



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
49

Box
15

Folder
852

The Year in Review, 1966.

THE YEAR IN REVIEW

Rabbi Daniel Jeremy Silver

Last year, two hundred million Indians suffered chronic malnutrition. A voice from the past was heard in the land. It was the voice of the priest-philosopher Malthus, who in 1798 warned in his Essays on Population that we tend to spawn faster than we develop means of subsistence. He said that men were careless breeders and incredibly short-sighted planners. We grab for all the material advantages of life but we are careless with their conservation. Rather than effect intelligent controls over population we expose ourselves willy-nilly ~~over~~ to the wolves of pestilence, war and periodic famine. For a good long time after the publication of his book, advances in agricultural technology made many feel that Malthus had been a far too gloomy prophet. But, incredibly, in this, the twenty-fifth year of the Atomic Age and the tenth year of the Space Age, mankind stands on the brink of the most decimating famine in all of history. No one knows how many die in India every day of simple starvation. Within five years Pakistan and China will suffer a similar dismal fate. Within the decade the Arab Near East, much of Latin America and North Africa will join the unhappy list of starving and hungry nations.

Population tends to multiply at a near geometric pace. Programs of population control and of land reclamation tend to move ahead at a snail's pace. The danger of famine has been widely broadcast. The governments of the world are well aware of the urgency of food production and population control. Yet, incredibly, there are still many cultures and at least one

modern Western faith which insist on old-fashioned social moralities, which emphasize childbearing and not family planning and birth control. Even more incredibly many leaders of hungry nations continue to do business as usual; to prepare large defense budgets, to divert into their pockets capital designed for the physical improvement of their land, to put off and delay reclamation projects which were needed yesterday and a year ago. India and Pakistan can not afford an arms race over Kashmir. Egypt, Syria and Jordan can not afford to dream dreams of revenge against Israel. But the arms are somehow purchased, and the dreams are rendered into battle plans. The vanities of power beguile and entice far too many heads of state. They disdain the hard, sweaty, dirty labor of building dams, pouring concrete, planning hospitals, laying irrigation pipes for the glory of reviewing large armies and the glamour of playing the game of international intrigue. In the process their countries are bankrupted, morally as well as financially.

In the last ten years the United States has sent 140 billion tons of surplus food to the overpopulated nations. In February of this past year the President went before the Congress to ask for an extension and an increase in our Food For Peace Program. We will send more food as we have sent development opportunity through our economic aid, our A.I.D. program, World Bank loans, and the like. We have been among those who have tried to give life to the living.

Unfortunately, there is another side to our activities. During the last several years the great industrial powers of the West, Russia, Germany, France, England and the United States have become arm merchants to the

world. Eager to keep our defense plants humming, eager to develop a favorable balance of trade, eager to keep friendly military juntas friendly, we have plied the hungry nations with bullets and guns and tanks and planes. We have corrupted the corruptable. We have enticed those who could be enticed. In this last year alone, 20 billion dollars worth of military hardware was sent by industrial nations to nations who can not afford large standing armies because they can not afford to feed their people. The world requires an arms embargo, not an arms race. The world requires increased agricultural yield, not increased fire power. And yet, the arms manufacturers, generally supported by and encouraged by their governments who grant poor nations favorable loan arrangements, pandered to the vanities of rulers and leaders, diverting their attention from that which is urgent, hastening the day when the world will be clawing for food as hungry dogs claw for a meatless bone thrown to them from the table. Instead of helping the world beat swords into plowshares, we are huckstering swords about the world -- and this is the way not of peace but of death and starvation.

During 1966 the American people discovered that their own vast agricultural surplus had diminished. We did not face famine. Much land was still lying fallow. We did face increased food costs. Housewives organized price strikes in Denver, Texas and Oregon. These food strikes were symbolic of a growing awareness among Americans that you have to pay the piper. For the better part of two years we had happily danced behind the Presidential piper. He played for us a happy tune which promised a victory in Asia without

a tightening of the domestic belt. He told us that we could have what we wished in Viet Nam and at the same time prosecute the War on Poverty; spend great sums of money on our educational system, which God knows require it; and effectively concern ourselves with mass transportation, water and air de-pollution, urban blight, all the serious domestic problems which confront us. The President sang this song in his State of the Union address:

"We will not permit those who fire upon us in Viet Nam to win a victory over desires of all the American people.

