



## Daniel Jeremy Silver Collection Digitization Project

Featuring collections from the Western Reserve Historical Society and  
The Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives

### **MS-4850: Daniel Jeremy Silver Papers, 1972-1993.**

Series III: The Temple Tifereth-Israel, 1946-1993, undated.

Sub-series B: Sermons, 1950-1989, undated.

---

Reel  
48

Box  
15

Folder  
825

Taking Stock of 1965, 1965.



Taking Stock of 1965  
Daniel Jeremy Silver  
December 26, 1965

Nineteen sixty-five was a year of comfortable prosperity and of disconcerting political portent. Diplomats with well-filled bellies stand snappishly criticized other nations and as the year wore on diplomatic conversation became curt and bitter. Almost daily the Chinese accused our government of being war mongering, colonial, imperialist. Secretary McNamara addressed a joint meeting of the NATO heads of state, urging a ten-year war containment against Communist China in terms fit for a holy crusader. There was Vietnam, the only issue which perceptibly cooled the temperature of the cold war. Traditionally, world wars have begun in Europe; traditionally Germany has begun these world wars. Elections in Germany this past year revealed that chauvinism, nationalism is flowing at high tide. Germans wanted reunification soon if not now. When a group of reform clergymen suggested that the Germans renounce once and for all claims to Polish territory beyond the Oder Nisi Rivers, they were roundly castigated by the left, by the right and by the center. Germany was eager to have her hands near or on the nuclear trigger. At yearend Mr. Ehrhardt seems to have come close to that desired attainment. Aulospach, former secretary general of the United Nations, made this sage observation of European policy today. French nationalism, he said, is a pity; German nationalism, he said, is a catastrophe. Well, our government has encouraged German nationalism over the past twenty years since the end of the second World War. We have done this knowing full well that Russia will not sit tight and tolerate Germans in control of nuclear arms pointing directly at her heartland, and I humbly submit that if we are concerned with peace at this time and the lifetime of our children we had better turn our sites from the far corners of the globe to Europe, the burgeoning, quivering, eager Germany, the Germany who will yet within the months or the years, unless we control them, reverse the trend for peace which has settled in Europe.

But let us turn for a moment from the dark clouds to the happy economic sunshine. Nineteen sixty-five was the fifth straight year of heightened prosperity



in these United States. Our economy grew at an encouraging pace. It is estimated that the gross national product will be increased by some thirty billions of dollars. The stock market stood at near record heights and it maintained these heights for most of the year. Unemployment fell to some 4.3 percent of the labor force, its lowest rate in almost a decade. In city after city companies were advertising for the first time in years for unskilled labor. These were good times. This was a good year in which Americans earned more, kept more, spent more, spent more for luxuries, spent more for travel, and owed more, and asked only for another year of the same. Would I be wrong to suggest that we have wrapped ourselves psychologically and emotionally in an atmosphere of economic euphoria. We wanted no gloomy Gus's so that when the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Mr. William McChesney Martin, suggested during the year what he called disquieting similarities between this prosperity and that of the twenties. He was roundly ticked off in the public press and abused for his gloominess and his pessimism. America had seemed to have believed that by some divine skill we had sculpted an economic system and economic controls which would assure for us prosperity everlasting. Of course, we had not managed to reverse the outflow of gold reserves. Of course, we had during the year to exchange our coinage for a baser metal. After many years of vast agricultural surplus, some farm commodities were showing up in short supply. Prices during the year had inched up. The dollar lost some two percent of its value in the last twelve months, its highest rate of fall, its fastest rate of fall in nearly fifty years. Nevertheless, we preferred to believe that our president could somehow juggle a 25 percent increase in our defense budget, the space program, and maintain a steady outflow of consumer goods, the cost of government, the war on poverty, maintain steady prices, steady wages in the present rate of taxation. The danger flag of inflation was in the air, quickened and brought on by our sudden swift surging commitment, military commitment in Southwest Asia. The shoe had not yet pinched and at year's end only the thoughtful American realized that in the months ahead each and everyone of us would begin to pay the price for our global warhawking.



