

Now It Looks As If Some of the Viet Cong Even Get Their Basic Training At Our Expense

"Dong Da, South Vietnam, March 6 (Reuters)—A dozen sorry-looking figures, bare but for ragged shorts, slouched through punishment exercises with weighted packs on their skinny backs. 'They are recruits who ran away, some of the many who go—but the few whom we catch,' explained an officer at the South Vietnam Army's national training

center here. Desertions . . . amount to as much as 30% of the some 3,000 men in training here at any one time. . . . Some officers estimate that as many as 10% of the recruits are actually Communist Viet Cong, who slip away again when the Government has given them their training."

—Baltimore Sun, March 7.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. XIII, NO. 10

MARCH 15, 1965



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

LBJ Rushes In Where Ike and Kennedy Feared to Tread

In 1954, when Nixon, Radford and Dulles wanted U.S. intervention in Vietnam to prevent the negotiation of peace, Eisenhower "remarked", according to his memoirs, *Mandate for Change*, "that if the U.S. were, unilaterally, to permit its forces to be drawn into conflict in Indochina and in a succession of Asian wars, the end result would be to drain off our resources and to weaken our overall offensive position." Kennedy, it was recently revealed, faced a similar demand and made a similar decision his first year in office. Arthur Krock in his *New York Times* column Feb. 14 disclosed for the first time that Kennedy turned down a proposal by the Joint Chiefs of Staff to send 40,000 U.S. troops to Vietnam. Mr. Krock said he was at the White House on Oct. 11, 1961, when "the President had just come" from a meeting with the Joint Chiefs at which he rejected this recommendation. He told Mr. Krock, according to notes made by the latter right after this off-the-record talk, that "he still believed . . . the U.S. military should not become involved on the Asian mainland" particularly in "civil disturbances created by guerrillas." What both Eisenhower and Kennedy refused to do Johnson has now done. He has landed U.S. combat troops in Asia.

Coy Hints of A Wider War

It is true that the arrival of 3500 U.S. Marines at Danang was accompanied by the usual double-talk. "Because of the limited number and role assigned," said the *Washington Post* March 9, "the U.S. Government does not consider that it has 'put land combat troops in Asia' in the sense this is usually understood." Our Generals can be as subtle as Greek theologians. It is true that there is a certain military logic in the dispatch of the Marines. Danang is the air base from which we have been bombing Laos and North Vietnam. Hawk ground-to-air missiles were placed there to defend the base from any possible retaliatory air attack from the North. The next problem was to defend the missiles from the guerrillas. Recently at Pleiku and earlier at Bien Hoa, disastrous night attacks on U.S. bases showed how unreliable were the guard arrangements of our South Vietnamese allies. Marines were thereupon sent in, as the *New York Times* correspondent politely phrased it March 8, "freeing Saigon's troops for combat duties." But the Marines are not just going to sit there. They might even go out and do a little shooting on their own.

We Can Only Hope Things Stop "Improving"

"The Vietnamese forces are hurting the Viet Cong. According to the best figures we can get—recognizing that the nature of the war is such that these may not be exact—about 75,000 Viet Cong have been killed so far. Our aviation operations have contributed materially to this success. Improvements in the professional competence of Vietnamese officers, improvements in the sub-sector advisory system, and improvements in the actions of the popular forces all encourage us to think that the Vietnamese will be better able to defend themselves and to cope more effectively with the infiltration from the north than has been the case in the past."

—Gen. Harold K. Johnson, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army to the Senate Committee on Armed Services, March 3.

"Saigon, Vietnam (AP)—The Vietnamese armed forces suffered their heaviest casualties yet against the Viet Cong during February, U.S. military officials reported today. The report said 870 men were killed, 1820 were wounded and 1450 are missing. Many of the missing are presumed to be deserters. . . . The American report also listed a new high in loss of government weapons—2,950—while the Viet Cong lost 655 weapons in combat."

—Washington Evening Star, March 4.