This nation is mighty enough, its society healthy enough, its people are strong enough to pursue our goals in the rest of the world, while building the Great Society at home."

The song was sung all year long, but the notes began to grate on our ears. The war was costing more than 2 billion dollars a month. In November it was discovered that Washington had under-estimated the cost of war by some ten billions of dollars. In eighteen months inflation had erased 6% of the buying power of the dollar.

Faced with a budget which in the next fiscal year will reach 125 or 126 billion dollars, 25% more than last year, the American people's common sense ran square up against the President's confidence that he could maintain a high level of domestic expenditures, fight an increasingly costly war, and not bite into our prosperity. Between the President's confidence and our common sense lay the much discussed credibility gap.

In New York City a program which is bringing the light of reading literacy to 20,000 adults is to be closed next month. Across the nation Job Corps

Centers are being phased out. The government will no longer make small business loans to small business men in the ghettos of the central cities. The anger and bitterness of the recent testimony by Civil Rights leaders, representatives of the poor and social workers before Senator Ribicoff's Executive Reorganization Sub-committee dealing with urban affairs, made it quite clear that hopes had been blue pencilled, that the shoe pinched and it pinched most tightly on those who had the least share in our abundance.

We had danced to the Presidential piper and we had danced ourselves into serious difficulty. The election results in November gave evidence that the people no longer chorused the piper's tune. The American people felt that they had not been leveled with, that they had not been talked straight to, that they were still being enticed and beguiled by promises which could not be met. The President's party lost 47 seats in the House, 3 in the Senate, 8 Governor's chairs, 9 majority state legislators. There were many explanations of this vote. But one was supreme and paramount. It was a vote of lessening confidence in the Administration's projects and performance. It was a demand for honesty and consultation. There was a price to be paid and Americans wanted to know why and how much and if it was necessary.

On the domestic scene 1966 was a year of growing awareness and of higher costs. It was a year of escalation and of higher casualties in Viet Nam. The year began with 185,000 United States servicemen in Viet Nam, 40,000 serving with the Seventh Fleet in the South China Seas, 12,000 in Thailand. At the year's end there were 390,000 United States servicemen in Viet Nam, 40,000 in Thailand, 40,000 with the Seventh Fleet, 45,000 South Korean

mercenaries fighting with our armies and a brigade of New Zealand and Australian troops.

During 1966 it became increasingly clear that American units were bearing the major burden of aggressive military action. Most of the fall and early winter our casualties outnumbered those of the South Viet Nameese army. Their capability, if not their morale, was limited. There were at least 150,000 deserters from the South Viet Nameese forces this year. It was increasingly evident that the announced assumption on which we had entered the war that we were defending a small, committed, freedom-loving people threatened by invasion from without and subversion from within was hollow and had been false from the very beginning.

We paid a high price in Viet Nam during 1966. Six thousand five hundred American servicemen had lost their lives. The war cost us two billion dollars and more of our reserves every month. No end to the manpower build up was in sight. The question of who shall be drafted and how became a matter of heated national debate. The question of which Great Society reforms must be slowed down and which shelved became an Administrative tangle and a national frustration.

The war has been hard-fought. Unfortunately, there is no victory in sight. What had we gained for all of our expense and for all of our casualties? Very little. Viet Cong commandos operate even in Saigon, bombing our billets, blasting our ammunition dumps. True, we seem to have dented the capability of the enemy to make large scale attacks. The Viet Cong seem to have reverted to guerilla action. But the high casualty rates of the past few months

would indicate that they have done so with deadly efficiency. We have been bombing North Viet Nam for sixteen months. We have dropped on North Viet Nam more explosive power than we dropped on the entire continent of Europe during World War II. The results? The rate of North Viet Nameese infiltration into South Viet Nam has tripled in twelve months! By our own military admission North Viet Nameese and Viet Cong soldiers are better fed, better led and better armed today than they were twelve months ago.