During 1965 the Economic Opportunities Act and the other programs of our war on poverty were set in motion. The visible symbols of these were the Headstart operations, Appalachia, the job trading centers, the small business aid programs and the like. There was some evidence of miscalculation. There was some evidence of mismanagement. Every war breeds waste, yet there was great evidence of human salvage and progress. We had set out our men on the first reconnaissance of the war on poverty, the first skirmishes had been fought, yet, already, the orders had been cut to retreat, to pull back. The budget would have to be tightened and pared. How far? No one knew, but it seemed evident that we could not escalate the war in the jungles of Asia without constricting and confining the war on the jungles of our central cities.

President Johnson had succeeded in winning the legislation for his great society during lush years when he would have cared for everyone, for the needy, welfare; for the affluent, a cut in taxes. Those who had never made their peace with this welfare legislation have already announced that they intend to try to use the cost of the war in Vietnam to dismantle the architecture of the great society. President Johnson's stature will be in this battle put to the test for he will discover whether the great society was a convenient and effective campaign slogan or a deep personal statement of political belief and it will put our beliefs to the test. Were we fair weather humanitarians, where with the first cry, the first fear of a raise in taxes, we cast away the mantle of our civic virtue and concern ourselves only with our pocketbooks. I fear that the latter would be the case.

Nineteen sixty-five saw some miraculous achievements in space. There was the Mars probe of Mariner IV and those dramatic pictures of that little-known planet. There was Col. Liantus' walk in space followed so shortly by that of our own Major White. There was the join-up of Gemini VI and Gemini VII and the triumph of atmospheric calculation. It was exciting. It was adventurous. It was expensive. And most Americans realized we had far more critical and far more complicated problems to solve here on earth. And many thoughtful people wished that our government



would undertake similar crash problems to solve the problems of smog and smoke in our air, dirty streams and polluted waters, the increasingly critical water shortage, the population that seems to be growing at a cancerous rate, the cities which are sprawling ugly over this countryside, disgracing the beauty of our land, the conservation programs lost to building enterprise. These were the problems which concerned Americans. These were the problems that determine the quality of life of our children and our children's children for it is not yet clear in America or across the world that we will win the battle to achieve civilization against the carelessness and the waste - shall I say it - against the cupidity, the greed, of man. For though this was a good year, an abundant year, here in America, there were places in our globe, in Latin America, in Asia and central Africa where men earned less than more, where men ate less and not more, where men suffered shorter lives, not a long one. The problems were known. The problems have long since been studied, but Americans, the world alike, seem to a certain degree unable to move from knowledge to act. Symbolic perhaps was the attitude of the Vatican Council towards birth control. Four years the issue was debated, the one issue in which church policy would affect the well-being of mankind, and after four years it was resolved to turn the matter over to a commission which would report at some indefinite date. The time is now. The issues are urgent, yet our world seems determined to continue fighting its petty wars, muscling each other for spheres of influence, being greedy for the goods of this day, being careless of the goods of another day. And not always carelessness. In America we passed two pieces of important legislation which were of a welfare and humane nature. After some ten years of delay brought on by the most expensive lobby ever undertaken in Washington, Congress finally passed Medicare. The Americans had insisted that the painful and the costly problems of infirmity and age be met and met they were. Now, of course, the young will have to pay the price for the aged, but, after all, God willing, the young grow old. Medicare is the cost of our medical revolution, the cost we must be willing to pay, and as Medicare was the cost of our medical revolution, so the one and a half billion



dollars Federal Aid to Education bill was the cost of many years of rather spotty financing of public education, the cost to the nation. Some cities and some suburbs had spent great sums of money to educate their young; in other states, in other cities, in other suburbs, had spent far too little. Yet, an educated youth was our future, our strength and our security so we passed a bill, a first installment, of our debt to the young. Now, this bill was not passed without danger to the donor. Seeking the concensus which he so well loves, President Johnson had devised a legal smoke screen, a verbal masquerade, that a direct aid to the student which permitted aid to be granted through this bill to private and parochial systems alike and we have moved one step closer towards direct government support of denominational religious instruction with long term results at which we can now only guess.

