I understand you made an address in the Senate on this subject. Could you send me a copy of it? Thanks.

Sincerely,

HENRY SHEMIN.

OAKLAND, CALIF.,  
July 1, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: I have heard nothing but the most favorable comments about your televised address of last Sunday.

Since I unfortunately missed hearing it, would it be possible to have a copy sent to me—or two. I'm sure that one will be on loan continuously.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES FRANKLIN.

CONGERS, N.Y.,  
July 1, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In a letter published in this morning's New York Times, Norman Thomas states that on June 22 you made a bitter and documented attack on the administration's policy in Vietnam, and that

this speech was not covered by the newspapers.

I, too, am growing more and more doubtful of the wisdom of our current policies in Asia. I would appreciate it greatly if I could read a copy of your speech. I am also most interested in knowing if administration supporters have bothered to answer the questions posed by you and Senator GRUENING.

You may be sure that, whatever the best policies are of dealing with communism in southeast Asia or elsewhere, I and most of the people I know recognize that there is nothing sacred about the actions of the United States. When our actions seem to cause the deaths of many Americans and Asians, the rise of governments like the Diem regime, and all the other horrible aspects of the Vietnamese situation, they should be even more open to constant reappraisal by all citizens.

Sincerely,

LARRY M. LAWRENCE.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS,  
Champaign, Ill., July 1, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: If available for public distribution, I would very much appreciate a copy of your speech on U.S. policy in southeast Asia, made in the Senate on June 22. I have seen no reports of it in the press and would like to read it for myself.

I have always admired your independent thinking.

Sincerely,

HERBERT I. SCHILLER,  
Research Associate Professor.

NEW YORK LIFE INSURANCE CO.,  
Houston, Tex., June 29, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: You appeared on the "Today" show on June 25, 1964. If possible, I would appreciate your sending me a copy of the comments you made on this program. Best personal regards.

JAMES D. DAVIDSON.

BAR HARBOR, MAINE,  
June 28, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I saw you, I think it was last Friday morning, on the "Today" show, and want to congratulate you on your stand on Vietnam. That we should be there, if at all, only to keep the peace, not to make war, and that we should better be acting through the United Nations, seems to me sensible and just. I was glad to see that Senator CHURCH also favored U.N. action.

I am currently chairman of a local Mount Desert Island Committee for Peace which sees as its role the study and propagation of intelligent means of cooperating peaceably with all peoples. Last winter we decided that we did not know enough about the southeast Asia situation and that we should call in someone who could tell us the facts. We tried to set up a public discussion on Vietnam. I wrote to Senator MANSFIELD, who is a "classmate" and old friend and whom I knew to be something of an expert on that region, for suggestions on speakers. He gave me no specific names, but referred me to the universities of this region. I tried Harvard, Bowdoin, Bates, and the University of Maine without finding anyone. I wrote to Ellsworth Bunker, who is also an old friend and whose experience in India as our Ambassador should have given him insight, but I got no answer—he probably never received my letter. We contacted the Quakers, the Turn Toward Peace groups, and others. We turned up no one whom we

abandoned Vietnam as a subject and settled for South America where I at least have intelligent colleagues. We remain in profound ignorance of what is really going on, and particularly of why we are there. I respect the abilities of Mr. Lodge and Mr. McNamara, but no decent American is going to support wholeheartedly a war entered into by the back door and under the cloak of secrecy.

I shall write to MARGARET CHASE SMITH, from whom I have yet to get a straightforward answer, and to Senator MUSKIE, who is much more forthright, to heed your voice. And I will write to MIKE MANSFIELD and GEORGE AIKEN. I wish that you were 30 years younger, and that I could be working beside you.

Cordially and respectfully yours,  
PHILIP E. WHITE.

HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.,  
June 29, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I read in the newspapers with extreme interest excerpts from your courageous speech concerning our warlike policy in southeast Asia. I have written the President urging him to pursue the course outlined by you. I would very much appreciate receiving a copy of the speech if one is available.

Very truly yours,

STANLEY FLEISHMAN.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,  
June 28, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to add my voice to those who have already expressed serious concern over the deteriorating situation in southeast Asia, where our Government has committed itself to a disastrous policy of unilateral military action and nuclear brinkmanship reminiscent of the era of John Foster Dulles diplomacy. Our commitment to prosecution of the war in South Vietnam, with the imminent possibility of escalation into a nuclear confrontation between East and West, is an unjustifiable violation of the U.N. Charter and the Geneva Agreements of 1954. As you made unmistakably clear this afternoon on television's "Issues and Answers," we cannot enforce peace in southeast Asia, or anywhere else in the world, if we place ourselves above and outside the jurisdiction of international law. To judge from recent developments in South Vietnam, as well as the statements from Washington and our military command in southeast Asia, it appears that we are prepared to risk an all-out nuclear conflict with China in order to have our way in that part of the world. It is preposterous to speak of freedom and independence for the people of South Vietnam and the rest of southeast Asia, when we are conducting a brutal war of annihilation in which the native population are the victims of napalm, crops contaminated by poisonous chemicals, and villages which are strafed and burned to the ground.

At this time, when American public opinion is bewildered due to misinformation and conflicting reports out of Washington and Saigon, it is vitally important that you (and the courageous minority in Congress, such as Senators GRUENING and MANSFIELD) continue to voice loud and clear your criticisms of present U.S. policy in southeast Asia, until such time as the American Government is shamed into taking a course of action which is honorable and realistic. In your speeches to the Senate, and on such occasions as your appearance on "Issues and Answers" today, you have made an important contribution to political realism, and what I hope to be the beginning of intelligent and

open political dialog on our policy in southeast Asia. As in the case of Senator FURBRIGHT's remarkable speech to the Senate on the divergence between myth and reality in foreign policy, I predict your unceasing efforts to arouse the American conscience to the truth about Vietnam, will incur the wrath and indignation of those who have reason to be embarrassed and ashamed for something which is indefensible. In closing, I wish to convey my thanks and admiration for your courage and principles.

Respectfully yours,

BART SMITH.

P.S.—If it is possible, could I trouble you with a request for several copies of the transcript to your views expressed on "Issues and Answers." I would like to send one copy to my father, Richard D. Smith, a great admirer of yours who now lives in Europe. He remembers you from our Oregon days in mid and late forties, when it was his privilege on one occasion to meet and speak to you at the fair. Since then he has followed your career in the Senate with keen interest and pride, and on several occasions (so he has told me) he has communicated with you by letter from Europe. (He has lived in Europe with my mother for the past 11 years, where he works as a safety director. Currently he is the safety director of SETAF, whose headquarters is in Verona, Italy.)

CLEARWATER, FLA.,  
June 30, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I was appalled the other day to learn over NBC-TV (Ray Sherer) that you had labeled the President as a "warmonger."

Perhaps this is just another Sherer inaccuracy or worse still, an outright distortion. I would hope so as such a statement can only do irreparable harm to our cause in Florida where we are seriously being challenged by the Republicans come next November. I do hope that you can disavow this opprobrium and will appreciate learning your more temperate views in due course. Perhaps the most incredible part of all this is Senator CHURCH's failure to defend or dilute the assertion by Sherer.

Cordially,

H. B. QUALY.

OMAHA, NEBR.,  
June 29, 1964.

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

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am enclosing a copy of the letter I am sending to NBC. It explains itself. I just thought you might be interested to know how some of the public reacted.

Very truly yours,

C. F. BANTIN.

OMAHA, NEBR.,  
June 29, 1964.

Re interview of Mr. Ray Sherer with Senator MORSE of Oregon.

NATIONAL BROADCASTING Co.,  
New York, N.Y.

GENTLEMEN: We heard the interview Mr. Sherer had with Senator MORSE on the "Today" show June 25. On the "Today" show of the following morning we were dumbfounded to hear Mr. Sherer say that Senator MORSE had called the President of the United States a warmonger. This is a very serious accusation to make against a Senator and it could do irreparable damage to a public career if accepted as true by an unsuspecting public. We knew it was entirely untrue.

We have long been aware that Mr. Sherer is one of the reporters or commentators who slants his interviews by using questions that are loaded or slanted, or by sneering in-

lections of the voice which change the question into a disparaging comment. We concluded, rightly I think, that this was a tactic to put Senator Morse in a very bad light and discredit his views with which, no doubt, Mr. Sherer disagreed.

This morning Mr. Sherer read a letter from Senator Morse and stated that the Senator had not called President Johnson a warmonger. I could detect no sincere feeling of regret or apology on Mr. Sherer's part.

I can see but two possible explanations of this incident. The first is that Mr. Sherer was completely unaware that he had distorted and misquoted what the Senator had said. If this is true he is incompetent and should not have the responsible of reporting to a nationwide audience.

The second possibility is that Mr. Sherer deliberately and knowingly altered the news, in which case complete dishonesty would be involved.

Neither explanation combined with the weak correction given today—I cannot call it an apology—can excuse such reprehensible tactics to chop down someone Mr. Sherer disagrees with. The incident has the appearance of inexcusable arrogance.

I can assure you that from now on a number of us will question the veracity of Mr. Sherer's statements except for news items which we can corroborate from other reporters on other networks.

I have no connection with Senator MORSE. I do not particularly agree with him, and I know he does not need me to defend him. However, this flagrant violation of honesty in reporting could involve and reflect unfavorably on any Senator, Representative, or private citizen.

I hope this incident will anger enough people in the country that future episodes of the nature here demonstrated will be detected by the public for what they are and be properly resented as foul play.

Very sincerely,

C. F. BANTIN.

HADDAM, CONN.,  
July 1, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It was my good luck to hear most of your discussion Sunday on TV program "Court of Reason" on channel 2 from Boston.

I want to congratulate you on your sensible and realistic position on the Vietnam situation. I cannot understand that "we" as a peace-loving nation have any business in southeast Asia or are some of our military men and others not so peace loving? If there is a problem there it should be handled through the United Nations.

As I did not get to hear the entire discussion on "Court of Reason" is it possible to get a few copies of the discussion? I have some friends that I would like to have read it.

Also, Senator MORSE, your recent remarks in the Senate on this same subject which were printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I would like to have some copies if they are available.

Keep up the fight.

Respectfully yours,

ERNEST F. MCNUTT.

PROVIDENCE, R.I.,  
July 1, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As one who is deeply concerned with our increasing involvement in South Vietnam I would like to thank you for your wise and courageous counsel and in particular for voting against the confirmation of General Taylor as Ambassador to that troubled part of the world.

I have two requests to make of you. I would very much appreciate receiving copies of your recent statements on South Vietnam. In addition I would appreciate any suggestions you may have for increasing the visibility of anti-interventionist sentiment. Both Norman Thomas and I. F. Stone have pointed out the distressing fact that our "free press" seems determined to ignore your statements on Vietnam, reporting them seldom if ever. If the counsel of U.S. Senators is systematically suppressed how can the views of those, like myself, who support your position, be made visible?

Sincerely,

ROBERT SEKULER.

HAWTHORNE, CALIF.,  
June 28, 1964.

Senator MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: Heard your interview on the radio today and I certainly agree with your point of view 100 percent. Wish I could get a copy of your interview, also is there anything I can do as an individual to help your cause and viewpoint as far as the public is concerned.

I had a foster son caught in the Chinese trap in North Korea and to say the least am real unhappy with that type of a situation.

Sincerely,

HARRY B. FAY.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,  
June 24, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Last night, on TV, I saw and heard both you and Senator ARKEN express displeasure at the appointment of General Taylor as Ambassador to South Vietnam.

Though I am not one of your constituents, I take the liberty of writing to you because you represent my point of view in this matter—and to you rather than Senator ARKEN because I met you once when you were visiting here in my community of Highland Park a few years ago.