The policy of 1966 was a policy of escalation. It was a futile policy. We poured almost two hundred thousand more men into South Viet Nam, and all manner of equipment. The Russians poured more equipment into North Viet Nam. A week after we fired our first air missile we had one fired back at us. We bombed closer and closer to Hanoi. Four Hundred and fifty American aircraft have been lost. A hundred Russian MIGS of the latest type have been brought into North Viet Nam and presumably the air space which we have controlled without contest will not be contested. We began to organize commando raids against the North Viet Nameese coast. The Communists opened a guerrilla second front in Thailand. What will happen when we bomb the population centers of Hanoi and Haiphong? Is Saigon immune from bombing or the estuaries or our ports? If we bomb Hanoi from privileged sanctuaries in the Philippines or Thailand, what is to prevent the Communists from bombing Saigon from privileged sanctuaries in China?

It became clear during the year, that for every act of escalation on our

part, the enemy was capable of making an equal and opposite response. It is a fool's game that we play and it has been foolish and worse from the beginning.

1966 was a year of much diplomatic talk about negotiation. The year began with a thirty-seven day bombing pause over North Viet Name. Diplomats scurried about doing whatever diplomats do, trying to turn this pause into a conference, a cease-fire and negotiations. General Westmoreland complained that the Communists were using the lull to build up their striking capacity. Secretary Rusk said that there had been no significant response from Hanoi. In early February the bombings were resumed. General Westmoreland did not bother to mention that we had been using that same lull to build up our forces and that during this entire lull we had continued to bomb in South Viet Nam and Laos. Secretary U Thant of the United Nations said all year long that the response from Hanoi had not been the curt dismissal Secretary Rusk had stated it to be. Our allies in the free world continued to remind us that though we talked piously of unconditional negotiations we had anything but unconditional negotiations in mind. Our 14 points, our stipulations, made it clear that we intended to win at the Conference table what we had not won on the battlefield. We were insisting that at the end of hostilities, all troops be withdrawn, except those of our Saigon allies who would thus be left in complete physical control of all Viet Nam south of the seventeenth parallel.

Negotiation requires compromise. We were offering only to exchange an end to hostilities for victory. The offers for negotiation were not accepted.

Bullets whined in the jungle. Men died. More men were sent. And more men died and more men will be sent. As the year wore on, it became increasingly evident that Viet Nam was an international embarrassment and that the Administration had not the faintest idea how to dis-embarrass itself of it. We wanted out. We did not know how to get out.

The whole issue of negotiation was clouded over and muddy. There were those who said that the United States spoke of negotiations as a cover to new escalation of the war. There were those who said the United States had not made up its own mind. The President went to Manila. In his long hasty sweep across the outskirts of Asia he spoke of peace and negotiations. The communique from The Manila Conference spoke of peace and of negotiation. But when the President went to Chamranh Bay to speak to the troops he reverted to the victory idiom of the frontier: "Come back," he said, "with the coon skin on the wall." Bring home the scalp! Military victory or negotiated settlement? Will the real President Johnson please stand up.

As our frustration mounted, our posture towards the rest of the world became increasingly truculent. General Ongania of the Argentine overthrew a democratically-elected government. What was our response? We sent him guns and allowed him to purchase jet planes to beef up the very army he used during the summer to attack his own national university and destroy its freedom of speech. During 1966 we began to arm two of the most feudal and caste ridden kingdoms in the world—the slave owning kingdom of Saudi Arabia, and the bedouin kingdom of Jordan. Increasingly, we were involved with the caste ridden oligarchy of the Thais, a feudal nobility, opposed by their own

economic and deprived masses, and by ethnic minorities, who in Thailand are completely without the law.

1966 was for American foreign policy, a year of arm sales, and arm shipments. We thought in military and para-military terms. At the year's end the government of Sweden added the name of the United States to the list of the internationally irresponsible governments to whom the Swedish government could not sell arms. How the mighty had fallen.

Senator Aiken of Vermont said that what was needed in Washington ^{WAS} ~~were~~ not more doves or more hawks but more owls— more wisdom. What is the way of wisdom? As you well know, I have said for almost five years now that in Asia the way of wisdom is not the way of weapons. I have opposed the build up of our military forces in Viet Nam from the days in which there were only military advisors. I opposed the building up of our forces in Thailand two years ago when we first sent military advisors. The way of wisdom begins with the recognition that even the powers of the next powerful nation on the face of the globe is limited. In Asia we have bitten off more than we can chew up even if it were morally or politically proper for us so to do. The new Asian doctrine which seems to have hypnotized our government extends American power far beyond the ability of the American people to live up to the requirements of that power.

