



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
52

Box
16

Folder
965

Deeper Into Asian Mud, 1971.

Deeper Into Asian Mud
The Folly of Vietnam Goes On and On and On
Daniel Jeremy Silver
February 28, 1971

Vietnam has spelled tragedy, a tragedy for the victims of this senseless war, tragedy for all ^{for all} southeast Asia, the war has been fought, the war has despoiled the countryside, the farm and the jungle, tragedy for this nation whose polity it has divided, tragedy for the world whose interests it has preoccupied, there were far more pressing problems to be concerned with. The majority of the American people wanted to be quit of Vietnam for a number of years. ^{To the} ~~It is a~~ credit to the American people, at least the majority of them, as soon as they saw the consequences of this involvement they began to clamor for withdrawal, for an end. Certainly this was at least part of the significance of the elections of 1968; certainly this is what the Gallup and other polls have been revealing to us in increasing proportions in the last months ^{and} years; certainly this is what our own conversations, our own knowledge of others, our neighbors, ^{and} friends would indicate. The President misunderstood the temper of the American people, he has not denied it. In fact, in the last address to Congress dealing with our foreign affairs, ^{trying} ~~he tried~~ to explain his policies in southeast Asia he wrote ^{of their initiation} and ~~he~~ included this phrase: "The support of the American people during the remainder of the conflict requires a diminishing United States involvement." The President, for reasons of principle, his reasons were quite personal reasons, wants to be out of Vietnam. There are only two issues on which he can lose the next election; one is the issue of the economic health of the nation, the other is the issue of the war in Vietnam, the casualty lists, inflation. And the two are intertwined, inter ^{linked}, for it is the over two hundred billions of dollars which we have poured into that Asian mud which has to the largest degree unbalanced our economy and brought about the present straitened circumstance. Two hundred

billion dollars - I did a little arithmetic the other day. If in 1960 we had given to every man, woman and child in South Vietnam and North Vietnam and Cambodia and *in* Laos fifty thousand dollars we would have spent less money in southeast Asia than we have spent on war. And imagine the hospitals that could have been built, the roads which could have been laid, the agricultural irrigation project which could have been undertaken, fifty thousand dollars for every man, woman and child. Or if we had taken ~~the~~ ^{is} same two hundred billion dollars and given it to the poor families in America who represent the "other America", the poor, those who live below the poverty line, we could have given ~~them~~ a quarter million dollars, two hundred and fifty thousand dollars, to every such family and still have spent less of our national treasury. Imagine the decent housing we could have raised, imagine the kind of schooling we could have provided; imagine the kind of deprivation we could have undone. Instead of ~~we~~ ^{this} we find ourselves, because of the budget, because of our war budget, because of fifteen years of war budgets, we find ourselves cutting back on minimal welfare support, cutting back on public housing, cutting back on all the programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity, cutting back on educational and medical research, cutting back on all those things which make for the vitality and *the* vigor and ^{the} health of the nation.

Vietnam is a disaster. The question is what do we do about it? How do we get out? Many of us have become so frustrated, the war has lasted so long, the policies which have been undertaken by successive governments, Republican, Democratic, ^{Republican}, the policies have been so inimicable to what we have wanted that we in a sense have *turned* ~~to~~ off, *tuned* ~~to~~ out. There are a lot of people I know, there are a lot of people whom you know, who whenever the news comes on flick ~~the~~ the news off, ^{who skip} ~~Wade~~ ~~sick~~ of the black headlines of southeast Asia, out of sight is

somehow out of mind. We don't want any part of this ongoing guilt, ongoing burden, ongoing frustration, it's too much for us. And many of us have become almost paranoid in our reactions about Vietnam. We have come to look upon successive administrations as the devil incarnate; we have come to assume that every ^{one} ~~word~~ of their undertaking is mach^{avellian} ~~avellian~~, mischievous, ^{shrewd} ~~crude~~, diabolic. What they propose in all areas we have come to instinctively deny, we have reacted with our passions rather than with our intelligence. And though as you know I fundamentally and totally believe that we have been misguided in every action we have taken in southeast Asia I submit to you that a kind of naive pacifism is not wisdom but the absence of policy; that a bumper sticker "Another Family For Peace" is not a conceived calculating reasonable realistic foreign policy; that ^{naive} isolationism would be one of the worst disasters which could come out of southeast Asia. The President said in his report to Congress ^{just two} ~~a few~~ days ago that he saw forces in America which would sweep us towards an isolationism which would be as disastrous as excessive zeal and in that I agree with him. The American people have somehow come to believe that the world is different than the world really is; that if only America would cease being so belligerent, so ^{malicious} ~~monarchous~~, so imperialistic, if we only would withdraw from wherever we have commitments then somehow all of the problems of the world would drain away. The only guilt which exists in the world is our guilt. We have guilt aplenty, but there is guilt to be shared because there is greed in every nation. The world survives not because the nations of the world want peace, but because there is a balance of terror between the nations. Yes, there is a lesson in southeast Asia but there is also a lesson in the Middle East. Yes, there is a lesson in Cambodia, but there is also a lesson in Czechoslovakia and ^{Munich} did take place. I believe we've drawn the line at the wrong place in the wrong part of