It seems to me that the appointment of General Taylor infers a hardening of our pursuit of a military solution for the problems of southeast Asia—and further limits our freedom to choose some other method which could more nearly serve our true national interests in this area.

I understand that you have made some comments on this general subject on the Senate floor and would appreciate a copy of your remarks.

Thanks again for representing my point of view.

Sincerely,

ANNE BRINCH.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR  
THE UNITED NATIONS,  
June 16, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: The Milwaukee chapter of the American Association for the United Nations is much concerned about U.S. involvement in Vietnam. It is our opinion that the United Nations organization should assume responsibility for peacekeeping activities in Indo-China.

We respectfully request that you use your good office to that end.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN O. RIEDL,  
Chairman, Milwaukee Chapter.

PACIFIC PALISADES, CALIF.,  
June 15, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: In view of the actions we have taken in Vietnam and Laos, it is most im-

portant that the American people get your point of view on the situation. Most of our TV and radio programs are showing only one side of the story—the present policy.

Your interview on "Face the Nation" was most informative and I feel that you should use your office to obtain time on other major broadcasts to tell the American people the true story of the Vietnam war.

Respectfully yours,

LEAH ROSENBERG.

HARBOR CITY, CALIF.,  
June 16, 1964.

Senator MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to commend you for your stand about this stupid war that we are engaged in in Vietnam. I can never figure out why after the French were driven out of there why our Defense Department went there to get a lot of Americans killed in a futile war over a country that don't belong to us. Johnson, Stevenson, Rusk and McNamara keep uttering words about the new regime and its merits, and it is not getting anywhere. The State Department encouraged murder there, one of the ignoblest acts ever staged by statesmen. Tell them again to get our boys out of there.

Sincerely yours,

J. E. MCKENZIE.

SANTA MONICA, CALIF.

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

DEAR SIR: We feel that the program presented on "Face the Nation" (CBS) be repeated again and again. All stations should show it, because of its timely importance.

Yours truly,

MRS. L. GOODMAN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,  
June 15, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: In view of the many TV programs urging our total commitment in Vietnam, I urge you to make your voice heard on other stations, such as the program on "Face the Nation" as of several weeks ago.

Sincerely yours,

NORA SCHACK.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,  
June 16, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Thanks for your fight to get this country out of southeast Asia where it had no business being in violation of the final declaration of the Geneva Conference to which the United States was supposed to be in accord.

The United States insists it is a Christian, law-abiding nation but after reading of our atrocities in Laos and South Vietnam I would like to know upon what we base that claim.

Insist upon that war being taken to the United Nations, where it belongs, and where this Government is preventing it from being settled.

Thanks again for your efforts, however futile, since I fear you are up against great odds.

Very sincerely,

MRS. ANNE E. O'CONNOR.

SANTA MONICA, CALIF.,  
June 15, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your interview on "Face the Nation," May 31, 1964, on CBS television was so important that we urge you to speak on all the networks. Yours is the only important voice counteracting the

July 9

many programs which call for extending the war in Vietnam.

Sincerely yours,  
LEAHN and DARALEE HALPRIN.

SANTA MONICA, CALIF.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In regards to your recent CBS "Face the Nation" interview, what can we the agreeable public do to get repeats of your talk. Being so vital a public service it should be repeated on as many other stations as possible. Having written to other major stations, what else can I as one do. Of course I'll advise others of my like hundred friends to request your repeat program. (Many already have.)

Keep up speaking out when and where you can. More agree with you than you know—only not many are writers.

Sincerely,

MRS. IRENE TAX.

FAIRFIELD, CONN.,  
July 3, 1964.

HON. THOMAS J. DODD,  
Senate House Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DODD: You and your conferees should do something right soon about getting this situation under control and our people pulled out of that rat trap.

Once the general public wakes up to the fact this Vietnam-Laos fiasco is another Korea in the making—which is exactly what it is—no LBJ and some few Members of the present Congress might well find themselves looking for other work come November 3.

The great altruists, who never get into combat, say we can't back out of Vietnam because we will lose "face."

Well, the French pulled out after committing some 400,000 men over a period of years, and is Mr. DeGaulle's face red? Hardly. He is laughing at us.

After all, what is this word "face"? Is it not a gentle metaphor for "raw power"—or the lack of same?

President Johnson tells us there is no country on this globe we could not completely annihilate 6 or 80 times over in a matter of hours—and they all know it.

So I do not think we need be too much concerned about our "face."

But the Congress had better get desperately concerned about committing the lives of our children and our grandchildren—and at once.

If this situation has not been cleared before November there is likely to be such a flood of protest votes against all now in office—excepting those who stand with Senator Morse—as could quite possibly swing the election.

Don't forget, Senator, the women now vote and every mother in this benighted country is violently opposed to any more Koreas.

With them this matter carries an infinitely greater priority than all the sound, fury, and blather the integrationists can stir up. My wife has told me.

You have built up some little prestige in Washington, Senator, and deservedly so.

There will never come a better time for you to exert it.

Most sincerely,

HORACE D. STRONG.

ADA, OKLA.,  
July 1, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: We heard you answer the issues on "Issues and Answers," June 28, 1964. I'm sure more Oklahomans than our family would like for our allies to join us in our problems in Vietnam. And help keep our plans of the United Nations agreement we made after World War I. Full support would sure be ideal; also, more help in Washington.

Thanks for trying.

JIMMIE JO TAYLOR.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,  
July 2, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This letter is to express my deep appreciation of your criticism of our present policy in South Vietnam. I was shocked when I saw the headlines in the paper saying that the President was considering the risk of all-out war in South Vietnam "in the interests of peace." I considered the statement wholly irresponsible and extremely dangerous. But I felt completely frustrated because I could not see anything that I could do to stera this drift toward war with China, except to write a letter to the President, which I have done.

Your statement gave me a ray of hope that sanity would prevail. I live in a university town and I can say that none of my friends favor the policies we are now following. I feel certain that the majority of the people of the United States are with you.

I also want to express my appreciation of your support of the public ownership of the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest extra high-voltage interstate and of your support of the acreage limitation provision of the Reclamation Act.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER E. PACKARD.

MILL VALLEY, CALIF.,  
June 29, 1964.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Last night I heard you being interviewed on radio by two ABC newsmen.

I can't tell you how heartened and inspired I was by your stand concerning our policy in Vietnam. I know that you are very busy with your work in the Senate, but I feel that if you could perhaps make your views more available to more people; to talk on television, to somehow reach the people, and let everyone know that there is another road to settle the Vietnam situation, namely through the U.N. and not by the way Mr. McNamara and, unfortunately, President Johnson are doing by involving us deeper and deeper in this war.

Bravo to you. I wish there were more like you in Washington.

Sincerely,

PHILIP FATH.

MONTEREY PARK, CALIF.,  
June 30, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to add my voice to yours in support of your sober and enlightening judgment of our policies in southeast Asia.

I wish it were possible for me to assist you in the herculean task of awakening the American people to the dangers inherent in our position. Even on page 6 of the Los Angeles Times your words convey the basic truth—might creates blight.

I wish you good health and a long life, sir.

Sincerely yours,

ISAAC B. SALTERS.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,  
July 2, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE: May I add my little mite?

I appreciate very much your peace efforts. A statement such as L.B.J.'s to the people at Minnesota (I believe) a few days ago hardly fits in with this age of potential mass destruction.

I believe the booby hatch (insane asylum) is the proper place for people who are war brainstorming.

May your and the Alaskan Senator's efforts increase in ratio to the rolling snowball's proportions.

The booby hatch should also include the reactionary Senator GOLDWATER.

Best,

FRANK CHOHA.

LEXINGTON, KY.,  
June 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You are so wonderful this morning on the Today show—you are so right and our country is like a mother or father who neglects their children to take off to the more ego rewarding business to let their own family go hungry—uncared for while they do a lot of work for the poor—very rewarding in publicity, etc. I would so love to have a copy of what you said this morning on the Today show. I have no children so that angle is not a worry but if we don't work under the law as a government—why and how can they expect their citizens to do so. If we belong and support the U.N. why don't we use it?

DOROTHY SCHIMPERING.

NORTH NEWTON, KANS.,  
July 1, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I heard you on TV last week, also read about your work in "The Progressive." I agree with you and hope you will continue in your effort.

I have not read anything about your efforts in the Senate in our daily papers but headlines like the one above are not hard to find. These are the kind I do not like.

More power to you.

Sincerely,

SAM REGIER.

WALLA WALLA, WASH.,  
June 28, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: I have just listened to your questions and answers on the ABC television about the United Nations Charter as it applies to this country.

I am in complete accord with your views and the sooner our Nation gets back to law and order the better it will be for us.

I only wish there was some way we individuals could aid you in your wonderful defense of our great national heritage.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH TAGGART.

OAKLAND, CALIF.,  
June 29, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Although I am not a constituent of yours, I wish to thank you for expressing your views on South Vietnam. I agree with you wholeheartedly, word for word. If I were a citizen of Oregon I'd work day and night to keep you in office. We need men like you.

You are one of the real statesmen we have in Congress today. Most of them are political hacks.

Good luck to you.

Mrs. FRED A. HANSEN.

GREAT BEND, KANS.,  
July 2, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We heard your interview on the "Today" show, last week, and want to commend you for your stand on Vietnam. As Korea and every place else on the globe, we are sending our boys to be slaughtered.

We have no business in Vietnam, Laos, etc. Our CIA goes in and stirs up a civil war and we throw up with our boys and more money.

If you want to do our country a big favor, why don't you go on TV some evening and tell what you told that morning and all the rest you know, when you have more air time and you can enlighten more people as to what really is going on there. I also think



a lot of it is to help the Catholics—Kennedy was the one who sent in the first Americans, who divided Vietnam into North and South. Why isn't Johnson impeached? Where does the Constitution give him the power to involve us in war, thousands of miles from here and on people who have done nothing to us? Let these people take their quarrels to the U.N.

We never suggest countries take their troubles to the U.N. Our smart—they think—men in Washington send our boys all over the world where we have no business. Any two-bit ruler can ask for our troops and money and we send them. Why? They say, "We will keep our commitments." Just what darn fool gave all those promises? Isn't it about time for whoever did it to lose face, instead of us, our boys?

It's time we had a President and Congress who are for America. England stopped her draft in 1957. They use us like we still were her slaves.

Get our boys and money home. More power to you. Tell us more.

Yours respectfully,

Mrs. N. CAMPBELL.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX.,  
June 30, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: I am enclosing a clipping from yesterday's newspaper—and I beg of you to give this article some notice and publicity in the Congress.

I have a son engaged in the fighting in Vietnam and a husband who will surely be going soon if this war continues. There are many, many more wives and mothers like myself who are vitally concerned over the lack of any apparent concern in Washington over this situation.

Unless Congress becomes concerned enough to force the present administration into doing something about Vietnam there may not only not be a Democratic administration after November, but a great many Members of Congress may find themselves without jobs before too much longer. The American public is finally becoming aroused over Vietnam and will demand that some steps be taken to end this war—one way or another.

We are fully aware that Congress does not make foreign policy, but on the other hand our representatives should be the conscience of this country—and many of them seem to have forgotten that they even have a conscience in this election year.

Again, I respectfully request you take some action to bring this to the attention of your fellow Members of Congress.

Sincerely,

Mr. ROBERT L. GOLTZ.

HENRY J. TAYLOR WRITES

"I think the military situation is coming along fine now," Gen. Paul D. Harkins stated June 22 on his return to Washington from command in South Vietnam. This was apostasy, tragic to observe.

Fine. That's Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara's line. And it's utterly heart-breaking to see a distinguished officer peddling that kind of pap under McNamara's censoring eye. God help us. This is what happened to the prewar armed forces in France.