The way of wisdom is the way of peace. The path to peace begins in a unilateral cessation of the bombing of North Viet Nam. This bombing is not only legally suspicious - we are bombing a land and a government with whom we are not legally at war — it is militarily suspicious. What are the results

of sixteen months of bombing? The enemy in the field is as strong, if not stronger than he was before we began. U Thant ~~and~~ others have made ^{it} abundantly clear that the very minimum requirement for conversation with Hanoi is an end to the bombing of that land. Beyond a unilateral cessation of this bombing the American government must acknowledge what it has not yet admitted; that our rationale for this engagement has been false from the beginning. We have claimed that we are in Viet Nam simply to purge South Viet Nam of invaders, to return Viet Nam to the condition it was in before hostilities began, before the Communists began to infiltrate. In this framework we seek a Korean-type settlement, a return to the status quo ante. But that which was before was not a Korea of 1949, but a South Viet Nam divided against itself, at war with itself - a South Viet Nam which had deliberately refused to hold an internationally required plebescite on the possibility of reunification with the North.

And so, when we speak of peace, of negotiations, we can not assume that all we have to do is pull out our troops, that the North Viet Cong should pull out leaving the South Viet Nameese in control of their land. Many in the Viet Cong are southerners and many in the Saigon Junta are from the North. South Viet Nam for the South Vietnamese is even in our terms an undesirable goal. What we need in South Viet Nam is a cease-fire, an international presence, the disarmament of all combatants and the possibility of a representative government, representing North Viet Nameese and our Vietnamese, a neutralist government tied neither to the East nor to the West, concerned with the welfare of a badly bewised people.

We can not win what we expect to win in Viet Nam. We can be bled of our prosperity, bled of our young men, bled of our decencies. The year ends with our Ambassador to the United States, Mr. Goldberg, writing to U Thant, asking him to use his good office to secure negotiations. The year ends without any public avowal by our government that it has changed its stipulations on the prerequisites for negotiation. The year ends with talk of peace but without any real possibility of peace.

1966 was a year of war, of alarms of war, and of memories of other wars. In 1966 the Hawk flew over our capitol, it flew over Peking, it wheeled over Hanoi. It wheeled, flew and darted down as if it were some predatory beast, destroying life, destroying all that came into its path. China suffered terrible purges, reminiscent of the Stalin purges of the middle 1930's. Armed with the adolescent enthusiasm of his Red Guard, Mao secured his own power, destroyed his enemies and united his nation to prepare for war. We were not sure, any of us, against whom he was preparing to fight. Though he spoke bitterly of the United States as the "war mongering devil of Viet Nam," his real concern seems to be focused on his northern and western borders where Russia and China dispute ownership of lands in Outer Mongolia and Manchuria. If there is to be open conflict between these one-time Communist comrades, surely we ought to be out of Asia, far away from any possibility of being involved.

In 1966 there was war, there was preparation for war, and there were the memories of other wars. A one-time Nazi was elected Prime Minister of the Federal Republic of West Germany. A Neo-Nazi party, the National Democratic Party received a million votes in two provincial elections. The

re-unification of Germany remained the cardinal political ambition of all German political parties. Re-unification meant to the Germans not only the peaceful knitting together of the Pankow and Bonn governments, but the return to the Fatherland of Polish lands east of the Oder-Neisse Rivers, Prussia and the Sudetenland. Germany has developed the second most powerful army in all of Europe. Germany's ambitions and actions gave many sleepless nights and nightmares. It is in the heartland of Europe that the great global wars have begun and been spawned. It is the ambition and militarism of Germany which has spawned them. One prayed for a new Germany, a new heart, and one saw the old Germany, the old ways, the old arrogance, the old prejudices.

1966 was not a good year. About all that we can say for it is that we are alive. It was a year in which the world seemed hypnotized by the possibility of armed conflict. In the Near East there was the threat of war. In Central Africa there was a threat of war. In South Africa there was a threat of war. In South Asia there was war. In Central Europe there was a threat of war, and even long time peaceful neighbors in South America were, for the first time in a hundred years, arming themselves with offensive weapons.