President Johnson sought in 1965 as in 1964 to take for himself the mantle of the leadership of this great center in our American polity, the mantle of consensus. During 1965 this mantle was his although it was somewhat abrasive at its edges for 1965 was a year of protest, of marching, of picketing, of parading, of placards. It seemed at times that everyone was marching, the young and the old, the pacifist and the war monger, the civil rights spokesman and the Ku Klux Klan, the student and the teacher, the parent, the child. Some enterprising businessmen in New York even set up a professional placarding service: we will picket anyone any time at so much an hour.

But there was a serious element to this picketing, a growing unease in the nation, of our attitudes, our national policies, in the areas of race and the area of war. Men marched in Selma early in the year. Their cause? Voter registration. Their grievance? The deliberate delay by county officials, one or two registrations completed in a day, these rejected procedural. The result? The immediate result? A pell-mell attack by state troopers with truncheon and tear gas against those who paraded, an act which President Johnson was to label an American tragedy. A long term result? The voting registration act of 1965, one of the grand and glorious achievements of the past year. The Congress ordered the government to intervene in



counties where registrars refused to make the voter rolls open to all. Congress struck down the specious voter qualification tests which had been used to eliminate the unwanted, the black, affixing their signatures to these rolls.

When President Johnson addressed a joint session of the Congress in behalf of this legislation. He used, as you recall, a refrain from the familiar negro civil rights hymn: we shall overcome. I'm afraid that many of us early in 1965 believe that after ten years of struggle and of law we had somehow overcome the debilities of race which were imposed upon the negro and the Puerto Rican and the Mexican, that America<sup>ns</sup> had broken the Gordian knot which seemed to keep these people outside of the great society. And then late in August as the smoke rolls over the Watts area of Los Angeles we were reminded that the war on prejudice and the war on poverty had hardly been begun. And that while a few days of near anarchy 31 died, 700 were injured, 2400 were imprisoned, \$200 millions of property had been destroyed and in ruins. Why? As a sub-verbal protest against the indignity, the cruelty, the grayness and the coldness, the bitterness and the poverty of the ghetto, the other America. It was no happenstance that after Watts those who have been concerned these many years with the war on poverty joined with those who had been concerned during the year with the war on war. Peace groups joined with the civil rights groups because those who have been concerned with our economic opportunities legislation recognized that if we escalate the war in Vietnam and if it persists at its present rate or at a higher rate for years, it is the poor of this nation who will pay the price for the war, the price of dismantled welfare legislation, the price of aborted hopes, the price of frustration. All roads domestically led to Saigon, to the albatross that the nation wears around its neck, the war we had not wanted, the war we cannot win, the war which we cannot seem to escape.

During 1965 it became clear, the issue of why we were in Vietnam had become academic. We said that we were there to preserve the freedom of the Vietnamese. The Vietnamese might well ask whether they really enjoyed freedom under Diem or his successor, but this was no longer relevant. The simple, ugly, relevant fact was



that we were deeply and seemingly irrevocably committed to this war. As the majority leader in the Senate, the moderate and temperate majority leader said in March of this year: the United States is in Vietnam; whatever the circumstances which led to that commitment is now in great debt and anyone who assumes that the projection is reversible before an ordered peace can be obtained assumes in error, indeed, it is more likely to be increased. How correct Mr. Mansfield, in fact, was. When he spoke early in this year we had 23,000 military personnel in Vietnam largely in supportive and advisory roles to the Vietnamese army. By the end of the year we had 200,000 military personnel in Vietnam fighting an open, if undeclared, war against the Viet Cong, the South Vietnamese rebels, and against the North Vietnamese regular army. When Mr. Mansfield spoke these words our planes were engaged in attack only if in direct support of a tactical military mission. By the end of the year we were attacking daily South Vietnam and North Vietnam and raiding in North Vietnam a curtain of bombs which was marching ever closer to the capital and to the great industrial centers of Hanoi, Haifong. This was the year of the war hawk. This was the year of escalation. This was the year of napalm, death. And at year's end the government was speaking of the commitment of 500,000 man expeditionary force, of the obliteration of Haifong and Hanoi, the doctrine of hot pursuit over China.