Any of about 16,000 Americans in South Vietnam could tell you how fine the situation is. Our entire position is just a long, drawn-out Bay of Pigs all over again.

In another sense—an even more basic sense—the truth about a war is known only to a soldier under the gun, there or anywhere, ever.

It's easy to confuse morale with a desire to fight. I've never known one soldier in a thousand who wants to fight. Most fight for

a dozen other reasons combined; but oh, no, not that one. Along with hunger, fear is a universal emotion. It has nothing to do with bravery. Anybody with any sense is afraid. Fine? Nothing's fine when you're getting shot at.

NOTHING'S FINE IN COMBAT

Nothing's fine when you start to count the missing and the dead, and you do not know how it could happen that one of them is not you.

Nothing's fine when the road blows up and your eyes go blind because something smashed them closed. You're afraid to open them, because you may not be able to see. Or it's pitch dark anyway and your face—do you still have a face?—is flat down in the mud.

Nothing's fine when you hear a sharp, hard ping—a single shot—and you feel the man next to you in a jeep or helicopter suddenly strain his body against yours. A moment ago he was your friend. Now he is dead.

He is lost, to everyone who loved him, and to the world. He will never see morning again, write a letter, or sing a song. He has no hope and any hope of this world in him is gone forever.

It's easy to discuss the problem of war—in South Vietnam, Laos, anywhere. But this is different and it is the essence of war. One man. Men in their prime, dying one by one.

WHAT IKE TOLD ERNIE PYLE

General Eisenhower once said in a letter to Ernie Pyle: "I get so eternally tired of the general lack of understanding of what the frontline soldier endures—the acceptance of unendurable conditions—that I become completely inarticulate." Or listen to Ernie Pyle himself.

We were in Italy. An infantry column was coming out of battle. All ranks were 50 feet apart, for dispersal. So were Ernie and I. The wounded were lying with the dead because the Germans had shot our litter bearers when they stood up and walked over to get them. That night this is what Ernie wrote:

"The line moves on but it never ends. All afternoon men kept coming around the hill and vanishing eventually over the horizon. There is agony in your heart \* \* \*. The sag of their bodies speaks their in human exhaustion \* \* \*. They're just guys from Brooklyn and Main Street, but you wouldn't remember them if you saw them \* \* \*. Their world can never be known to you."

Each day in South Vietnam armed Americans die quietly, tragically, unknowingly, obediently.

THE U.S. DEFEATED AGAIN

Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, who personally takes over in South Vietnam now, recently admitted to the Armed Forces Subcommittee that we control nothing there. "We command nothing," he agreed. Fine? As at the Bay of Pigs and the giveaway at Laos, the United States is defeated again. But not a holsy debacle, mind you, nothing noisily noticeable. General Taylor's task is to see that the collapse stops short of that.

On June 24 able Washington insider James Reston wrote in the New York Times: "This administration is not prepared to accept any spectacular defeat in South Vietnam, particularly in an election year."

In short, Americans are just to die quietly, tragically, unknowingly, obediently—while nobody rocks the political boat until November.

Isn't there anything—anything, anything, anything—that can bring conscience into politics?

WALNUT CREEK, CALIF.,

June 29, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing this letter in response to the comments you made about our unilateral actions in South Viet-

nam which I heard on a recent ABC radio program. No doubt you will receive very few letters applauding your stand. This is one of them.

I am very encouraged about the fate of mankind when I hear a Senator make the appeals to reasons that you did. A world of law is our announced goal, and we should live up to our professed beliefs.

You have my complete support in your efforts to return the United States to the community of civilized nations, and make the world truly safe for humanity.

Thank you,

DALIEL LEITE.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
July 2, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to strongly commend and congratulate you on the responsible attitude you took with regard to the South Vietnam problem. I fully sympathize with your position and urge you not to give up your efforts for a reasonable solution ending the war in that unfortunate area, and consequently, U.S. participation in it, as fast as possible.

Considering the desperate situation in South Vietnam and the danger of the United States getting involved in a major war as a result of previous irresponsible policies, I wish that more of your colleagues would start following your example.

Sincerely,

INGERORG D. KILKER.

FONTHILL, ONT.,  
June 28, 1964.

Senator W. MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Having just listened to your broadcast on "Questions and Answers," I felt that I would like to express my thanks for renewing the faith we have had in the officials of the U.S. Government. I'm sure this personal feeling of mine applies personally to many of my fellow Canadians. In recent years sometimes there has been a small doubt creeping in as to whether anyone in power could ever possibly admit any mistakes in their policies but having heard you speaking so outwardly and sincerely on the television show I have mentioned, once again we have every faith in your powerful Nation.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs. M. COLEMAN.

THE THACHER SCHOOL,  
Ojai, Calif., July 1, 1964.

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

Sir: I admire your courage in speaking so eloquently in support of your convictions. I heard you on the "Today" show, and have since read your speeches in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. As a teacher I support your determination to call to the attention of the American people the grave dangers we face in southeast Asia today.

But if this is the Democratic administration's policy, how can one voice his opposition at the polls come November?

Sincerely,

M. H. SHAGAM.

SAN ANSELMO, CALIF.,  
June 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Our thanks to you for such a fine statement on American policy in Vietnam that we heard on the NBC "Today" show.

Your arguments were given with the same kind of political fervor that ordinarily can only be heard on the far right. We were glad to hear a Member of the Senate apply this same spirit in the cause of the integrity of the United States and in the cause of peace.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. JULIE MATHEW.

July 9

VAN NUYS, CALIF.,  
July 2, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been following your remarks on the southeast Asia question during the past 10 days. You have the leadership on the statesman's approach to the whole question.

As I just wrote to Senator GRUENING, Red China is a problem but it will be better solved in debate, face to face—not only with mainland China but face to face with the whole world. We must "solve" the problem with clean hands. The day of 1898 must not be repeated in another area of the world.

I see some (like the Lice people in Fortune) are thinking of dividing China between Russia and the United States—Russia to have hegemony over northern and the United States to have hegemony over the southern area under, I presume, Chiang Ching-kuo. This is the same old cul-de-sac thinking and action.

I wish you were heading a third party to light a fire under both the old ones.

Respectfully,  
DONALD R. PRISMON,  
Associate Professor, American History.

ANAHEIM, CALIF.,  
July 1, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

SENATOR: Regarding your stand on South Vietnam and Laos, a man who can keep his head while all those around him are losing theirs, is a man.

It may be you are ahead of the times; evolution hasn't caught up with you; sometimes you seem like a man among apes.

I've known for many years that you would be a good man for President; however if you can somehow straighten Johnson out on his foreign policy, etc., it would be the next best thing to being President yourself, and possibly then Johnson might become a great President.

Sincerely,  
DWAYNE AUCHARD.

CHICAGO, ILL.,  
July 3, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have always had a great deal of admiration for your independence of thought and action which fortunately was constructive and liberal, and after seeing and hearing you on the TV program, "Issues and Answers," on June 28, my admiration multiplied, for you faced many issues fairly and squarely and gave answers to questions which many of our political leaders avoid and evade.

May you continue to be given strength and health to continue representing the people of the United States in so fair a manner for many years to come.

Sincerely yours,  
HARMAN REZNICK.

[Reprinted from the Plain Dealer, June 18, 1964]

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE—NEEDED: AN APPROACH TO END THE WAR IN VIETNAM

The United States is a foreign party to a civil war in Vietnam. Fifteen thousand U.S. uniformed personnel have been committed to the battle. Casualties include American soldiers.

Acceleration of the American war effort in South Vietnam invites increased aid by China to the Communist Vietnamese. Stepping up the war effort risks the use by either side of nuclear arms. Nuclear war offers no victory. What is the alternative?

Negotiation is urged by Senator Wayne Morse, Senator Ernest Gruening, Columnist Walter Lippmann, and others. Recognizing it takes both sides to make peace, we urge our Government to initiate a conference of nations to guarantee a neutral Vietnam. We support U.S. efforts to insure enforcement of agreements. The United Nations can assist direct negotiation. Inspection teams must be free to operate wherever needed. They can be backed by frontier patrols.

The best guarantee of enforcement is the mutual advantage of the agreement. The goal is a Vietnam whose independence is guaranteed and respected.

Robert R. Archer, Professor; Raymond S. Beard, Business Counselor; Marguerite S. Bellamy, Housewife; Keith C. Billman, Social Worker; Evelyn A. Blackburn, Insurance Agent; Isabel N. Bliss, Homemaker; William M. Bliss, Engineer; Edith O. Brashares, College Instructor; Edwin A. Brown, Minister; Rima Buckman, Sociologist; Bronson P. Clark, Businessman; Sheldon D. Clark, Lawyer; Lila Cornell, Homemaker; Marie F. Cotton, Homemaker; Wendell P. Cotton, Salesman; Natalie C. Crouter, Housewife; Elfrieda S. Dalber, Secretary; Alan J. Davis, Minister; Hortense M. Davis, Teacher; Jack G. Day, Lawyer; Steven Deutsch, University Faculty; Mort Epstein, Designer; Gall R. Gann, Homemaker; Donald S. Gann, Surgeon; Joel M. Garver, Lawyer; Paul Gitlin, Social Worker; Henry Gluck, Psychologist; William F. Hellmuth, Jr., Professor; Arnold A. Herzog, Lawyer; Fred Husa, Office Worker; Sidney D. Josephs, Businessman; Mrs. Harry Kirtz, Homemaker; Waldo H. Kiever, Consultant; Dennis G. Kubly, Minister; Jerome Landfield, College Professor; Ada N. Leffingwell, Homemaker; George Levinger, Educator; John P. Marhevka, Male Hair Stylist; Mrs. Edward A. Marshall, Homemaker; Charles R. Miller, Lawyer; Paul I. Miller, Professor; Hans F. Mueller, Retired; Laura Mueller, Homemaker; Sarah B. Nenner, Housewife; James M. Newman, Advertising; Paul Olynk, Professor; Clyde Onyett, Public Relations; William W. Outland, Order Analyst; Samuel Prelwitz, Industrial Research; Harold J. Quigley, Minister; Willard C. Richan, Educator; Eldon P. Roe, Merchant; Marlan Rosenberg, Social Worker; Ralph Rudd, Lawyer; Audrey Sabadosh, Librarian; Nicholas Sabadosh, Teacher; Wilmer L. Satterthwaite, Painter; Vera A. Schwartz, Legal Secretary; A. L. Sherwin, Lawyer; Frank Spigel, Lawyer; Benjamin Spock, Physician; Sam Sponseller, Retired; Vera Smisek, Teacher; Oscar H. Steiner, Businessman; Helen Stewart, High School Counselor; Edward A. Taubert, Photographer; Warren E. Thompson, Educator; Hugh Tyson, Graduate Student; Harry O. Way, Bacteriologist.

BEDFORD, OHIO,  
June 2, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Enclosed is reprint of three-quarter page advertisement-statement which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer the day the U.S. State Department had a foreign policy briefing session here.

It made a stir, as you will note from the report to the ad sponsors, also enclosed.

From Mr. Sullivan and Secretary Dean Rusk I gather it is U.S. policy to continue fighting until South Vietnam is established by defeating the guerilla forces, then offer to negotiate on the premise there is to be a separate South Vietnam.

Since Ho Chi-Minh has been fighting for 18 years or more for a united Vietnam there is an obvious deadlock. I see no justification for continuing a war, with resulting loss of American and Vietnamese life, which would have ended years ago but for American intervention.

The support of the ad sponsors of yourself is self-evident. We hope in some small measure to show Americans that our policy should be negotiation now on the ground rules for determination of the political future of Vietnam—not what it must be.

Sincerely,  
SHELDON D. CLARK.

REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA,  
June 29, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: I have just listened to an interview with you by the press over Voice of America—Philippines United States Armed Forces Radio.

I wanted to write and express my complete agreement with you and to urge you to extend every influence possible to influence the American foreign policy in Vietnam along the peace-oriented lines drawn out in this interview.

I say this as a registered Democrat and normally supporter of Johnson.

Respectfully,  
REV. PAUL PEDERSEN.

CHICAGO, ILL.,  
July 2, 1964.

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

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It was my good fortune to have heard your speech on TV on the "Today" show. It was a magnificent speech. I wish that every adult American could have heard it.

This is being dictated immediately after I heard your speech. It will not get typed for several days, owing to circumstances that I am unable to change, but the sentiments will not change in the meantime.

With very best wishes, I am  
Sincerely and very respectfully yours,  
JAMES H. HUTTON, M.D.

BOSTON, MASS.,  
June 27, 1964.

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

DEAR MR. MORSE: Each day people are being killed in Vietnam, and when people are killed there should be a very compelling justification for it. I can see none in this case. It is obvious where the sympathies of the Vietnamese people lie. They are not interested in dying for an oligarchy possibly created and certainly maintained by an alien power. The right of a people to self-determination is meaningless if we feel free to abrogate it whenever they disagree with our idea of what is best for them.

The United States places a high value on liberty and life at home. It is ironic that we should be so callous abroad. We should admit our mistakes instead of compounding them, and attempt to negotiate toward a neutral Vietnamese Government that enjoys the support and reflects the will of its people. A powerful nation saving face is not worth the life of a single human being. The spectacle would be ridiculous if it were not also cruel.

If, as I suspect, the President is indeed postponing a decision on this until after the election—thus allowing the slaughter to continue at its present pace—I would find it difficult to vote for one so calculatingly cold-blooded.

Sincerely yours,  
MARCIA ANGELL ROTT.

DETROIT, MICH.,  
June 29, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am sending this letter to you to offer my sincere thanks for your courageous and forthright television presentation of the Vietnam issue yesterday afternoon. Our war in Vietnam is an example of how tragically blind and inept American statesmanship which in recent years has brought us to this pass, has been. The French were bold enough to pull out of this deadly quagmire, only for us with more remote interests to step in.

You have done a public service to spotlight our disregard of SEATO commitments and our bypassing of U.N. in this dread emergency. Your appeal for honesty and legality in dealing with this problem, and your castigation of hypocritical and misleading doubletalk with reference thereto, offer us the best that has yet happened.

Again I thank you for your leadership in coming to grips with this situation.

Sincerely yours,

SAMUEL M. LEVIN,  
Professor Emeritus of Economics,  
Wayne State University.

TUCSON, ARIZ.,  
June 29, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: It is gratifying to learn of your recent pronouncements regarding the U.S. involvement in southeast Asia. All of the controversy on this issue that is allowed to appear in the press centers over whether we should step up the war or simply continue it at its present pace, and it is indeed rare to hear expressed the view that we have no business there altogether—a view which, we believe, has considerable support among a large segment of the American people, but which up till recently, has lacked a spokesman.

There are all too few public figures today willing to speak out on unpopular issues, and we are always thrilled to see you often fighting off the entire Senate—your one-man filibuster against the communications satellite bill, on which your colleagues were for once quite ready to vote for cloture, is a worthy argument in favor of unlimited debate, despite the fact that the procedure is generally used for far less worthy causes.

Keep up the good work. Only with envy and embarrassment can we compare Oregon's delegation in the U.S. Senate with our own.

DR. RONALD JACOBOWITZ,  
Mrs. ADA R. JACOBOWITZ.

BOSTON, MASS.,  
June 29, 1964.

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

DEAR MR. MORSE: I believe we all see things you do and admire you so much for all you have the courage to say. Especially in these days when so much needs to be said and so few have the courage to say them.

Mrs. ALICE HORNEY.

P.S.—I once attended summer school at University of Oregon and taught history of art in California college. I was a friend of Bob La Follette for years and visit Mary in Washington, and I know you were a friend of theirs. I admired Bob so much.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,  
May 18, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: Am so thankful for your fight to withhold troops from Vietnam.

Have written to President Johnson and Senator KUCHEL, of California, urging them to do same.

Yours with gratitude,

PATRICIA WERTHIMER.

WATERVLIET, N.Y.,  
June 29, 1964.

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

SIR: For some time I have been concerned about our foreign policy in the world and especially in southeast Asia. It was a pleasure to hear and see you on television on Sunday, June 29, at 1:30 to 2 on ABC news on the "Issues and Answers" program.

I agree with you in your belief that two wrongs do not make a right and that war solves no problems but creates them, also that the United States ought to pursue a policy of peace and not a brink of war policy. As a professor of philosophy I found your arguments to be both consistent and cogent.

Yours truly,

ALEX HETKO.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,  
June 28, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You are our only great hope today as we are surely inching along toward world war III. Your pronouncement of emphasizing principle as the basis of conduct in the Far East is something that the uninformed and ill-informed alike may understand. How can President Johnson be made to see the light and the danger of his policy? With the recent revelations of the CIA and Pentagon more enlightenment may come. How far are these men going because of their idea prosperity depends upon the vast heavy industry deals? To have such courage as yours expressed comes only by one in a decade, but with your spiritual development, you know that you will be the beneficiary through all eternity, with deep appreciation.

ANNETTE ROBERTS.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,  
June 29, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My husband and I heard you on a KABC program called "Issues and Answers" yesterday afternoon and we don't know when we've heard such a marvelous broadcast. It was thrilling to hear someone tell the truth about our activities in Vietnam. I just want you to know we agree with everything you said and hope there are more people with us.

What can we as citizens do about this? This morning the Times carries President Johnson's speech about being willing to go to war over this situation. Nobody asks the people any more. We're not willing to fight but we seem to have no voice any more.

Perhaps, if you'll keep speaking for us, we may see some sanity.

Sincerely,

JOE and CLARE GLOVER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,  
June 29, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This is to express in strongest terms a protest against continuing and escalating military action on our part in Vietnam and related area; also the replacement of diplomatic representation with military representation.

Instead it is to urge in strongest possible terms that we lead out in seeking solution through multilateral diplomatic action and work toward U.N. collaboration.

Our present napalm orgy is hardly favor-

able to our place in the coming decade of trade. You note that this is written from the Pacific Coast where, in spite of the dust kicked up by the ultraminded, there are those who view with concern the fact the European and Latin American countries are not interested in our fracas, but in building up practical trade relations.

In my own instance, this concern keen though it is, is secondary to my very great revulsion at the spectacle of torture which we inflict on thousands of homes and families in order to support for political reasons decadent potentates who obviously are repudiated by their people. I find it very difficult to reconcile this with the humanity which you proclaim.

Sincerely,

C. V. STURGES.

HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.,  
June 27, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

Senator MORSE: Thank you for answering the issues with the strong voice of reason, this Sunday on ABC.

Let us hope that after election year emotionalism and hysteria, more hearts and minds will become open and convinced.

Do carry on with the same clarity of presentation, honesty, and courage. May your voice of dissent soon become the rule rather than an exception.

We are with you,

YORAM KAHANA.

VANCEBURG, KY.,  
June 27, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

SIR: You are right on our foreign policy. No use to fight communism 5,000 miles away, when we are losing good men for nothing. If the administration must fight communism, which I am in favor of, we could do it 90 miles from home. I am sending you a clipping out of Louisville paper. Please read it, and please cut foreign aid more.

Respectfully yours,

ALLEN G. RAE.

P.S.—If you ever have the chance, ask Mr. Lodge why he really quit his post in Saigon. If you do, be sure and watch his reaction close. Of course, he may be a very good poker player. Do not take your time to answer this.

Thank you.

A.G.R.

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal  
June 28, 1964]

EXPERTS ARE WORRIED: WESTERN EUROPE  
SUFFERING ACUTE ATTACK OF PROSPERITY  
(By Carl Hartman)

BONN, GERMANY.—Western Europe is suffering from an acute attack of prosperity.

People are earning a lot more money than they used to, and they're not having to work so hard to get it. So they're spending it with an abandon that has the experts worried.

Unemployment has just about disappeared except in Italy. Even in Italy there are many places where labor is short, in part because high pay in other countries has drained away skilled hands.

MILLION GO TO GERMANY

Almost a million foreign workers have come to West Germany, and many thousands to Switzerland and France. They come not only from Italy and Spain, but from Turkey and Greece and even a few from Yugoslavia.

In Wolfsburg, home of the Volkswagen, 5,000 young Italian workmen are living three to a room in rows of neat wooden barracks. A good deal of the money they get is sent home—and helps bid up the prices of Italian goods.

In West Germany and France, thousands of good jobs go begging for want of applicants.

The experts call this overemployment and say it results in excess demand. The ordinary European finds such terms hard to understand. To him things look pretty good: Wages high, jobs easy to get, plenty of goods in the shops.

The businessman never had so many customers, with so much money in their pockets.

FARMERS DO LESS WELL

Farmers are doing less well than the rest of the population despite heavy Government subsidies. Wages are so good and farm prospects so relatively bleak that large numbers of farmers have found industrial jobs.

But they are not moving to town fast enough to satisfy the need of factories for labor. That's one reason industrial wages keep going up.

High wages mean high prices—especially in Italy where the law says price increases must bring wage increases as well. The result is that the Italian economy is getting as hot and breathless as a puppy chasing its tail on a summer afternoon in Capri.

It's Italy, the experts say, where inflation is at its worst, although there has also been a wage explosion recently in Holland.

EASY TO UNDERSTAND

From the human viewpoint it's easy to understand. Italy has long been a poor country, with the average workman earning only half as much as his counterpart in France or Britain, and only a fifth what the average American makes. Unemployment is traditionally high and families are large.

Between 1958 and 1963, national income in the European Common Market countries rose by half, and in Italy it increased by nearly two-thirds. A lot of the money went into food, but more and more into TV sets and refrigerators.

In 1960, only 1 Italian in 25 had a car. In 1963 it was 1 in 13.

The result, say economists, is that not enough is being saved for investment in new plant to increase production in years to come. This they find highly dangerous.

ITALY RUNS TRADE DEFICIT

They are worried that the Italians are buying so much goods abroad that they are not able to export enough to pay for them. Recently the United States had to come to the rescue and advanced a billion dollars to help the Italians out of this particular hole.

France and, to a lesser extent, Holland and Belgium have also been hit by this kind of inflation. Up to now, West Germany has been able to avoid it. Wages here have gone up but production has kept in step and prices have held steady.

They have held so steady, in fact, that West German firms are filing their books with French and Italian orders. Such trading is favored by the gradual disappearance of the tariff wall between Common Market countries. The big and growing demand for German goods tends to raise prices at home. Inflation can be catching.

GERMAN RAISES SOUCET

West German labor unions are coming up this fall with some wage demands to meet the price rises. If they get them, stable prices will be seriously threatened in West Germany, too.

The experts say they have a remedy, hard and unspectacular but effective. It's called holding the line, and the West Germans have shown its effectiveness up to now on a national scale. The calculation is that every year roughly 5 percent more goods are produced, so a 5-percent increase in wages and Government spending is also permissible. But no more.

In principle there is agreement on this by the governments of the Common Market

countries: France, Italy, West Germany, Holland, Belgium, and Luxembourg. It's often a long way between principle and practice. Practice in this case might mean strikes and unemployment. It would certainly mean the postponement of badly wanted schools, houses, and roads.

The agreement was made in April. The governments are due to report in July how well they are keeping their promise.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.,  
June 28, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have just listened to your interview on "Issues and Answers." Congratulations.

I wish we had more leaders like you in this United States. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,  
Mrs. M. L. ADAMS.