For as the *Baltimore Sun* reported March 9, the two battalions are "more than infantry" because equipped with light tanks and rocket launchers, though the idea of using them as "the spearhead of a prospective offensive force . . . it is stated, is not even remotely contemplated." The "it is stated" refers to an off-the-record briefing at the Pentagon the day before. The *New York Herald Tribune* reported the same day on the basis of the same briefing that while there was no plan to send more ground units to join the Marines, "there are hints that such units might be ordered if a Communist takeover seemed imminent." With such coy hints, we slide into that wider war President Johnson keeps saying he does not want.

If U.S. "military advisers" are killed with the South Vietnamese troops they are advising, the defeat does not involve U.S. prestige directly. But if two battalions of U.S. Marines should be overwhelmed by guerrillas, this would be a loss of face for U.S. forces. We would be compelled to send in

(Continued on Page Four)

Justice Douglas's Remarks, Concurring, on Buddhism Should Impress Vietnam

Supreme Court Unanimously Widens Right of Conscientious Objection

The Supreme Court is only a few hundred yards from the Capitol and a mile from the White House. But the atmosphere reflected by the Court's unanimous opinion in the Seeger, Jakobson and Peter cases last Monday is a whole universe apart. The major premise of White House policy on Vietnam, and of its overwhelming Congressional support, is that the killing of more human beings, whether our own countrymen or others, is of minor consequence. The Supreme Court, on the other hand, has chosen this moment to affirm as the highest moral principle in our constitutional system that a man has a right to refuse to kill for his country.

What Is Belief In A Supreme Being?

The right, it is true, is slightly qualified. The Court has yet to rule that this may be accorded an atheist, though motivated by the deepest concern for other human beings. But, speaking through Mr. Justice Clark the Court has unanimously read the conscientious objector provisions of the Universal Military Training Act so loftily as to cover any objector whose personal views may be regarded as religious, though in the most unconventional sense. Not to have done so—as Mr. Justice Douglas points out concurring—would have been to violate the guarantee of the free exercise of religion in the First Amendment and the equal protection clause in the Fourteenth. The statute allows exemption from combatant service where the individual's objection springs from "belief in relation to a Supreme Being involving duties superior to those arising from any human relation" but not from "essentially political, sociological or philosophical views."

All three of the conscientious objectors before the Supreme Court had been convicted in the District Courts on the ground that their refusal to take human life did not spring from belief in "a Supreme Being." Daniel Andrew Seeger had said that his ethical views, like those of Plato, Aristotle and Spinoza, were "without belief in God, except in the remotest sense." Forest Britt Peter would not go beyond belief in "some power manifest in nature which helps man in the ordering of his life." Arno Sascha Jakobson believed in no

A New "Declaration of Conscience"

"Because the use of the military resources of the U.S. in Vietnam suppresses the aspirations of the people for political independence and economic freedom; Because inhuman torture and senseless killing are being carried out by forces armed, uniformed, trained and financed by the U.S.; Because we believe that all peoples of the earth, including both Americans and non-Americans, have an inalienable right to life, liberty, and the peaceful pursuit of happiness in their own way; and Because we think that positive steps must be taken to put an end to the threat of nuclear catastrophe and death by chemical or biological warfare, whether these result from accident or escalation—

We hereby declare our conscientious refusal to cooperate with the U.S. government in the prosecution of the war in Vietnam. We encourage those who can conscientiously do so to refuse to serve in the armed forces and to ask for discharge if they are already in. . . . We urge others to refuse . . . to work in . . . weapons development."

—From a petition originated by A. J. Muste and sponsored by the Catholic Worker, the Committee for Nonviolent Action, the Student Peace Union, and the War Resisters League. Signers (there are now 2,400) face possible penalties of 5 years imprisonment and/or a fine of \$5,000 for advising draftees to refuse service.

more than "an Ultimate Cause."