Now, the majority of Americans acquiesced docilely to government policy. We were confused. If we questioned we accepted. There was, of course, a verbal minority which scored many a debater's point and denied to Washington the mantle of pious diplomacy. By and large, Americans acquiesced, especially so during Easter week when the President announced that we were willing to undertake negotiations, unconditional negotiations, any time at any place. We wrapped ourselves in the mantle of peace lover and went out to make war. Now, to negotiate is to trade, to barter. At negotiation you give up something to gain something. The trouble was that we had almost nothing to give up, South Vietnam. By day we controlled less than half of the countryside; by night less than that. We could not even suggest a popular election



but only South Vietnam. Our clique in the capital would hardly win a popularity contest. All we had to promise was that we would cease the reign of terror which we had imposed upon this benighted land, and if we could win at the bargaining table what we could not win on the battlefield or politically, control of all of South Vietnam along the seventeenth parallel, the security of our puppets in Saigon, then we were willing to call off the reign of death which we were showering daily upon the South Vietnamese people. In exchange for death, peace. We have nothing to negotiate. In fact, when we speak of negotiation, in my humble opinion, we demand and insist upon capitulation. That is why Mr. Rusk has talked of signals, of conditions, the channels in which peace feelers must be sent. He lives, and I'm afraid our government lives, under the illusion that we can somehow in South Vietnam still have our way. Yet, we have lost, if we ever had, the well-being, the feeling, the loyalty of the countryside. It is not only that we cannot permit an election of plebiscite North Vietnamese and South Vietnamese towards reunification. Those whom we oppose, the rebels in the field would win an election, I believe, an open election held in South Vietnam alone.

So, though we talked of negotiations we imply capitulation. As long as we insist that we must win what we have set out to win at the bargaining table what we have not won on the battlefield there will be no negotiation. And if we do obliterate and cinder the great industrial centers of the north, what sorrel will we then have to bargain with, to threaten with, what card will we then have to present when we do sit down for sit down we will and sit down we must. America cannot be committed to an endless war in the mud and the jungles of southeast Asia. As our government has insisted from the very beginning, we have no security reasons for being there. We have no territorial ambitions in that part of the world. This has never been our sphere of influence economically, politically or otherwise. How can we waste our wealth and our youth to win a victory which in fact we cannot win, to win a victory which if won must be discarded.

We need the conference table. We need patience. It required a year at Pan



Mujong to arrange and to negotiate peace in Korea. It may take two years or three years or more to negotiate peace in southeast Asia. But let us at least come to the conference table, dampen down the war, cease to use our engineering skill to destroy lives and cities. Of course, not all the evil is on our side. We are not the only intransigent ones. We are not the only ambitious ones. We aren't the only ones who have miscalculated. The plea must go out north and south to the Communist block as to the free world. America has been the nation which in this instance has escalated the war, has forced the issue. The onus of responsibility falls most upon us.

Would that the President had used this Christmas truce to attempt a larger truce. Would that he would find some other occasion to affect what must be the ultimate end of American policy - disengagement in southeast Asia. For the one great truth of the 1960's in the area of international relations is that the several nations of the world insist that they will dance only to their native tune. The shadow of Washington, the shadow of Peking, the shadow of Moscow, no longer loom so ominous and large across the globe. Satellites have gained a measure of independence from Moscow. France has moved apart from NATO. China and Russia are at each other's throats. Even the hard-won unity of the neutralist states has been abandoned. Each goes his own way. There is a block of Nasserite states now in the Near East, in Saudi Arabia and Iran and Tunisia who are the counter element to his power. When the neutralist states attempted during the year to have a conference, another Bandon, in Algiers they could not even meet and agree on an agenda. There was no longer an identity of interests. The world has become infinitely more complex and more complicated.