STEINER, ROUSE & Co.,  
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SENATOR: Please accept my most sincere congratulations on your outspoken views on our foreign policy.

I applaud your courage and your insight. Thanks in behalf of all straight-thinking Americans.

Very sincerely,  
SIDNEY ROSNER.

LITTLE COMPTON, R.I.,  
June 28, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Today I had the pleasure to hear you verify my very thoughts on the Far Eastern situation in which, until I heard you speak, I had felt so much alone. For some time past, I have felt the big brass in the Pentagon has been gradually preparing the public to not feel surprised when we again go to war. I do not mean to imply that this is done with that intention, but because of their way of thinking. And there are many "Goldwaters," and so few have read the "Passion of the Hawks," by Tristram Coffin, Congressional Catalog Card No. 63-1528. I feel you will understand my feelings, when I tell you, in the 74 years I have had time to ponder, brought up seven children, five sons at sea, all during the last war. It will be men of reason like yourself that can guide us through the troubled days ahead.

With best wishes and great respect,  
ROBERT W. GRICE,  
Member, Democratic Town Council.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have read quite a bit about what you have to say about Vietnam, in I. F. Stone's Weekly. I admire your outspoken and farseeing views on this grave situation. I have written the President that I am against his policy and do not intend voting for him, although I am a Democrat, unless he changes. I am very much afraid of the outcome. So, sir, keep on fighting against war; there will only be losses. I also read "Overkill."

Sincerely,  
LETTY SPOCK.

PONTIAC, MICH.

SAN FRANCISCO WOMEN FOR PEACE,  
San Francisco, Calif., June 20, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: We were shocked to read in our newspapers that U.S. jet fighters armed with rockets and bombs have been attacking positions on the Plain des Jars in Laos. This is especially distressing in the face of repeated denials—the most recent last week—that the United States is using jet aircraft for military action in Laos or Vietnam. We

military participation in southeast Asia does not indicate that a repetition of the Bay of Pigs incident is imminent. As at that time, we fear another belated public admission that U.S. policy is being made by the CIA and the secret government, not by the State Department.

We were even more deeply shocked and dismayed to learn that a general has been appointed to the delegate post of Ambassador in this most troubled spot. Again we urge that you take every possible step to end U.S. armed intervention in southeast Asia, beginning with the dismantling of the Danang Air Force Base, and that you use your good offices to bring peace to this area.

Sincerely,  
Mrs. GLORIA FELDMAN,  
Chairman.

(Copies of this letter are being sent also to Senators William Fulbright, Thomas Kuchel, Clair Engle, Congressman Philip Burton, and Secretary of State Dean Rusk, as well as President Lyndon B. Johnson.)

CHICAGO, ILL.,  
June 29, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I think your views on the war in Vietnam are a valuable contribution, and I hope they will have some effect.

Yours truly,  
SAMUEL D. LIPTON, M.D.

DETROIT, MICH.,  
June 28, 1964.

OUR BELOVED SENATOR MORSE: Thank you kindly for your wonderful answers on TV "Today." If only we had more men like you in Washington how different the opinion of the world would be toward our United States of America.

Thank you again. Please keep up the good work.

Very gratefully,  
VALERIA KLEK.

THE UNIVERSAL EXCHANGE,  
Orlando, Fla., June 28, 1964.

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

God bless you, sir. Thank you for the straightforward statements you made to us via television today.

You said that these issues must be taken to the people, and the people must be heard. Will you speak at meetings throughout the Nation to accomplish these purposes?

As you know I have been trying for years to arouse the people to work for universal prosperity and peace.

I cannot attract an audience to public meetings, nor even get space in the newspapers and time on radio and television to announce my meetings.

I am sure your name and your message will draw tremendous audiences.

The friendship room of the First Federal Savings & Loan Association, Orlando, is available to me for Saturday afternoon, July 25, if you will speak.

Thank you,  
JAY CRESWELL, Sr.,  
Trustee.

[From the New Statesman, June 26, 1964]

A CRUEL AND NASTY WAR

How seriously should we take last weekend's threats of American military action to "restore" the situation in southeast Asia? Gen. Maxwell Taylor's appointment to replace Ambassador Lodge will strengthen the military setup in South Vietnam, but gives nothing to the hotheads; and President Johnson went out of his way in announcing the appointment to emphasize that he was not contemplating an extension of the war. On the other hand, the deep, background briefing on which most of the Washington cor-

respondents based their reports of renewed American toughness seems to have originated with Secretary Rusk in person. It is thus clear that the administration means this further final warning to impress outsiders with the threat of interdiction by American bombers. It may still be bluff—directed, perhaps, as much to Messrs. Goldwater and Nixon as to Mao Tse-tung and Ho Chi Minh. Even so, the domestic device of trying to outbid Goldwater's lunacy is self-defeating.

The truth is that American policy in Laos and South Vietnam is now in a disastrous situation. In Laos Communist control extends over four-fifths of the country; in South Vietnam the military situation is on paper a shade less disastrous, but all the evidence suggests that, outside one or two anti-Communist fortresses, most of the suffering population would prefer to settle for the hardships of a regimented peace under the Vietcong than prolong the misery of war and corruption under General Khanh. If this is true, what would be the end of aggressive American air intervention? The bombing of Hanoi and the Vietcong supply lines would greatly increase the prospect of a direct United States-China confrontation—and it would be imprudent to suppose that the Russians could remain indifferent to that. It would also harden non-Communist opinion in the whole of Asia against the United States. Moreover it would almost certainly be ineffectual. The Pathet Lao and the Vietcong are guerrilla fighters and they will go on fighting, hampered but not suppressed by interrupted supply lines, until either the Chinese call them off or the populations of Laos and South Vietnam find an alternative which inspires their resistance. The intervention of American bombers in this situation could do nothing to change it fundamentally, and any effect it had would be at a heavy—even unacceptable—political price.

There are in fact only two serious options open to President Johnson. He can, if this is what he wishes, claim the Indochinese Peninsula as vital to American security and send in troops to conquer it. Such an operation might be successful in the end and at a cost. But it would be a lengthy, difficult campaign and it would have to finish with a long-term American occupation. To almost the whole of world opinion outside the United States, it would seem both senseless and immoral and it would command little or no support from any of America's major allies, including Britain.

Moreover, when the full cost in men and material was understood by the American public, the war weariness which led to the end even of the Korean war would be aggravated by a sense of shame and exasperation at the futility of an operation which failed to distinguish between vital interests—India, for instance, or Berlin—and mere political prestige. If the President is not prepared to recommend this, the alternative remains a settlement by negotiation—a settlement which must include the Chinese and which must in the long run involve the abandonment of 10 years of disastrous American policy. Unpalatable? Certainly. But, as President Kennedy bravely told his people a year ago, not even they can expect an American solution to every world problem—and the alternative (as the French found to their cost) would be worse.

The Johnson administration now faces a test of statesmanship. Clearly negotiation with the Chinese and the North Vietnamese is impracticable before the election. But, short of an all-out war, it must come soon. The President's best course now would be to follow the advice which Secretary McNamara is believed to be offering—to concentrate on defending what is left of Saigon-controlled Vietnam and the line of the Mekong River, meeting Communist attacks with no more

than equivalent force. That situation would be militarily and politically uncomfortable, but, in the short term, not impossible. It is the only course which leaves the door open for serious negotiation later, to end what Walter Lippmann has bluntly called a cruel and nasty war that has no visible end. The alternatives are escalation or humiliation.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,

June 29, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Until I heard you on "Issues and Answers" yesterday I was in complete despair and I cried out to myself, Isn't there one voice to be heard?

Re Taylor as Ambassador to Vietnam: I came to Washington in May to lobby with W.I.L. on Vietnam. We got to important people in State Department. I'll come again if you think it will help.

Mrs. J. MARTIN KLOTSCHE.

[From the Washington Post]

NEUTRAL INDOCHINA STILL A BUFFER—ASIA SCHOLAR ARGUES THAT PEIPING ONLY WANTS A QUIET BORDER

(NOTE.—Two weeks ago in this section, Prof. Wesley R. Fishel, of Michigan State University, wrote that the United States could neither withdraw from former Indochina nor allow it to be neutralized. Our only choice, he argued, was to "stay and fight." Here is a differing opinion on what our policy should be, written by an associate professor of sociology and a staff member of the Institute of War and Peace Studies at Columbia University. Amitai Etzioni is also the author of "Winning Without War," recently published by Doubleday.)

(By Amitai Etzioni)

In the last few weeks, the United States has again escalated the war in southeast Asia by strafing pro-Communist positions in Laos with rockets which hit, among other targets, a Chinese mission.

Like previous escalations, this one did not bring us an inch closer to winning the war; guerrilla wars are never won from the air. Like previous escalations, it involved us more deeply in a war that continually costs more lives and resources. This involvement, in effect, has given Communist China the option to decide if and when to turn this war into a Korean-type confrontation.

If tomorrow, China were to match our thousands of "advisers," our mass supply of modern weapons and our aerial bombardments, we would either have to retreat openly under fire (which is quite inconceivable), engage in a large-scale conventional war (which the Democrats swore never to get entangled in again after Korea) or use nuclear weapons, which would at least push China back into the arms of the Soviet Union and probably instigate a world war.

A DULLES LEGACY

The alternative is not preventive surrender but genuine neutralization. In examining neutralization, we have not yet freed ourselves from the Dulles tradition that sees in neutrality the immoral position of noncommitment in the struggle between the forces of light and darkness as well as an invitation to the Communists to try to fill the resulting vacuum. That neutralization is supported by De Gaulle (and the U.S.S.R.) is viewed by many in the Capital as sufficient evidence in itself that this idea does not warrant careful consideration.

The critical question is not whether the area can be neutralized but whether neutralization can be made to stick and not be a thin cover for an American retreat and a Communist takeover. In principle, neutralization can be made to work only if it is in the interest of all the big powers concerned. It is my central contention that this is the case in southeast Asia now.

The key to our mistrust of a neutralist

solution for southeast Asia is our expectation that it will result in Chinese domination of the region. China is depicted by our propaganda as a major aggressive, expansionist power ready to engulf first the Indochinese peninsula, then Malaysia and Indonesia, and soon all of Asia.

PEIPING OVERRATED

A busy team of learned State Department staff members and consultants provides an endless flood of quotations from Chinese writings and speeches to this effect. But we should learn to distinguish between pronouncements and policy.

In reality, China is neither a major nor an aggressive power, and neutralization of the area would be in line with its present foreign policy. China's bellicose threats seek to cover up a quite cautious foreign policy in order to gain favor in the international Communist movement without incurring the risk of a major war.

China has talked about liberating Taiwan for half a generation but has done nothing about it. China has criticized Khrushchev for retreating from Cuba but itself did not try to move into next door Hong Kong, full of pro-Chinese Communists. It has not launched an attack on Quemoy and Matsu, 3 miles from its mainland shore.

Far from being the aggressive nation we tend to describe, it has improved its relations with Japan, Pakistan, and Ceylon, increased its trade with Britain and Canada and won the recognition of more than 50 countries.

In general, Communist China's policy at this stage seems to be to support weak neutral governments on its borders. Cambodia has been such a weak neutral country for a decade and a half; Burma readily qualifies for the same characterization; Nepal is not exactly a formidable opponent or a Western ally. Yet these countries are as free as Pakistan or Thailand.

Even when India's defenses collapsed, China did not take the risks involved in marching deeper into the country but limited itself to holding a border zone that has been in dispute for years, and over which even Nationalist China recognizes mainland China's claim. Once India was shown to be weak, it was left alone.