Mr. Justice Clark in a truly reverential opinion, citing some of the foremost theologians of our time, among them Paul Tillich, decided that the exemption covered anyone whose views hold the same place in his life "as an orthodox belief in God" does for the conventionally religious. Mr. Justice Douglas noted that Buddhism's conception of God is so unlike the Western as often to seem atheistic. He pointed out that there are 171,000 Buddhists in the U.S. and that to rule otherwise would be to deny them the right of conscientious objection. This Supreme Court opinion, circulated in predominantly Buddhist South Vietnam, may help to demonstrate that we Americans are not all savage dispensers of napalm.

Foes of HUAC Plan New Fight to Force Abolition Proposal Out of Rules Committee

The next step by Congressional opponents of HUAC is to force Judge Smith, Chairman of the House Rules Committee, to release one of the thirteen abolition resolutions which he currently has bottled up in committee. A discharge petition signed by 281 members is the only way. Last month the abolitionists used a new tactic and tripled their support in battle over the committee's annual operating funds (\$370,000). They first introduced a motion requiring the committee to justify its funds in a public hearing. This won 64 supporters (including 6 paired). Thirty-two congressmen (3 paired) voted against the appropriation itself. This too was progress. Only 20 voted against the appropriation two years ago and only 6 before that.

The debate was less lopsided than the scoring. HUAC partisans and opponents turned out in nearly equal number, and from the applause it appeared that the partisans were concentrated on the Republican side. Only one anti-HUAC speech failed to win applause, and this significantly was when Rep. Joelson (D., N.J.) urged HUAC to investigate the right-wing. "Our objections are fundamental.

They are constitutional," Don Edwards (D., Cal.) objected, "The same constitutional disabilities exist regardless of the political philosophy of the committee's targets." To encourage any of his colleagues who might fear "adverse political reaction" from voting against the committee, Edwards recalled names of those who had opposed a 1946 HUAC appropriation. Among them were four present chairmen of House committees and, to everybody's surprise, Lyndon Johnson.

Only one congressman, Leonard Farbstein (D., N.Y.), mentioned the three peace workers, Donna Allen, Dagmar Wilson and Russell Nixon, now under indictment for contempt because they refused to testify in a HUAC executive session. Nor did any member point out the tragic consequences of HUAC's hearings in Buffalo and Minneapolis last year. Six of the fifteen Buffalo witnesses called to testify lost their jobs. In Minneapolis it was two out of eleven. A third was forced to stand trial before his labor union. HUAC is not the extinct volcano that it sometimes seems to be around Washington.

Alabama Mobsters Not The Only Obstacle; How Justice Dept. Drags Its Heels**The Selma Beatings, Like the Birmingham Bombings, Will Help The Negro**

This is written after the first march at Selma but goes to press before the second. Governor Wallace and Sheriff Clark, the state police with their tear gas and the posse with its whips, the white onlookers with their imbecile gloating, will prove to have made the greatest single contribution to the Negro's cause since the Birmingham bombings forced passage of the 1962 Civil Rights Act from a reluctant Administration. The brutal suppression of Negro efforts to exercise rights as elementary as those of voting and peaceful demonstration must focus the eyes of all the world on us at the unbearably painful moment when we are trying to muster support abroad for our war to make Southeast Asia "safe for democracy." It will be hard to explain why the cause of freedom, like charity, should not begin at home. Nor to hide the striking resemblance between our rationale for the war in Vietnam and that put forward by such characters as Sheriff Clark. In terms that recalled the White Paper, he explained on ABC's *Issues and Answers* March 7 that all would be well with the "Nigras" in Alabama if only those Northern agitators would go away!

Delaying Democracy in Mississippi

The Alabama mobsters are not the only obstacle to racial justice. In the wake of the Supreme Court's decision last Monday in *U.S. v. Mississippi*, the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party pointed out that the Court was ready to rule on the merits and throw out the elaborate system by which Mississippi for two generations has disenfranchised its Negroes. Mr. Justice Black for a unanimous court said it was sending the case back for trial because that was the course asked by the Solicitor General. The MFDP said that it had been urging the Justice Department for months to ask for immediate and full relief. The MFDP said that to ask only a remand for trial would result in months, perhaps years, of further denial of the right to vote in Mississippi. This delaying tactic, and the Administration's failure to submit its promised bill on voting registrars, suggest behind-scenes love-feasts with Eastland. It was likewise a blow the