During 1966 one needed the moral vision of our faith. It was easy to say that mankind was hypnotized to believe that man is fated, to assume that war is inevitable. Not so. If there will be war, we will have bred the war. It will have been our own inactivity, our own carelessness, our own ambitions, our own arrogance, our own and mankind's, which will have brought the holocaust.

Our faith teaches us that human destiny is of human manufacture. Peace or war, disaster or progress — which shall it be? As 1966 ended we looked

for the peace-makers. We sought the architects, the builders, the doctors, the social workers, the teachers, the statesman who can build bridges of understanding, and the basis for cooperation between man.

It is in our tradition to end on an encouraging note. However, realistic the assessment, we are after all alive, there is hope. Where is our hope? You are our hope. Mankind is not an abstract. Governments do not exist out there. We are mankind. We are the government. Hope? Here in our hands. Vision? Here in our minds. Kindness and understanding? Here in our hearts. Man has the necessary abilities to architect the Great Society and a world partnership in peace. We lack nothing except courage and vision and a sense of urgency. As 1966 ends and 1967 begins, let us pray for that courage and vision and sense of urgency.



a Jan. 4 1966 to present and to the Congress in 1966
From the House of Representatives, and meeting 10 years and 10 months
to the House of Representatives, 1966

1966 to the House of Representatives, 1966
to the House of Representatives, 1966

presented, but not in the House of Representatives, 1966
presented, but not in the House of Representatives, 1966

presented, but not in the House of Representatives, 1966
presented, but not in the House of Representatives, 1966

presented, but not in the House of Representatives, 1966
presented, but not in the House of Representatives, 1966

presented, but not in the House of Representatives, 1966
presented, but not in the House of Representatives, 1966

presented, but not in the House of Representatives, 1966
presented, but not in the House of Representatives, 1966

presented, but not in the House of Representatives, 1966
presented, but not in the House of Representatives, 1966

presented, but not in the House of Representatives, 1966
presented, but not in the House of Representatives, 1966

presented, but not in the House of Representatives, 1966
presented, but not in the House of Representatives, 1966

presented, but not in the House of Representatives, 1966
presented, but not in the House of Representatives, 1966

presented, but not in the House of Representatives, 1966
presented, but not in the House of Representatives, 1966

presented, but not in the House of Representatives, 1966
presented, but not in the House of Representatives, 1966

presented, but not in the House of Representatives, 1966
presented, but not in the House of Representatives, 1966

ask - what are the under and the
stimulation & double, vague, impaired some more than
can be as poor as we needed as long as they could
or other people would not be able to do this?

The VA heard during 1966 that some small
businesses were being taken over - that means that
these have to be merged into public domain - ~~that means~~ that

See General of Personnel and
and need process forms
and need process forms
and need process forms

5000 lbs
 10000 lbs
 15000 lbs
 20000 lbs
 25000 lbs
 30000 lbs
 35000 lbs
 40000 lbs
 45000 lbs
 50000 lbs
 55000 lbs
 60000 lbs
 65000 lbs
 70000 lbs
 75000 lbs
 80000 lbs
 85000 lbs
 90000 lbs
 95000 lbs
 100000 lbs