None of these neutral countries has been annexed because China itself is weak. Her agriculture is in a mess; her industrialization is floundering; a succession of administrative crises and food shortages have left the country with a low morale; the Chinese Army is poorly equipped; China has found it difficult to obtain gasoline to fly its airplanes since the Soviet Union cut off the supply; it has no nuclear weapons or modern systems of delivery.

For at least the next decade, China will have to focus on building up its industrial base. Whether that goal can be reached in less than 20 years and whether China will be as Stalinist and bellicose after that period as it is now are open questions. For the next 10 years, however, China is to be expected to prefer weak neutral countries on its borders over the risks of a fuller confrontation with the United States as a result of a violation of a neutrality pact.

To be successful, neutralization must be backed by power. We must make clear from the onset that neutralization will win our support only if China and Russia will commit themselves to refrain from armed intervention in the neutralized area, and that any violation of these commitments will bring our return with a vengeance, with whatever force required.

We are now committed to protect the people of the area from external aggression and to assure their right of self-determination; we can fulfill this commitment under neutralization by setting up remote deterrence forces; i.e., by holding forces in a state of

July 9

readiness outside a given territory to deter the intrusion of the other side and if necessary to counter it.

The zone to be neutralized has yet to be determined. Ideally, all of southeast Asia should be included. North Vietnam was a Chinese vassal for hundreds of years, and its leaders still fear and resent Chinese overlordship. Given an opportunity, Ho Chi Minh might well prefer to act like Yugoslavia, at least like Rumania.

But it might be too late for the inclusion of North Vietnam; the younger generation of pro-Chinese leaders might be too deeply entrenched for this plan. Nor is China likely to let go of North Vietnam.

It would be more realistic to neutralize an area where China would be unwilling to accept the risks involved in continued or renewed conflict with the United States: South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos south and west of the 1962 neutralization line (which the pro-Communist forces have not yet crossed).

Such a zone would obviously meet with the approval of France and have the active support of Russia; the U.S.S.R. seeks to contain Chinese influence in Asia.

A neutral zone established in line with the interests of all concerned might still be eroded and a major war triggered if either side, while seeking to adhere to its commitment, felt that the other side had violated the pact. That is what happened with the 1954 and 1961-62 neutralization accords.

Not only were they not backed by power, but an utterly ineffectual international machinery was set up to supervise their implementation. A fair-sized United Nations observer force patrolling the borders of the area would go a long way toward doing that job.

By making violations more visible to world public opinion, they would become less tempting. (No U.N. force could deter a major power intending openly to violate the neutrality pact; that would be the task of the "remote deterrence" forces.) Such a U.N. force would be much more likely to gain Soviet financial support than the peace-keeping activities in the Congo or Gaza Strip.

After a short period of pacification, free elections should be held in the neutralized territories under U.N. supervision. There seems to be no reason why Cambodia would not retain its current government nor why south Laos, shorn of the Communists in the north, would not continue to be governed by the present Vientiane coalition of rightists and neutralists.

The fate of the South Vietnamese Government is less easy to predict. The present Government has practically no popular basis and suffers the onus of being the puppet of a foreign power. At worst, free elections would lead to a nationalistic pro-Communist government.

As long as South Vietnam was prevented by the neutrality pact from joining any military bloc or being annexed by North Vietnam, however, it would still be a buffer state in the way of future Chinese expansion. And there is the possibility that with the return of a saner life in South Vietnam, viable political alternatives to the National Liberation Front would emerge.

This is not a sanguine picture. Surely we would prefer to leave South Vietnam with a democratic government committed to economic development and social progress. But there is no way of establishing such a government; surely our massive economic aid to a government by generals and our escalation of the war have not brought such a government closer.

The alternative in southeast Asia is not between flourishing democracy and communism but between trying neutralization and escalating a war in which no military victory seems possible; which devastates the

pugnant regimes seem necessary and leaves China with the option to involve us in another Korean-type war.

CARLSBAD, N. MEX.  
 June 28, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: Please accept my thanks for the many things you do for all U.S. citizens. I think you are correct about foreign aid, the war in Southeast Asia, preserving our wilderness areas.

A. O. ORDEN.

WESTON, MASS.  
 July 2, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you so much for continuing to speak out boldly, wisely, and courageously against our present Government policy of prolonging our participation in the civil war in South Vietnam. Please keep up your end of the struggle and try to get influential Senators, Representatives, and business leaders to support your views and those of many other decent Americans, who like myself are parents and voters, and who deplore the cruel tactics of torture, napalm bombings, pesticides used against much-needed crops, which equate our actions with those of the Nazis during World War II.

I wish you, and Senators GROENING, BARTLETT, PELL, and AIKEN could help our administration bow out peacefully from this hopeless war—with the help of our allies and the U.N. and turn the southeast Asia problems over to the U.N. and obviously prepare our people to see that China must be admitted to the U.N. too.

Thank you all for helping pass the civil rights bill too. I hope you have a fine Fourth of July weekend.

Very sincerely,

RITA PAINE  
 Mrs. John B. Paine, Jr.

NEW YORK CITY,  
 July 4, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: It is so heartening to hear a sane voice in Government circles as regards our treacherous, suicidal and unmoral position in southeast Asia—but also how sad and frustrating that you have so few allies for your patriotic, just position.

We are beginning to wonder why our Government is so committed to protect freedoms so many thousands of miles from home when they can't seem to manage to protect a few hundred civil rights workers who are down in Mississippi to uphold the Constitution of our land.

Mr. MORSE, your voice must be heard outside the Senate Chamber and committee-room. This country needs you to speak out loud and clear if we are to emerge from these nightmarish times into a real blossoming of our democracy.

Sincerely,

Mrs. H. BEATRICE G. SCHUTZ.

BOSTON, MASS.,  
 July 1, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have just watched you on the television program "Issues and Answers," and I would like to thank you for your sane and courageous position on Laos and Vietnam. As a young person who would like to live long enough to marry and have children (I am presently a student at Harvard College), I have been most concerned by the provocative foreign policy presently advocated by both political parties in this area. I feel, as you do that it is extremely unfortunate that nowadays politicians must prove their opposition to communism by exhibiting a willingness to engage in an all-out war which would be disastrous for all humanity, and I agree that the matter of southeast Asia would best be handled by the

I wonder if you are in accord with Senator FULBRIGHT's suggestion that our Cuba policy also be reassessed. It has always seemed ironic to me that our Government tolerate the many rightwing dictatorships in Latin America and the rest of the world, and yet be so maniacally militant in its policy toward Castro. Granted, the man is a dictator; but isn't he preferable to men like Batista or Somoza or DuValier or that stanch ally of ours, Franco? Perhaps here again our wisest course of action might be to further freedom through economic aid, unilateral reconciliation, and arbitration through the U.N.

Thanking you again (I wish you, and not my cousin LEVERETT, were the senior Senator from Massachusetts), and looking forward to hearing from you, I am,

Sincerely yours,

STEPHEN SALTONSTALL.

SHIFFFIELD, MASS.,  
 July 4, 1964.

HON. EDWARD M. KENNEDY,  
 U.S. Senate,  
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: Concerning the involvement in Vietnam, I hope you will support the position taken by Senators AIKEN, MORSE, PELL, GROENING, and BARTLETT on the matter.

We seem to be in Vietnam for emotional reasons, not for the defense of the United States. Defense of the country seems to me to be the only constitutional reason for ordering our forces into action, unless the action is called for by our United Nations treaties. In the Vietnam matter there has been no U.N. action, and there has been no declaration of war by our Congress. This is another Korea-like trap.

Indeed our security is endangered by our presence in Vietnam. There is no visible military advantage there which we do not have anyway from our naval position.

What we seem to be getting is a progressive military socialization of the American economy in the guise of battling communism in the far reaches of the world. Does this make sense?

Let's settle the Vietnam adventure before war and ruin overtakes us.

Sincerely yours,

WILLARD C. FRENCH.

CIRCUIT COURT OF OREGON,  
 FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT,  
 Portland, Oreg., July 1, 1964.

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

DEAR WAYNE: Just a note to let you know that I was watching the "Today" show on June 24 and was proud of your courage and statesmanship.

We are going to have to do more than give lipservice to establishing the rule of law in our relations with other nations.

I agree with you that this is the greatest contribution which our Nation can make to a world that will find it difficult to survive unless it substitutes the rule of law for the rule of force.

With every good wish, I am,

Cordially yours,

ALFRED T. SULMONETTI.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,  
 July 1, 1964.

THE EDITOR,  
 The Evening Star,  
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I suspect that Columnist Max Freedman's attack tonight on Senator MORSE was caused by his having been attacked for associating with the Senator.

Last week (I think it was Tuesday) one of your editorial writers was flaying Senator MORSE for being "gravely obnoxious" for having said the United States was the leading

threat to world peace. Across the page that night Columnist Freedman was exercised about the Johnson administration's having stumbled into, in southeast Asia, a piece of brinkmanship unsurpassed by John Foster Dulles at his wildest.

This similarity of view must have been brought to Mr. Freedman's attention. He shouldn't turn tail, though. He was quite right in his "brinkmanship" analysis last week.

Senator MORSE is also quite right in advancing "the grave charge," according to Mr. Freedman tonight, "that the American program in Vietnam 'violates one international commitment after another.'" It is not true that "he commands no support for this view," as is also claimed, because he has mine—at minimum least.

I thought last week Mr. Freedman was with the Senator and me.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. DOROTHY MAUND.

GLENDALE, N.Y.

HON. U.S. SENATOR WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: The more I read about your statements in Washington, and before various committees and articles in newspapers, on the U.S. foreign policy, you are becoming by far, my favorite U.S. Senator.

The courage and wisdom you have to say the things you do against great odds.

I, being a veteran of the first World War, only hope that the Almighty will bless you with good health and long life, to keep up your good work. The people of your State should be very proud to have such a U.S. Senator.

Here's hoping, in closing, that the overwhelming majority of the American people will agree with you. And I may live long enough to see it.

Lots of good wishes.

BEN SMITH.

STANFORD, CALIF.,  
July 2, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I agree completely with your attitude toward the Vietnam situation. I think it is the only morally and politically correct thing to do. Withdraw from Vietnam is what the United States should do. We, as you stated, should turn it over to the United Nations, too. Your stand on the entire situation is very encouraging.

Sincerely yours,

NANCY SMITH.

ELGIN, ILL.,  
July 1, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We have seen and heard you on TV and we think you are great. It takes a man of courage to say the things you did.

But we disagree with you on the U.N. It is a Trojan horse and the United States should get out of it.

Respectfully,

DOROTHY and RAY NIEDERT.

SENATOR MORSE: We commend you on your efforts to stop the war in southeast Asia. We agree with you thoroughly.

We would appreciate copies of your speeches on the subject—and the price for multiple copies.

Please inform us of anything we can do to aid you.

Yours truly,

SYBIL MURRAY.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

VAN NUYS, CALIF.,

July 1, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We pray for your continued health and clear thinking so that your voice will continue to be heard, so importantly, in our Senate.

Good wishes. We wish we could vote for you.

Most sincerely,

EVELYN T. MOYER.

LEXINGTON, MASS.,  
July 4, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: I would like to express support and gratitude for your recent warnings on Southeast Asia and hope everyone will pay attention to what you have said about the problem.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ARTHUR J. PENNELL.

TUCSON, ARIZ.,  
July 3, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: It is encouraging to note that you and a few others in Washington are talking sense on the situation in southeast Asia. I and several of my friends hope you will continue your efforts to extricate the United States from a very dirty and frustrating war.

Sincerely yours,

J. C. SPITZER.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,  
July 4, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your remarks in the Senate about Vietnam and objection to a military man, Gen. Maxwell Taylor, as Ambassador made or rather gave me hope. Our President speaks about the risk of war. Does he forget we live in an atomic age.