Aubrey Williams

If Aubrey Williams had been different, he might have become a Governor of his native Alabama or represented it in the Senate. He came of an old "Confederate" family. He had a natural eloquence, which reflected the streak of poet in him, and his sympathy with common folk fitted into that Alabama Populist tradition from which Justice Black, and Senators Hill and Sparkman sprang. But Aubrey would never compromise or even consent to be silent on the racial issue. He had a grandfather who freed 1,000 slaves before the Civil War, and Aubrey was ruined politically by that streak of humanity in his genes. His heyday was the New Deal. He was right-hand to Harry Hopkins in FERA, WPA and NYA, the alphabetical agencies which sprang up to help the hungry and the jobless and to give new hope to youth. Aubrey was of that inner circle of the devoted on whom Franklin D. Roosevelt relied. One of FDR's last acts was to nominate Aubrey Rural Electrification Administrator. The power trust defeated him by using the racial issue against him, especially his sponsorship of the Fair Employment Practices Commission in 1941. All his life he fought for the rights of the Negro, as publisher of *The Southern Farmer* and in the Southern Conference Educational Fund. When he died he was head of the Committee to Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee; that was dying with his boots on. His old enemy Eastland attacked him and his championing of the Negro finally forced *The Southern Farmer* out of business. He loved his native South but found himself so isolated that he finally moved to Washington, where he battled a fatal illness for months. None of the prominent and powerful whom he had helped, from Lyndon Johnson down, came to his funeral. Loneliness in death as in life was the price of living in full accord with a tender conscience. Nothing in our time has been harder than to be a truly Christian white man in today's South. Aubrey was.

day after Selma to have the Court rule, as it did in *Swain v. Alabama* through Justice White over the dissent of Goldberg, Warren and Douglas. For the first time since 1880 the Court upheld the death sentence conviction of a Negro by a jury from which Negroes were systematically excluded.

The High Cost to the Negro of Farm Program Discrimination in The South

In one sense the Civil Rights Commission's report on the administration of U.S. farm programs in the South follows the pattern of its previous indictments. There is the same painful story of our government's acquiescence in racial segregation and exploitation, but now it is the Department of Agriculture rather than Justice or HEW that stands guilty. Here are two representative samples: Although discrimination in federal hiring has been prohibited by Presidential directive for over twenty years, the 1,350 Southern offices of the crop allotment program had a "total permanent employment of Negroes that consisted of 1 full-time Grade 3 clerk and 7 part-time workers." In applying the farm credit program, the average size of loans going to poor whites was four times greater than those going to equally poor Negroes.

It is when discussing the consequences of this discrimination that the Commission's report offers a new and more radical perspective: Over the past thirty years, the Commission writes, "Southern white farmers have raised their incomes, increased the size of their farms, improved their

housing and advanced their education." From this progress the Negro farmer has been virtually excluded. It is for him as if the depression never ended. Negro tenants, for example, were farming an average of 40 acres in 1935 and an average of 35 acres in 1959. White tenants, by contrast, operated farms averaging 97 acres in 1935 and 200 acres in 1959. Similar figures could be cited for full and part owners and cash tenants. In the past thirty years overall acreage held by whites increased by 3 million and declined by 22 million for Negroes.

The gap between white and Negro income has grown as rapidly as the gap in landholding. By 1959 Negro income had not even reached the 1949 income level for whites. On a state by state basis, the richest Negroes, who live in Maryland, were poorer than the poorest whites, who live in Kentucky. Two-thirds of rural Negro families had less than a \$2,000 income in 1959, but this was true for only one-fourth of white families. No poverty program that is limited to providing "equal opportunity" can succeed in closing gaps like these.