the world for the wrong reasons, but lines must be drawn. We do not live in a world where everyone out there is saintly and we alone are the devil. We live in a world of ^{spring} ~~grass~~ greedy nations, each trying to take advantage commercially, militarily, in terms of balance of power of all other nations and we must never forget this. It may not be the world we want to live in; it may not be the world we want to leave to our children, but this is the world. We can't ^{blink} ~~break~~ it away. No amount of moralism, pietism, simplistic pacifism will allow us to change the nature of the world. When a weak animal is blooded the hounds redouble their effort. The President is right when he says that this nation must be very careful to remind itself always that there are commitments, freedom, ^{defense} for one's self. We cannot be gainsay which must be honored.

I'm not prepared for ^{all my adamant} violent opposition to the ^{President's} ~~questions~~ policies in Vietnam to ^{blink} two statements he made. I do not believe that he is ^{machiavellian only} ~~machiavellian, finally~~. I believe him when he says I want to end the war and save the lives of the brave young men in Vietnam. And I believe him when he tries to explain his policy in terms of ^{the} continuing commitments of the United States. I want to end it in a way which will increase the chance that their younger brothers and their ~~younger~~ sons will not have to fight in some future Vietnam some place in the world. I simply believe that he is applying the logic to the wrong place, drawing the wrong line. I find myself in short often protesting the war among those whose protests are not taken on the same basis as mine, those who are opposed to all American commitments anywhere in the world and I do believe that the greatest power in the world has commitments in western Europe; it has commitments in the Middle East; it has commitments in Latin America, ^{commitments} which must be honored, commitments to those weaker, ^{yet} ~~and~~ who are aligned with us in common purpose and common value. My

^{own} ~~only~~ feeling about Vietnam is that we ought to follow ^{have} in Vietnam the example that General DeGaulle set for us when he withdrew the French from Algeria. The French, you remember, fought the National Liberation Front of the Algerians for some eight years. It was a bloody war, *it drained France's* economy, France was being ticked off as no longer a great power, it was a third rate power. Then General DeGaulle *came* ~~changed~~ *into office*. He looked at the situation. He saw that half of the French army was involved in Algeria. He saw how much of the French treasury was being ^{forced} ~~pushed~~ down *that desert drain* and he cut French losses in Algeria overnight. He announced withdrawal. He turned the withdrawal, the retreat of French troops, into a logistic triumph. He negotiated with the National Liberation Front ~~and~~ ^{of} the Algerians, ^{the} ~~to~~ withdraw ^{al} peacefully the exodus of the ^{al} the French Nationals, some of whom ^{had} ~~have~~ lived in Algeria for two, three, four and more generations. And at the end of that tunnel the French economy was buoyant, France was again able to become a major power, ^{the} the glory that DeGaulle thought so much of and which ^{he} ~~she~~ has ^e paddled around the world became again a possibility of the French nation and, interestingly, France began to earn dollars from Algeria from its commercial enterprises, not to throw away ~~blank~~ dollars in Algeria as heretofore. I believe that this ought to have been our policy in Vietnam once we saw the disastrous consequences of our involvement. The only ^{argument} ~~army~~ *I have heard* against such a policy would be that so many of our allies would be slaughtered ^{if} ~~in~~ the Viet Cong and the National Liberation Front and North Vietnamese marched into Saigon. Perhaps. Blood has flown in southeast Asia for twenty-five years. The streets have been bloody during all of those twenty-five years and I somehow suspect that if we really wanted to we could negotiate with Hanoi about the removal of *minions* and puppets ^{from} ~~in~~ that part of the world and ^{move} ~~have~~ them safely to these shores.