We sent 23,000 troops during the summer to Santo Domingo. The military junta there was opposed and feared a left wing rebellion. We were not opposed by anyone. There was no China to sponsor and to arm the rebels. We had our way without bloodshed. At year's end 7,000 of our troops remain on this beleaguered island and the rebellion simmers at the corners below. We cannot impose upon our will upon this little island of people even though rebellion means suicide, political suicide for them. They in-



the freedom to remain in power?

Is it not time that the United States disassociated itself from this myopic concern with what a capital, this capital or another is allying with us or against us in the cold war? Why not for awhile allow the nations of the world to go their own way, to have their revolutions, for you must have a revolution as you transform yourself from tribalism and feudalism to technology, to the twentieth century. Why not for awhile lend our economic support if it is asked, our Peace Corps, our technical aid? Beyond this ask nothing more of the nations of the world but they leave their neighbors in peace and leave us in peace. Has not each of our major stumblings in the cold war come about when we sought to impose a cold war responsibility upon a nation at the very time that that nation was seeking to break the shackles of the past and emerge into the twentieth century?

Perhaps we have come to the time when the Biblical simplicity, or is it the Biblical vision, is true, not by power, not by might but by God's spirit, by the process of goodness. Perhaps we have come to the time when the Biblical symbol is true, that a little child, a child of decency, can lead the peoples of the world where all the king's armies and all the king's men or all the Pentagon's tanks and all the Pentagon's planes can't force a nation or people to God.

And so 1965 comes to its end, a bitter sweet year, sweet in the eating, bitter in the living. Nineteen sixty-six will be a year of severe test for this nation and for the world. Tempers are frayed. Passions are red hot. Those in power have lost much of their patience with protest. Many in power have become deaf to other points of view. Nineteen sixty-six will tell the temper of men, whether we are sunshine humanitarians, sunshine heroes, or whether we have the stuff with which to insist on humane legislation in a decent nation at a cost which will affect our pocketbooks, our family budgets, whether we have the stuff to accept frustration and perhaps international defeat and yet retain the high pride we all feel in our nation and in its institutions.



sist on the right to kill themselves. They insist on the right to go their own way. So it is with all the nations of the world. Pakistan and India are financed and fed by Russia, by the United States, yet the two great powers of the world working surprisingly in consort could not abort the war in Kashmir. When Mr. Sukarno in Indonesia tried to turn over the foreign policy of his nation lock stock and barrel to the Chinese, the Indonesians reminded him in no uncertain terms that he was Indonesian, they were to go their own way. All of the great powers have overestimated their power. We did so in southeast Asia. It is time that we retrench. And I, for one, do not fear this growing complexity, this growing chauvinism of our globe.

It seems to me that the reason most often advanced for our presence in southeast Asia is the so-called domino theory. If Saigon were to capitulate tomorrow Singapore would fall the next day, the Phillipines a week from now, Hawaii a year from now. And yet does not the independence, the intransigence of the several neutral nations, of the emerging nations, act as a buffer between the great powers?