Mc George Bundy Admits Vietnam Is Not A "Vital" Interest

(Continued from Page One)

more troops and urged to do more retaliatory bombing in the North to restore our "prestige." Once we begin committing combat troops, we are caught in what the French call the "engrenage", in the "gears" that will drag us further and ever more painfully in. The Marines are landing at a time and a place that invites a Dunkirk if not a Dienbienphu. Danang is set like Dienbienphu in a bowl of hills dominated by the Viet Cong; the only fortunate difference is that it offers a quick escape route by sea. The military situation all about the place is deteriorating. One plane with Marines was shot at while landing. Though the defense perimeter is supposed to be 8 miles out, guerrillas overran a regional forces platoon only three miles south of Danang runway the night before the Marines began arriving. To the south of Danang, guerrillas have cut the North-South railway and the one highway to Saigon. For most intents and purposes they have cut South Vietnam in half. The few coastal towns still held by the government in the central portion of the country are crowded with refugees with no way out except by air. Heavy U.S. bombings are exacting their toll of civilians, though they have not stopped the guerrillas. The rate of desertions from the South Vietnamese army is rising sharply, and if there is going to be war much longer we are going to have to wage it.

They Agree With deGaulle

War weariness has spread. A correspondent in *Le Nouveau Canide* (Paris) Feb. 25-March 4, describes the frenzied effort in Saigon to cash in whatever property is saleable and get out. The "information agencies" here in Washington are doing their best to hide the full truth. NBC's radio correspondent Robert Goralski said in a broadcast from Saigon March 4 that a top ranking member of the South Vietnamese government told him that it is "basically in accord with Gen. deGaulle's position that the only way out is to sit down at the conference table with the North Vietnamese." Though this appeared on the AP ticker, the only paper in which we saw it was the York, Pa., *Gazette and Daily* (March 5), and it was soon dropped by NBC. A caller checking with NBC

Some People Are Funny That Way

"Although it is sometimes officially denied, the Sky-raiders have dropped napalm bombs throughout the South. No napalm has been used in either Laos or North Vietnam so far, however. Restrictions on talk about the use of napalm came after the Vietcong gave particularly effective propaganda distribution to the photograph of a villager and his child after a raid. [That was the Associated Press photo we reprinted last March 30—IFS]. But the bombs have been too valuable in penetrating caves and trenches to give up. 'The public seems to have an aversion to napalm,' a senior American officer said, 'because people think it's kinder to blast a man's head off than to fry him to death'."

—New York Times from Saigon, March 7.

was told that it was not broadcast again because the Assistant Secretary of State, presumably Wm. P. Bundy, advised NBC the interview was "off-the-record." One touch of realism was in the AP's account from Camp Pendleton, Cal., of Operation Camelot (*Washington Star*, March 7). In this exercise Marines came ashore "in the friendly but war-torn nation of Lancelot." One feature of the exercises showed somebody was familiar with the "friendly" realities they will face when they come ashore in Vietnam. The AP said "relief units of the 1st Marine Division" were under simulated "sporadic attack by civilians unsympathetic to the U.S. peacekeeping mission." The Marines seem to be preparing to land on hostile beaches.

While more combat troops are thus being readied, the public is being prepared for a U.S. naval blockade; Goldwater must think he won the election! The one hint of more sober thinking at the White House came in a talk McGeorge Bundy made here to the Radcliffe Club (*Washington Post* society page, March 3). In answer to a question, he denied that Vietnam represented a "vital" interest of the United States in the sense of a life or death matter. "It would hardly be in the interest of either side," the President's chief foreign affairs adviser said, "if there should be a full-scale thermonuclear war." We're glad to hear a war-hawk cooing.

We'll Be Glad to Send A Sample Copy of This Issue To A Friend — Send A Stamped Self-Addressed Envelope

I. F. Stone's Weekly 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20015

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed \$5:

Name

Street

CityZone.....State.....

3/15/65

For the enclosed \$5 send a gift sub to:

(To) Name

Street

CityZone.....State.....

For \$5.35 extra send I. F. Stone's *The Haunted Fifties*

Indicate if announcement wished ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20015

Second class
postage paid
at
Washington, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except the last week in December and the first week in January and Bi-Weekly during July and August at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N.W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: \$5 in the U.S.; \$6 in Canada; \$10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: \$15 to Europe; \$20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.