I saw the President's remarks all over the front pages and no rebuttal. I felt hopeless. What can I do? But with voices like yours (someone showed it to me in an obscure newspaper) I begin to have hopes again. Thank you, Sir, for your courage.

Respectfully,

SYMA KAUFMAN.

CONCORD, MASS.,  
July 2, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your strong stand about the war in Vietnam. Your voice should be heard loud and clear above all the threats of bombings and extension of the war against Red China. This is as you say "immoral and inexcusable." More power to you.

Sincerely,

ALICE LEE.

LAGUNA BEACH, CALIF.,  
June 29, 1964.

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

SIR: I agree with you heartily in your summation as to the involvement abroad into which our country's foreign policy is leading us, vis-a-vis southeast Asia. The foolhardiness of our unilateral intervention there could but bring about a contest of wills between China and ourselves, a test which jeopardizes the whole world. It shapes up almost as though we are engaged

in "Red-baiting," hoping to lure Red China to move as it did finally in Korea (we disbelieved clearly stated warnings then), to the end that Nationalist forces on Formosa may be unleashed to assault the mainland, and all that hardware the military have had around unused for so long, may be thrown at the Chinese—which as you have said, will only beget us the hatred of the Asiatic peoples, if not the world. Would we allow Chinese intervention in Mexico or Central America?

It was bad enough noting in a recent copy of Life magazine, torture shots of Vietcong by their captors, the Vietnamese, wherein we Americans are indirectly implicated. Though the Vietnamese officer administering the "treatment" is quoted as only "doing his duty," I believe that was the defense repeated by German war criminals and for which the German people as a whole were indicted. The hate reflected in the captive's eyes perhaps is indicative of what we can expect when they have license to do the same (not that they are not using methods of terror, but that's their guilt, not ours).

Could it be possible that there are "vested interests" there in South Vietnam of which we have no knowledge, for which our otherwise uncalled for unilateral action was devised to protect? Could it be possible that the loss of King Ranch properties in Cuba is what has whipped up such agitation in relation to that island undergoing social change—while almost complete disregard exists in another dictatorship every bit as ruthless in Haiti where the Murchison brothers apparently have considerable property?

Again and again, the issue of property seems to be what we are called upon to defend as against human rights, i.e., the desperate search of peoples throughout the world to change the existing status quo, and in great many cases to the end that they may have opportunity for a more abundant life, long denied. Just which side are we really on? Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—for whom?

Our pretensions to the "defense of freedom" has a hollow ring in light of the fruitless struggle by some peoples in the world who have had to resort to whatever methods are available—confronted by our "shows of force," what can they think?

The British seem to have learned their lesson, and the French theirs, but we, brash adolescents that we are, seemingly may have to learn ours the hard way, if we persist in our present course of unilateral action. That we could not have been more aware of historical imperatives, indicates our sad state of immaturity. God have mercy on our souls.

Most sincerely yours,

C. W. CHASE.

LOWELL, MASS., July 4, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You are doing a terrific bang-up job of speaking up against the involvement of American troops in the civil war of South Vietnam.

As of the present I am thinking of casting a write-in vote for you as President in the November election.

Keep up the excellent work.

Peace on earth, good will toward men.

Respectfully yours,

CHARLES GIBADLO.

HON. SENATOR WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: I wholeheartedly commend and thank you, for letting the American people know the true facts about the situation in South Vietnam. The course the United States is pursuing is indeed a threat to the

July 9

peace of the world. I hope your colleagues in the Senate, will be influenced by your wise words and act accordingly, so this matter will be put before the United Nations, thereby averting a major war in Asia, saving the precious lives of thousands of our boys, and millions of dollars.

Thanking you again, I am,  
Respectfully yours,

EDIT: I HERSHEY,  
LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

SNYDEL, TEX.,  
June 30, 1964.

Re request for additional list of liberals.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Last Sunday, June 28, I heard your discussion over the radio on "Issues and Answers," and I appreciate so deeply your courageous stand against the U.S. involvement in Vietnam, where as you have often said, "We have no business to be."

It takes real courage and lots of it to speak out against a Government policy or procedure that has been made popular by such powerful groups as the political organization that is backing GOLDWATER including the John Birchers, American Legion, the Pentagon, and others.

All of we liberals throughout our Nation should stand squarely behind you. Senator MORSE, and let you know that we are with you and the others, Senators CHURCH, CRUENING, OLLIN JOHNSTON, JAMES EASTLAND, and MIKE MANSTFIELD. The action our Government has embarked on is a form of imperialism that in some ways is almost as bad politically, economically, and humanitarially as was procedure used by England, France, Spain, Portugal, the Dutch, and others during the period that they were building their empires. It is our duty as liberals to band together and try in every way possible to stop this aggressive action before the United States gets so deeply involved that it can't stop short of bringing on another major war.

Senator MORSE, there surely must be other liberal Senators and Representatives that believe as you do and if they receive the right kind of encouragement might join in with you, and won't you please appoint someone in your office to make a list of all who believe as you do whose names I do not have, so that I may also write them, and if any are up for reelection I will try to send a contribution to help on their campaign expenses.

Most sincerely yours,

G. W. ZENITH, SR.  
SEATTLE, WASH.,  
July 2, 1964.

EDITOR,  
The Seattle Times,  
Seattle, Wash.

DEAR SIR: It would be enlightening to know what factual basis the Times has for stating that Senator MORSE's "dangerous distortions go far beyond competent criticism" when he opposes administration policies in South Vietnam (July 1).

There seems to be considerable evidence to justify Senator MORSE's description of Major General Khanh, head of the Government, as a "tinhorn tyrant."

General Khanh recently arrested nine top political opponents who asked for the release of two prisoners. He banned a newspaper, "Tien" (Progress) because it spoke of the general's regime as the so-called democratic government. Another newspaper was banned for criticizing the failure of the Government adequately to protect the American aircraft ferry that had been bombed by the Vietcong. The general has already closed down more than 20 journals.

I salute Senator MORSE's integrity and courage in joining the unpopular minority who are trying to let the American people

know how dangerous and self-defeating our policies are in southeast Asia.

Sincerely yours,

MARY FARQUHARSON.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: More power to you. I wish to heaven the two Senators from this State were in your class.

MARY FARQUHARSON.

LA JOLLA, CALIF.,  
June 28, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have just been listening to your TV interview today and I want you to know that I am saying here, here, I am with you. The ominous war cloud again growing over southeast Asia needs to be spotted and dispersed, and I hope there will be a growing sentiment to back your warnings. More power to you.

Sincerely,

MARY MASON.

ALHAMBRA, CALIF.,  
July 1, 1964.

Re the shocking and brutal war in Vietnam.

EDITOR,  
Life Magazine,  
New York, N.Y.

SIR: The shocking photographs shown in the June 12, 1964, issue of Life, are "ipso facto" proof of guilt as well as positive identification of the guilty.

These shocking offenses against the body of prostrate and shackled prisoners are against all canon laws pertaining to treatment of human beings.

Crimes against humanity must not go unpunished. The guilty should be held for international war crimes trials, regardless of national origin, color, or race.

To date of beginning of World War II, beating a prisoner with a cane, "the torturing went on intermittently for nearly 3 hours." "A captive turns to avoid choking on water poured into his nose," by these minions of the devil, would have called for a court-martial and a prison sentence or, possible summary execution of the guilty.

Senator WAYNE MORSE (Oregon) has stated, "that the American program in Vietnam, violates one international commitment after another. Why are American soldiers there?"

Let the preacher from the pulpit preach and let all the Christian people in Christendom rise up as one nation and put a stop to this shocking and brutal war.

As a veteran of World War I, I recall with sorrow the mockery of the slogan on 1917-18, "To make the world safe for democracy" and "this is the war that is to end all wars."

Yours for world peace and not for World War III.

PAUL M. SMITH.

Copy to Senator WAYNE MORSE, Oregon,  
Washington, D.C.

FRESNO, CALIF.,  
June 28, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: My wife and I would like to thank you for your sanity and courage in opposing the administration's Asian policy.

It's become fairly obvious to us that our Government hasn't always been practicing what it preaches. We had practically given up hope that there was a man of reason in government who would speak out.

We have been appreciative of your liberal, common sense stands in the past.

I feel sure that there are large numbers of Americans who feel the same way we do about our aggression in Asia.

We wish you the best of luck. Generations to come will remember and be grateful to you and those few like you.

Sincerely,

CLAUDE HASTY.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,  
July 1, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to offer whatever encouragement I can in your effort to deflect the insane warmongers of U.S. policy in southeast Asia. From the material made available by most of our daily newspapers (even here in New York) it is extremely difficult to form a rational estimate of current happenings; the few accurate reports on your speeches in such journals as the National Guardian have been a most welcome note of sanity in our present circumstances. If our country ever gets out of its present position of being the leader of all the most reactionary forces in the world, much of the thanks will be owed to you. Please accept the gratitude of one citizen. I hope that we are not too alone in this struggle.

I am a graduate of the University of Rochester (1961), have been attending the New School for Social Research this past year, and will be attending the City College of New York this coming fall (working on a master's degree in philosophy). I am writing as a private citizen, and do not represent any political party (what political party could anyone not in favor of preventive war join under present circumstances?).

Sincerely,

JAMES JOHNSON.

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF.,  
July 2, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: I just read your speech of June 2 as reprinted in the Liberal Democrat with which I thoroughly agree. I hope you will keep up the strong opposition to this Vietnam project of the Pentagon.

I can best express my opinion by enclosing a copy of a letter I wrote to William Winter the other day.

Best wishes,

IRVING F. LAUCKS,

JUNE 30, 1964.

Mr. WILLIAM WINTER,  
Editor, "William Winter Comments",  
Sausalito, Calif.

DEAR MR. WINTER: Your May 4 issue which I just read (forwarded from Honolulu) says "we have been deceived"—about Vietnam, etc.

I have a theory of deception even worse than yours, viz: No military strategist in his right mind would undertake to maintain a landing by conventional tactics on a coast 8,000 miles away from his base, with 700 million potential enemies in the hinterland and the coastal inhabitants indifferent or even hostile.

Therefore, since Pentagon strategists have done this, and have gradually increased our forces in Vietnam from a few advisers to now 18,000, and are now pressing for more; and since I don't believe they are entirely crazy, I deduce that they have had in mind from the beginning the possibility of using nuclear weapons either on Hanoi or Peiping or both whenever the necessity arose. They would figure this might be a good chance for some practice. By the use of nuclear weapons they might maintain an otherwise untenable position.

Furthermore, I suspect that the buildup for peace which has been going on ever since last Christmas, has been to prepare the American public for the bad news that we now must undertake another oriental war, this time even worse than Korea.

The administration can now point to its peaceful record—"you see, we have used every means to cultivate world peace and diminish friction—now regretfully we are forced into



And, of course, the public will fall for it, the poor fish.

Best wishes,

IRVING F. LAUCKS.

P.S.—I note your good plug for the center in same issue. I hope to see you in Santa Barbara some day.

NEWTON LOWER FALLS, MASS.

July 3, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My heartfelt support to you in your courageous speaking out against the administration's move toward escalation in southeast Asia. Please keep up this opposition.

Sincerely,

LESTER GRINSPOON, M.D.

TACOMA, WASH.,

June 29, 1964.

THE LETTER BOX,  
Editor, Tacoma News Tribune.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is a copy of a letter to the Tacoma News Tribune—our only newspaper. Hurrah for your courage and understanding.

HAROLD BASS.

"BACKS SENATOR MORSE

"DEAR EDITOR: Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, deserves the praise and support of the American people for his courageous condemnation of "McNamara's war" in southeast Asia. It is tragic that only a handful of our Congressmen realize what complications would grow out of expanding that war. Not only would there be the certainty of Chinese participation but the very nature of the terrain would impel us to use tactics that would arouse the condemnation of most Afro-Asians and perhaps the world.