1. W.B.H.S. The
 2. W.B.H.S. The
 3. W.B.H.S. The
 4. W.B.H.S. The
 5. W.B.H.S. The
 6. W.B.H.S. The
 7. W.B.H.S. The
 8. W.B.H.S. The
 9. W.B.H.S. The
 10. W.B.H.S. The
 11. W.B.H.S. The
 12. W.B.H.S. The
 13. W.B.H.S. The
 14. W.B.H.S. The
 15. W.B.H.S. The
 16. W.B.H.S. The
 17. W.B.H.S. The
 18. W.B.H.S. The
 19. W.B.H.S. The
 20. W.B.H.S. The
 21. W.B.H.S. The
 22. W.B.H.S. The
 23. W.B.H.S. The
 24. W.B.H.S. The
 25. W.B.H.S. The
 26. W.B.H.S. The
 27. W.B.H.S. The
 28. W.B.H.S. The
 29. W.B.H.S. The
 30. W.B.H.S. The
 31. W.B.H.S. The
 32. W.B.H.S. The
 33. W.B.H.S. The
 34. W.B.H.S. The
 35. W.B.H.S. The
 36. W.B.H.S. The
 37. W.B.H.S. The
 38. W.B.H.S. The
 39. W.B.H.S. The
 40. W.B.H.S. The
 41. W.B.H.S. The
 42. W.B.H.S. The
 43. W.B.H.S. The
 44. W.B.H.S. The
 45. W.B.H.S. The
 46. W.B.H.S. The
 47. W.B.H.S. The
 48. W.B.H.S. The
 49. W.B.H.S. The
 50. W.B.H.S. The
 51. W.B.H.S. The
 52. W.B.H.S. The
 53. W.B.H.S. The
 54. W.B.H.S. The
 55. W.B.H.S. The
 56. W.B.H.S. The
 57. W.B.H.S. The
 58. W.B.H.S. The
 59. W.B.H.S. The
 60. W.B.H.S. The
 61. W.B.H.S. The
 62. W.B.H.S. The
 63. W.B.H.S. The
 64. W.B.H.S. The
 65. W.B.H.S. The
 66. W.B.H.S. The
 67. W.B.H.S. The
 68. W.B.H.S. The
 69. W.B.H.S. The
 70. W.B.H.S. The
 71. W.B.H.S. The
 72. W.B.H.S. The
 73. W.B.H.S. The
 74. W.B.H.S. The
 75. W.B.H.S. The
 76. W.B.H.S. The
 77. W.B.H.S. The
 78. W.B.H.S. The
 79. W.B.H.S. The
 80. W.B.H.S. The
 81. W.B.H.S. The
 82. W.B.H.S. The
 83. W.B.H.S. The
 84. W.B.H.S. The
 85. W.B.H.S. The
 86. W.B.H.S. The
 87. W.B.H.S. The
 88. W.B.H.S. The
 89. W.B.H.S. The
 90. W.B.H.S. The
 91. W.B.H.S. The
 92. W.B.H.S. The
 93. W.B.H.S. The
 94. W.B.H.S. The
 95. W.B.H.S. The
 96. W.B.H.S. The
 97. W.B.H.S. The
 98. W.B.H.S. The
 99. W.B.H.S. The
 100. W.B.H.S. The

(Faint handwritten text, possibly bleed-through from the reverse side)

[illegible][illegible]

~~Confidential~~
dated under
and
and

that we would present a very
poor, very, and unimproved condition the
our condition ; the poor poor poor poor

The uncorroborated story of a well known leader of the
movement testifies before Sen. Riehoff ^{Ever. Reorganized} ~~that~~ ^{but} -
Committee would clear that the fact is - fact with into
the hope of many - & not fall into the hands of the devil
fortunate consequences.

What the press said argued in the testimony; the nation said
silently in the Nov. election. The Johnson's only lost
47 seats in the House, 3 in the Senate, 1 Gov. office, &
a majority control of 9 state legislatures. The media were
subject to many interpretations - but as the Dem. Gov.
Chap. the media made clear - it was fact and found

is statement of unimpaired confidence in the primary and the
policy of the White Administration was long had
lost to you and 6 100 was and which is
Pres. admitted it publicly - and - it had deliberate policy
discontinuing the work of the United States Army. These men
remained in
the army and
from must not be for

Don't think, 1966 was a year of major achievements,
high work, 2nd V.N. 1966 was a year of achievement &
high achievement.

There were 155,000 U.S. personnel in VN a year
ago, under 12,000 in Thailand, to now 40,000 men in
the 7th fleet in the China Sea. There were to be now 320,000
men in V.N., 40,000 in Thailand, to now 40,000.
in the 7th fleet, and to maintain now 45,000 S.K. in the area
a number of unlabeled V.N. men in the area.

[illegible]

The pull of random forces in dis-acculturation ^{and} to
 requires an acknowledgment of the full nature of the S.V.N. conflict
 The NLF consists not only of murderers but of revolutionaries, -
 even in the South consists not only of S.V.N. but of N.V.N.,
regulating forces but also about 200 UN to place
in the past war not just one V.N. What is
required is a new face - not a mere change of all
commitment - a UN presence - not the emptying of all
the land of all the S.V.N., the U.S. has a place
in the land and the South is regulating not a new
the and the land of the South is regulating not a new
part of the world, the U.S. has a place
in the land and the South is regulating not a new
conflict is regulating not a new
will have offered negotiation - an unprecedented and
to a historical new.



in order to wipe out dissent, to build up of two of the most important...
 and Jordan and our Arab...
 dissent and opposition.
 In a symbolic...
 to the United States...
 irresponsible...
 over Peking;
 of the Red Guard...

world that the first step in negotiation must be a unilateral end to our bombing of North Vietnam--a country with which we are not officially at war and which is not officially at war with us. This need has been stated ~~xxx~~ ^{only} not/by the Communist nations, by our allies, by the Pope and by some of the most respected men in the Senate.