The President has argued

and argued consistently since he has

since he has come into office, not against this policy of unilateral withdrawal. He has spoken of winding down the war and easing ourselves out. His arguments have taken generally this form and I take this from his report of two days ago, but he has spoken in this way on many many occasions. Others, he wrote, urge that we liquidate our presence immediately, cut our losses, and leave the South Vietnamese on their own. He reads me very well. I have repeatedly explained why I consider this a disastrous path: For the South Vietnamese people who would have lost their collective political choice and countless individual lives. For other non-communist countries, especially in Asia, among whom not a single leader recommended such a policy, for the global credibility of the U. S. word, for those Americans who have made such heavy sacrifices and for the integrity of American society in the post-Vietnam era.

I understand his logic, but I must confess that I reject it. He argues that we ought to wind down the war, not to withdraw, for the South Vietnamese people who could have lost their collective political choice and countless individual lives. When have the South Vietnamese people had a collective free political choice? Yes, they have lost countless individual lives, but I submit to you that the Vietnamization of the war will guarantee only that they will lose countless more individual lives. What is it? That the policy that the casualty list shall be of Vietnamese corpses rather than of American corpses. Yes, I can understand him when he says for other non-communist countries, especially in Asia, among whom not a single leader recommended such a policy, but I would submit that the policies recommended

South Korea, Thailand and Phillipines are minions and puppets, hardly represent the sum and the burden of the advice which has been given to the west by the free world. What do the leaders in Europe say and what do some of the leaders in free world Latin America say? That American involvement in southeast Asia has precluded America's involvement in their problems, that we have lacked the money, we have lacked the clout, we have lacked the will to maintain the forces of NATO adequately, that we have lacked the money, we have lacked the will to maintain the ties of economic reform and infusion of our monies into Latin America so much needed. And that because of our preoccupation in southeast Asia the free world as it has been traditionally defined is the weaker, not the stronger.

Yes, I can understand the President when he says for other non-communist countries, especially Asia, among whom not a single leader has recommended such a policy, but I submit that Thailand and the Phillipines and South Korea ought not to determine what our policy shall be. It's good for them, but not necessarily good for the free world.

What about for the global credibility of the United States word? When is one's word as a nation creditable? When one can act to meet one's commitments; when so much of American wealth and so much of American weaponry and so much of the American army is tied down in Vietnam what do we have left elsewhere in the world to make our word creditable? Why has the Russian navy moved ~~up~~ unopposed into the Mediterranean? Why has the Russian navy moved almost unopposed into the South Atlantic? Because we lack the capability to operate on two fronts effectively because of southeast Asia. The creditability of our word depends on

our ability support the free nations of the world. We have lacked the flexibility with all of our energies, all of our concerns, so much of our treasure was involved in that one little part. What about those Americans who have made such heavy sacrifices? The sacrifice of life is tragedy. Forty-five thousand Americans have died. Will they be resurrected by the sacrifice of more lives? How does one honor the sacrifice of the dead? By maintaining the values of the nation. Is our nation united, whole, strong, of one mind, of common purpose? Or has in fact Vietnam split us apart into roaring camps, where so preoccupied each with its own individual aims there lacks any sense in this nation of ours today of common overarching purpose. Where is the trust we once implicitly had in our government? That somehow it would muddle through internationally and lead us domestically? That, too, has been washed out in the dirty linen of southeast Asia.

I'm afraid that I must respectfully submit to our President that though I can understand the logic of his position I do not believe it ties in with the realities of America or the world today. Southeast Asia represents tragedy and this policy of winding down the war in southeast Asia represents I would respectfully submit potentially greater tragedy than we have seen heretofore. Because the President's policy for winding down the war rather than from simply withdrawing requires two elements: the first, negotiation, Paris, , peace talks and what have we offered at these peace talks? We would withdraw from southeast Asia provided the North Vietnamese would withdraw from South Vietnam. What we insisted upon from beginning to end was the viability of something called South Vietnam. We insisted that South Vietnam must be a nation; it never was, it was never intended to be, but somehow this has become a fixed idea, a requirement of our policy, the one requirement in which, of course, the North will not negotiate. Negotiations have