Ho Chih Men fears the embrace of Mao Tsung as much as Mr. Kan and the generals in Saigon fear the embrace of Washington. But nationalist desires of the little nations can act as the cushion that separates, pillows the bitterness between the colossal powers. As for us, it was chilling to hear late in the year that our Secretary of State has not absorbed this lesson. In Rio de Janiero at a meeting of the organization of American states he stated in no uncertain terms: the United States was prepared to act unilaterally if necessary to preserve the security interests of our nation, to be sure, and to preserve, he went on, the freedom of those who wish to be free. What a statement capable of misinterpretation. We went into South Vietnam to preserve the freedom of the South Vietnamese. Did they wish our freedom? We went into Santo Domingo to preserve the freedom of whom? The military clique in control of the nation? Or the freedom of the nation, the populace, to rebel against tyranny? And when he spoke to this organization of American states is he promising to Bolivia and to Peru and to Chile<sup>to</sup>, the oligarchies there in power,







We needed more money of the dark clouds - but we couldn't for the  
moment in the European currencies, 1965 was the 5th year of  
years of highland property.

The economy grew at an average rate of 4% - The G.I.P.  
increased by more than 10% during

The whole market had remained around 1965  
Unemployment fell to 7.5% of the labor force - the lowest rate  
of 1965-66

For the 1st time in 4 years there were no more  
newly killed labor.

Construction spent more

spent more for capital

spent more

spent more

WRHS  
AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES  
hundred more  
single "business  
employment of for military and  
employment of the most  
the same, would also allow to  
one of economic expansion, We needed to believe that good  
times would not end - that we had created economic internal  
which prevented unemployment, We had no policy  
until my leaving law, we had many more, coming of  
of F.R.B. received a major boost - the press for regulating  
"disgraceful unemployment between the present property will be  
united"

It had not received the outflow of new gold  
we had to exchange our money for new gold  
after a decade of new expansion, some good stuff



there is a hard supply.

Prices were exploding up. The dollar fell - purchasing power  
some 20% down in year more than in any 12-month period in  
our decade.

The red flag in the economic forecast was the 25% increase  
in military spending to feed the swift, sudden, massive  
escalation of our commitment in U.N. and your role may extend  
to believe that the market would pay for the spare  
program, the War on Poverty - all the while keeping a steady  
supply of consumer goods, steady growth, & low interest rates  
of loans. The idea had not yet perished - but it is absolutely  
clear that all economic activity will be paying the cost  
for an military expansion.

1965 saw the G.I.B.A. come into field operation, Operation

Heart Beat, submarine control, Universal disaster, approach  
There were mitigation. These disasters mismanaged - but there  
was also human relief - proper. The War on Poverty officials  
had deployed their troops - But at your end troops had been  
not to pull back, reluctant. To substantially the people are, the  
war on the people you into it should have to be  
unimpaired, low light - now even. There will be  
more and more man will analyze the situation have



made it clear that they would not be made head of S.V.N  
 to disrupt the local unity. The President seemed  
 to E.O.A. being head here, based on commitment for developing  
 welfare for the people. They talked for the affluent. One can not  
revert remembering of one year will for the time pass on  
the daily reality of global economic reality. The decision  
 which the president makes is his budget higher than in the past  
and of welfare will be seen whether in the social in  
an article of personal rel. will be concerned in effect  
campaign against the President will be in the future - T  
years of the future will be in the future of the future  
in the future of the future of the future of the future  
which you are in the future of the future of the future



There were some social issues in 1965 -  
 the movement to the future of the future of the future of the future  
 should be of the future of the future of the future of the future  
 but some remained on the future of the future of the future of the future  
 discussion. One factor is that of an individual's position in the future  
with bound to have the problems of the future of the future of the future

- Some of the issues
- Comparison of the future
- Predictions of the future
- With the help of some people











the deliberate delay of court registration of these registrations - over  
 application process only - & replied for next time - <sup>immediate</sup> ~~the result~~  
 a second full mail <sup>subsequent</sup> ~~letter~~ letter time to the post - at  
 least 3 months - "What the President can do with the congress  
Tragedy, The final result - one of the first movements of 1965 - the  
 Passage of the Vietnam Refugee Bill <sup>called for</sup> ~~by~~ Federal legislation on  
 the anticipated conclusion and an end to specious Vietnam  
Qualifications Test.

