

LETTERS TO THE STAR

Further Reflections on the Cuban Crisis

The President's dramatic action taken to stem the Communists' offensive build-up against our country in Cuba was also, by the nature of the present crisis, a call for strong national unity. America stands in accord with the measures now being taken, in the knowledge that — drastic though they must be — they are taken in the cause of freedom and its defense, not for selfish aggression. Such has been the record of the American Government throughout the cold war, and such has been the essential unity of our people.

American unity in time of crisis means bipartisanship. It does not mean one-party government, but the responsible co-operation of two strong parties. Such co-operation is denied under the monolithic system of communism, which fears the light shed by opposition. Such a system is contrary to the American way. It must not be adopted in this hour of trial that coincides with national elections. The Democratic administration, though slow to act in the Cuban situation, must recognize its need of Republicans who have shown their vision and stability in the fight to contain communism.

Raymond Pitcairn,
Bryn Athyn, Pa.

At this time of trial and danger, the American people rallied around their President and Commander-in-Chief, trusting him, as they should, for defending the interests and assuring the security of the Nation.

But the Communist Party of the United States chose this occasion for acknowledging once more its abject subservience to the Soviets.

Its spokesman, Gus Hall, had the arrogant audacity to send a telegram to the White House, urging "suspension of all proposals which can aggravate the danger," and called for a meeting between the President and Khrushchev.

However slyly cautious the wording, the very claim to influencing the President's actions and decisions is indecent at this time.

Once more, the Communist Party of the United States proclaims itself, impudently, to be outside of the national community. It is an agent of a foreign power, even at the time when this foreign power, the Soviet Union, threatens the very life of our Nation.

Nicolas de Rochefort.

Women of America, let us look into the faces of our sleeping babes, stand and watch our school children depart for school, eager and full of hope, send our struggling husbands off to another day of business that ensures our material life — and remember that Khrushchev has promised to bury us all. Little by little, he digs the grave. Look at our babes, our young children, and our good men — brothers, husbands, friends, fathers, fiancés, and vow that they will not stand alone! Let our President know that he need not only count our manpower — that we, the women of America, pledge our undying support — that we demand to be counted too — that the womanpower of America is solidly behind the President, the country, our men, and squarely in front of our children, an impenetrable wall of mothers!

Sonia M. Lyons.

Wife of a World War II veteran; Mother of a soldier now overseas.

As an American I applaud the action taken by the President in the Cuban crisis. However, as a voter I have a tongue-in-cheek attitude as to why, since this missile build-up began in July, action is now being taken. Can it be because of the forthcoming elections? It is a sad thing to realize how all this could have been avoided if the administration had shown the necessary gumption last April and had supported that futile and fatal invasion at the Bay of Pigs.

I. Chapin.

As I heard the President, I was swept with a feeling of patriotism that I have not experienced since I was a boy during World War II. It is possible that a person brought up in an environment of war news is particularly responsive to such a statement. But if President Kennedy had supported

I would have supported him completely. I still would, if he were to recommend such a course tomorrow.

At first I was let down that the President had stopped short of stronger measures. Now I am convinced that the President's decision as to our course of action is correct. An immediate invasion of Cuba might result in a sufficient blow to Soviet prestige that would cause a violent reaction on its part.

I personally doubt that such a reaction would take place. But I will say this: Before I am asked to see my country laid waste, I would like to know that my leaders have presented to the enemy the opportunity reasonably to avoid a general war. I am willing to do whatever is required, without reservation as to the consequences.

David M. Woolley.

It is a sobering thought to realize that as Washingtonians go to sleep at night, nuclear warheads in Cuba are pointed at this city. This makes me reflect on the recent events in Cuba, and the newly announced plans of the United States to halt aggression. I'm sure we Americans will face up to our responsibility to ourselves and to all freedom-loving nations, to protect the heritage we hold dear. May God give all men who value democracy the strength to preserve the right of freedom.

Veda Ann Tudor.

Are the lights about to go out all over the world again? Mankind eternally must face the yea or nay judgment of right and wrong, or good and evil. In the Cuban debacle we behold history's summation of all our sins. There is enough blame and default to shame all of us. We who cannot command unity and respect for law and order within our own household have presumed to direct the destinies of new-born nations just throwing off the yoke of primitive despotism. We who can't obey our own rules of right and truth have become champion and hostage of the impossible and perhaps the unwanted in the jungles of Asia and Africa. What would have been our reaction had the Soviet Iron Curtain and Berlin

have become a bubble of pathetic presumption, ready for the needle prick of Khrushchev's eager, gleeful bursting.

But the Cuban debacle could be mankind's salvation. Let us prove here, so close to home, that we intend to be masters of our own destiny. And once we prove we can do that, then mankind will have more respect for our good wishes and good will toward all others.

Thomas E. Mattingsly, M.D.

So Gromyko lied not once but twice about missile bases in Cuba; a strange thing for a Russian diplomat to do. Reports concerning activities in Cuba have been coming in for months; Fulton Lewis Jr. (about the only commentator remaining on the air not dependent on edited press association dispatches) has been reporting them in detail. Congressional committees have investigated and reported, and the Republican agenda makes Cuba an issue. But Gromyko (and I suppose the State Department in support) said it is not so and that satisfied the President. But now in the midst of election campaigning he discovers Gromyko lied — two missile bases appear set to go and others are in the course of preparation — and so he has ordered a quarantine. With the fat in the fire (or is it?), will there be the usual compromise accepting Russian terms?

Joseph N. Nielsen.

Is our encirclement of the Soviet Union with military bases and our boasted ability to deliver nuclear warheads to that nation justified by the same set of principles which has led us to commit ourselves to acts of war in our determination to prevent missile bases from being built in Cuba?

Do we insist that our military bases encircling the Soviet Union with missiles more powerful than those located in Cuba are defensive, while the erection of such missile bases in a nation which has already been attacked by a military force financed and trained by the United States is offensive? What would have been our reaction had the Soviet