It is not clear what Mr. Johnson is prepared to sacrifice for peace. His much vaunted trip to Honolulu, precipitated and hasty. General Ky returned to Saigon ~~XXX~~ - he spoke of a military attack on North Vietnam. The President's trip to the Phillippines in October was again precipitated a hasty and carefully worded communique in Manila lost all real meaning when the President spoke to our troops at Camrah Bay and told them in the words of Frontier America "Come home with the Koon Skin on the wall."

It seemed clear that the United States does not know how to disembarass itself of a disembarassing involvement. The increasing truculance in other areas of our National policy show the frustration of this war. Around the world we have ~~xxxxx~~ taken up again the responsibility of military juntas in Argentina, Brazil and Venezuela--with governments who attack their own universities in order to wipe out dissent. In the Near East we are subsidizing the military build up of two of the most feudal ~~xxxxx~~ kingdoms in the world, Saudi Arabia and Jordan and our Arms to the Thai government to attack, dissent and opposition.

In a symbolic act the Swedish government determined not to sell arms to the United States under a law which prohibits Sweden from such sales to irresponsible nations. ~~The hawk wealed over Washington and over Hanoi and over Pekin,~~ ^{purge} Mao's ~~approach~~ effected ~~that he was~~

of the Red Guard reminded the world of Stalin's purges 30 years ago which

*It would also seem to be an
advantage to precede any
possible military action in
such as to conflict of Canada*

presaged his expansionist dreams of Poland and the Nazi-Stalin pact of 1939.

China was being prepared psychologically and militarily for war. It was not certain who she was determined to fight. Hanoi still determinedly rejected

Chinese volunteers. Her military build up seemed to be concentrated on her Western and Northern borders where she disputes with Russia for control of Outer Mongolia and Upper Manchuria. The sign of Soviet split

held within it the possibility of war within the communist camp. *Page 7466* There was

~~war~~ ^{was} and the alarms of war and the memories of war everywhere. Germany had built up her Bundeswehr into ~~xx~~ the second most powerful army in Europe.

Prussia, Polish lands east of the Oder and Miesse Rivers and the Sudetenland were still pictured on German maps as part of the German fatherland. An

Ex-Nazi became Prime Minister and almost a million people voted for a Neo-Nazi party in provincial elections. There was war, there was the danger of

war and there was the memory of other wars and there was ~~XX~~ an urgent need for statesmanship and peace making. One had the feeling that if the United

States could swallow its pride and accept a neutralized Vietnam and disembrace itself of a vision of American power in Asia, other men might find other ways to

resolve other outstanding issues. I confess also that one had the feeling that

^{persisted} if the United States ~~persisted~~ on its present course, the tensions of the world

would and the ~~dangerous~~ dangers of a world war of holocaustical

proportions was present and near. Our faith teaches us that we are not fated or

destined - that we have it in our own power to build the bridges of peace, *and on*

to create the bitterness that breeds war. Rarely in recent times as there been

such a need for men and nations of courage and steadfast convictions who will sacrifice their vanity and ambition for peace, who will direct the welfare and

the many skills of men to the very real problems of poverty and illiteracy, of

ill-health and malnutrition, which are omni-present. ~~We cry out for help.~~



Kaddish

Friday Dec 23 1966

Sunday Dec 25 1966

Those who passed away this week

LOUIS M. BLOCH

PHOEBE FALLON

MOLLIE GREENSPAN

MILDRED MEISEL

HELEN ROTH

Vahrzeits

JEROME R. GARDNER

SAM KLEIN

BEN KORMAN

CHARLOTTE HAVRE

MARIE V. FALK

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

DR. M. D. FRIEDMAN

WILLIAM GOLDSMITH

READ ON SUN DEC. 25 ONLY

PHILLIP L. STEINBERG

ELAINE MAE SCHOCK