When Mr. Johnson addressed a joint assembly of Congress  
 on the V. Ref. Bill he stated the refugee of the new generation  
 and refugee legislation "We shall overcome" must be seen  
 as completing the last 10 years of the WRHS  
 to serve our people and the building of the future  
 section of L.A. in California and the future of the people  
program - more opportunities and with the most regard

of refugees, 31 were dead  
 700 " injured  
 2,400 " in the area  
 soon of refugees in the area in the area  
 few days which had passed and the area was still in the area;  
people still in the area and the area was still in the area -  
it was that the area was still in the area and the area  
people, The small number of people in the area was still in the area  
 to resemble other in the area and the area was still in the area  
 was not delight in the area and the area was still in the area



Amidst the moment it to read made, but still the  
repetition that of the case was not settled - if  
more & repeated & attended to be explained off for  
the was smaller & yet another with in order to keep -  
the small sum or for estimated on hand, the other,  
ad, excellent.

On the Pomoteu side any road could be Suway to V.W.,  
to the collations and to concrete roads - to the  
road and do not wait, could not, by  
road possible to wait.

During 1965 debate on the progress in U.N. because  
accident - it had not been decided whether the S.U.N. should be  
left free to be decided by the Security Council - but the matter -  
by years and the United States and the United States  
had transformed the program of military assistance into a field  
of military commitment, he hoped the United States of  
the U.N. in Mansfield - so unless and perhaps more  
served + if possible the world

The U.S. as a U.N. member has the commitment  
which led to the ~~substance~~, the commitment  
is now in great depth & ~~anyone~~ ~~under~~  
assumes that the projection is reasonable  
before an ordered and acceptable power can  
be ~~obtained~~ ~~assured~~ ~~error~~, indeed,  
it is now likely to be increased.











on peaceful terms. What is needed is a little readily - money  
is to be given. A demerol protocol, signs, at least a year of  
complexed and readily at penning to spread here - S.V.N.  
may take to year - 2 but let us have money - readily -

The S.V.N. money is my handle operation is black of money  
negotiable. I have said to you before then put your - money  
and believe that because of our power to control will be there  
there.

In June 1943, 23, 000 men and 3,000 to about 100  
modern men. The first. 2, 000 men are there only.  
We disposed then to of it. The middle part was  
- power. But there was also used a complex - little  
good - then to be done in the field -



20 years ago the 2nd series was the most important series in the history  
down to the present time - but only is there an actual series.

Under the rule, defined in the 1st series as an act of force -  
yet the first representation of those two series was  
could not cover the Kashmir War -

When there was no aid to impress Egyptian to  
Indonesian series then aid to Indonesian Indonesian  
which is possible but was an Indonesian

Washington is not the only great capital which may be











## Kaddish

Friday

12/24/65

Sunday

12/26/65

### Those who passed away this week

JEROME R. GARDNER  
MORTIMER L. GREENBERG  
SAMUEL THAL

## Yahrzeits

LILLIAN R. SCHWARTZ  
NATHAN E. POLSTER  
FANNIE KURZ OPPENHEIMER  
JOSEPH ROSKOPH  
NATE SCHAFFNER  
MAX MYERS  
MORRIS H. RICH  
MAX BEATUS  
RUTH GREEN CARL  
CAROLYN B. FISHEL  
ISAAC ALSBACHER  
JOSEPH COLBERT  
THEODORE LEVINE

MARIE V. FALK  
CARRIE FELBER  
SAMUEL SCHULIST  
ELAINE MAE SCHOCK  
SIEGMUND JOSEPH  
WILLIAM B. COHEN

READ ON SUN. DEC. 26 ONLY  
JEANNE B. FEDER  
JOEL M. KOBLITZ

~~ESTHER FELBER~~



The U.S. is in V.N. and whatever the circumstances which led to that situation the commitment is now in great depth and anyone who assumes that the projection is reversible before an ordered peace can be obtained assumes in error. Indeed, it is more likely to be increased.