"It would not be expedient for us to meet the enemy man to man in the jungle; we would make extended use of air power, napalm, poison sprays and atomic weapons. These indiscriminately directed as they are not only against people but to the destruction of vegetation and the soil itself, would incite the flaming hatred of most Asian peoples. They feel what we seem sometimes to forget—that life itself is sustained by the "Good Earth." They know that, to date, such weapons have been used only against Asiatics. We, without our great wealth and atomic might would be regarded as the great bully endeavoring by superior size and weight to subdue the brave but poorly equipped underdog.

"Moreover, what could we do with those parts of east Asia we might subdue? We have not been able to produce commendable results in South Korea where, in 12 years, though our country has expended billions of dollars, the government is honeycombed with corruption, millions are unemployed and hungry, and tens of thousands of students are demonstrating in opposition the trend to put Japan back into control of South Korean business and affairs. True, it would ease our load if Japan could manage South Korea; but to Asiatic peoples it looks like we are for turning the clocks back. Could we do any better in southeast Asia? Let's support Senator MORSE's effort to get us out of there.

"Yours very sincerely,

"Rev. HAROLD J. BASS,  
"Hillside Community Church."

SEATTLE, WASH.,

June 27, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for your stand on war.

B. D. FREER.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,

July 1, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This morning, I read in the New York Times a letter from Norman Thomas, and I received a letter from Pax which quotes N. Thomas.

I am happy to say that I support you in your stand on South Vietnam. In the French newspaper Monde, I read a report on your comments, and approve of them.

May I say that I am, with best regards,

Yours very sincerely,

MARCEL FRANÇON.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,

July 2, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In the National Guardian I have read your statement regarding the South Asian war. I admire you for trying to raise the issue involved for the opposition to this war. This war as I see it is a Pentagon war used solely for the purpose of testing weapons and war gadgets. That is all, except for a church group.

A recent letter from a soldier in this area wrote a letter and published in the Philadelphia Bulletin—in long, long—that testing of war gadgets is essential true—the main purpose. This next door neighbor to a fellow who defends the other side is on the spot of getting his scholarship revoked by the flag wavers.

The German military in 1914 was the strongest and best. Look where it led Germany. During the World War II the German military was the strongest in the world. Look at the result. Now the U.S. military is the strongest. If this military sustains its Asian policy it too can bring this country to a brink of disaster.

You deserve much credit for speaking out as you do against a fatal policy than can only lead to discredit.

Cordially,

P.S.—DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to sign this letter. If I did it really could get me in trouble—so please excuse me for not doing so.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,

June 28, 1964.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE: I want to thank you for your truthful appraisal of our policy in Vietnam.

We, the people, are very confused about our interference there, and hope that it will be brought out to all of us, that we must stay out of involvement that will bring about a war in which our sons will have to take part.

Thank you.

ETTA ISAACMAN.

MARKHAM, ILL.,

July 2, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It was with deep gratification that my wife and I read of your sane approach toward a solution to the undeclared war we are waging in South Vietnam.

It was particularly refreshing when so many elected officials are actually leading mass hysteria for war with any government with whom the United States differs politically.

Your lone voice must take the same kind of personal integrity and courage as must have faced Abraham Lincoln when as a U.S. Senator, he alone opposed the then "popular" war against our neighbor, Mexico.

I urge you to continue your fine effort toward awakening America toward the dan-

ger implicit in these days of nuclear power, and I am sure, many millions of other Americans who have no voice also wish for a true peace.

Respectfully yours,

BENJAMIN T. SCOTT.

OREGON DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION UNANIMOUSLY REJECTS SECRETARY UDALL'S PROPOSED ELECTRIC POWER INTERTIE ARRANGEMENT WITH PRIVATE UTILITIES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, while the Democratic convention in Oregon last week almost unanimously, with only one dissenting vote in support of the administration policy, called for a submission of the jurisdiction of the war in South Vietnam to the United Nations, they unanimously rejected Secretary Udall's present proposal for an intertie arrangement in connection with the so-called electric power intertie arrangement with private utilities on the Pacific coast.

Let me make very clear, Mr. President, that the Oregon Democratic convention does not object to the sale of power into California and other Western States from the Bonneville system; nor does it, of course, object to the sale of Canadian power, after the Canadian treaty is implemented. Other States are entitled to their share of the power, too.

The senior Senator from Oregon has never taken the position that the Pacific Northwest has a monopoly on, or monopoly ownership of the power that is developed from dams that have been built with the money of all the taxpayers of the country.

But we do have a Federal power policy. That Federal power policy is a sound policy. Our Federal power policy gives certain rights, benefits, and protections to so-called public power preference users.

The Democratic Party convention last Saturday wanted to know the specific details of the protection that Secretary Udall proposes as a guarantee in carrying out the long existing Federal power policy. They wanted to be certain of protections such as those enacted into law, for example, when the Bonneville Act was adopted in the first place.

I am in accord with the critics at that convention who hold that the agreement as tentatively proposed by the Secretary of the Interior does not contain those guarantees and protections. That is why the Oregon convention went on record rejecting the agreement in its present form as submitted by the Department of the Interior to the appropriate committees of the Congress.

Last Thursday I spoke on this subject on the floor of the Senate after testifying before the Senate committee. I stand on every word that I said last Thursday. I made my plea then that the proposed intertie agreement be made more specific.

The convention also went on record as opposing any agreement on the west coast intertie arrangement unless there is written into the agreement the construction of a Federal line from Hoover Dam into Nevada, Arizona, and the other areas to be served by that line. As the convention pointed out, and as some of us in our testimony last week also pointed out, that line is essential if we are to have a public power yardstick check against the private utilities. Such a check is needed if we are to protect the consumers who will buy the power.

We will find an insistence upon the maintenance of such a check from the industrial power consumers. There is no group more insistent that such a yardstick check be maintained than industry itself, because industry knows what happens to its power rates if a private utility is given control of dams built by the taxpayers' money. If we give them control of the transmission lines, we might as well give the power at bus bar.

I stress again that I am highly desirous of working out a satisfactory arrangement or agreement that will protect the legitimate—and I underline the word "legitimate"—interests of the public utilities, the legitimate interests of the public power group, the legitimate interests of the public power preference users, and, most of all, the legitimate interests of the taxpayer.

I am satisfied that the interest of the taxpayer will not be protected under the Udall agreement as offered in its present form. That is why the two Senators from Oregon have already served notice that we shall oppose the intertie agreement in its present form. I am hoping that in the weeks and months ahead we can work out with the Secretary of the Interior and with all parties concerned a satisfactory adjustment of the differences.

One provision, for instance, that must be deleted is that which would permit an escape from the assurance that an all-Federal transmission line will be built from The Dalles to Hoover Dam. I refer to the sentence on page 25 of the Secretary's report which indicates that it might in the future be possible to build that line through contracts with private utilities.

Under no circumstances, if we look at the agreement in its entirety, would any such proposal be acceptable or satisfactory to the Senators from Oregon.

In light of the discussion, the debate, and the resolution adopted by the Democratic Party convention in Oregon last July 4, the present administration would be well advised to note now that it is headed for the type of an all-out fight on the power issue in my State, such as past administrations, both Democratic and Republican, have experienced in the last 25 years. It will come if there is any attempt to underwrite an agreement, such as the one proposed, which would not give preference, in effect, to the public preference users under existing law, but would, rather, in effect give preference to the private utilities.

Now is the time to avoid such a controversy. Now is the time to insist that the Secretary of the Interior offer an agreement that cannot possibly be used, or have language in it that can possibly be used, as a device to circumvent or evade a great power policy that has served the best interests of the people of this country for a long time.

I would have the administration carefully reflect before it puts a stamp of approval on the present proposal of the Secretary of the Interior. I would recall to the memory of the Johnson administration, for that period of meditation and reflection, the names of some of our great conservationists and great bipartisan developers of our natural resources. I would have the Johnson administration recall the contribution of Pinchot, of Hiram Johnson, of Charles McNary, of Norris, of La Follette, of Brookhart, of Wheeler, of Clarence Dill, and many others.

Those Republican and Democratic conservationists are cataloged by some as progressive liberals, and they truly were. They were the great progressive liberals of a bygone day who wrote into the statute books of our country a set of laws that give to the consumers of our country the protection that they need against the hijacking and exploiting policies of the private utilities of this country. These practices would no doubt appear if we should permit the private utilities ever to go unchecked.

Many of us are concerned about the proposed Udall agreement on the intertie because, although we have the same objective in mind, we do not believe that the machinery or the principles set up in the proposed agreement will accomplish that fine objective.

I plead with the administration that they not rush this project, but that we take our time on it. They are not going to persuade me with the argument that if we do not get something done very quickly, Bonneville rates may have to be raised. I do not intend to sell out the interests of the people of my State for any mess of pottage. I want a sound program. I do not intend to be rushed into this. The proposed agreement, in my judgment, needs much reconsideration and redrafting.

This is not the first time that I have found myself in this position. Not so many years ago there were those in my State and throughout the Pacific Northwest who wanted me to swallow another partnership program. Under that program the Eisenhower administration sought to have the taxpayers pay for the nonreimbursable costs of a great multiple-purpose dam and then turn the power generation facilities over to the power utilities at the damsite. They called it a partnership. It was a fine partnership. My colleague at the time, Dick Neuberger—I paraphrase him, but I think the paraphrase is close to the original—said on the floor of the Senate one afternoon—

What is proposed is that the Federal taxpayers supply a cow, from which the private utilities can take the milk.

That is just about what the partnership program amounted to. Instead of surrendering to it under all the pressure that was being exercised by Democrats and Republicans alike, those of us who said we were not going to agree appeared before and appealed to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the House over a period of several years, asking for appropriations to proceed to build public dams, not partnership dams. We succeeded in getting the money.

One of the greatest thrills I have had in my service in the Senate was to give the dedication speech not so many weeks ago at the great Cougar Dam in my State. It is a multipurpose dam, a dam belonging to the taxpayers of the United States.

But the Eisenhower administration, in the beginning of that fight, would not recommend a dime in its annual budget estimates for Cougar Dam—or, for that matter, the Green Peter Dam, which will be dedicated within a couple of years.

The message was given to me time and time again that if I would just go along, we would get the money, so that the dam could be built. Many Democrats in my State were persuaded to "put the heat on." The mail was voluminous. Many of the Democrats who wrote to me asked me to surrender to the Eisenhower administration's demand for a partnership program.

I told them:

You say that now, but the time will come when you will applaud if we win this fight. If we lose this fight, you will pay through the nose with higher power rates for years to come.

We won both fights. Now we have one dam completed and another on its way.

The same thing was attempted in connection with one of the greatest of all our western dams, now under construction, the John Day Dam on the Columbia. We fought that battle, and we won.

I want my President to know now that we are going to scrutinize with the greatest of care the Udall intertie agreement. I want to say to some of my colleagues from the Pacific Northwest who are on the other side, "You had better scrutinize it, too. You had better go over the proposal with a fine-tooth comb."

We would like to sit down with the administration to work out a settlement that will protect the consumers and protect this country's power policy. If we cannot arrive at such a negotiated settlement of this matter, we are ready to fight. The people in our part of the country are ready to fight.

Members of the Democratic Party assembled at Coos Bay, Ore., served clear notice on this administration that we are ready to fight to protect the legitimate power rights of the people of the West. When we protect those people, we protect the power rights of the people of the country and the taxpayers as well.

I thought I should make these comments today because I have been advised that an attempt will be made to rush this matter through. I sincerely hope that, on reflection, the administration will decide to consider further before it acts.