~~ask~~ failed.ⁱⁿ Our attempting a policy which is called Vietnamization. Vietnamization appeals to the American people. It seems to speak of a nation defining itself, assuming responsibility for its own national destiny and it has had one glorious effect which the President never ceases to remind us of in that it has permitted the President to reduce our troop commitments in southeast Asia from 548,000 two years ago to some 320,000 today, supposedly to 286,000 by May 1. And we have watched the casualty lists in southeast Asia lower themselves from a level around 250 monthly in 1968 to 180 monthly in 1969, to 81 monthly in 1970, to 51 monthly in the last six months. Pressure within our country tended to diminish as draft calls went down and as casualty lists dropped. But there is a form of selective morality involved in all of this. What was the cost? During this same period when our draft calls were being reduced and our casualty lists were going down we forced the South Vietnamese army to raise its numbers by over 20 percent, from 900,000 men to 1,100,000 men and as our casualty lists went down their casualty lists over the last year have multiplied by five fold. We haven't reduced the number of the dead; we've simply reduced the nationality of the dead. Vietnamization meant simply that bought corpses. We said: we will continue to give you support, we are with you in your efforts, we will buy the soldiers, we will give you all the air and tactical machinery support you require, but you now must slug it out on the ground; it's you who will attack when the attack moves into Laos. In order to provide the cover for the policy of Vietnamization it was obvious that the United States would have to shelter the Vietnamese forces as they had never been sheltered before.

If our combat troops were to be withdrawn our air umbrella would have to be increased. Well and good, but it soon became obvious that we had to buy more time than just that. We had somehow to cut, interdict the supply lines of the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese into South Vietnam. And so about a year ago, just in February of last year you will recall that it was suddenly revealed to the American people that when we had ceased bombing in North Vietnam we had simply moved the bombers and the fighter bombers over into Laos and that we were now operating some five hundred to a thousand missions a day against the Ho Chi Minh trail. The little panhandle of Laos whose geography has suddenly appeared in our papers these last weeks has had more bombs dropped upon it than any other piece of real estate on the face of the globe. Still thousands of trucks a day move down those trails. We began to move our bombing elsewhere into southeast Asia to increase the ambet of the war in order to protect our own troops, so the President said, but actually in order to protect the emerging forces of the South Vietnamese. And then in April of 1970 suddenly the Cambodian government was overthrown and Lun Noa's government was introduced we moved American and South Vietnamese forces into the so-called sanctuaries just across the South Vietnamese borders in Cambodia, again to cut the southern half of the Ho Chi Minh trail, more importantly to prevent supplies from coming in from Sionukville on the coast directly north Vietnamese troops. Thirdly, we moved in the last weeks north and east. We moved into Laos and were there to cut those forces.

I'm not a strategist. I don't know whether these undertakings were successful

or they were not successful. The President claims that particularly the move into Cambodia was a success, that it cut the southern supply line into the Minkoh base area of South Vietnam and, therefore, freed the South Vietnamese soldiers that were in southern Vietnam to move north for this present undertaking. I simply don't know. I do know that the rate of casualties in southeast Asia has not been reduced. I do know that where a year and a half ago there were North Vietnamese enclaves ~~just outside the~~ just outside the South Vietnamese border in Cambodia, today North Vietnamese troops range across two thirds of Cambodia, that only the capital seems to be for the moment safe and that the South Vietnamese who were to be withdrawn when our troops are withdrawn remain in Cambodia because only they maintain the river supply line to the capitol and the route which runs from the capitol to the sea. And I do know that in Laos we seem to be bogged down. We have not yet begun to move against the major parts of the trail and more than this I do know that in Laos that the north, the Communists, have operated with relative ease in one half of the country which they control. They have for reasons best known to them maintained a balance of power and not attacked Yentian, the administrative capitol and not attacked Fon Pen, the provincial capitol, ~~but~~ the big cities , whether they could do so and that they may do so now. And I do know the massive air cover which we have provided in Cambodia and in Laos does not seem to be achieving the victory with honor that the President seems to want. We have tried every kind of strategy and tactic in that part of the world, each time we have pulled up short. Because of military power there is always a response, ultimately, to every attack that you make.

What concerns me most is now that we have governed our actions by Cooper Church amendment, congressional rules representing the will of certainly the

majority of the American people that our ground forces not be involved in these attacks, we are finding ways around this kind of restriction. We are bending it, our administration is bending it in every way that it can. We'll send in massive air support; we'll send in helicopters; when the helicopters are down we'll send in combat patrols in order to bring out our own downed flyers. But what happens if it all fails? What happens if we must precipitously pull out all the South Vietnamese from Cambodia and from Laos, if in fact the North Vietnamese troops gain the upper hand? What happens then to our ground involvement in South Vietnam and beyond its borders? And more than this. The President was asked ten days ago at a press conference: were there any limits to the defense of the growing American troops in southeast Asia? His answer was that we would not engage ground troops outside of South Vietnam, that there were really no limits to the engagement of our air power. He reminded the man who asked him, a reporter, that he had told publically and privately the North Vietnamese that if they did not show increased infiltration we would not show increased aerialist response, but that they had spurned this kind of give and take and that we were prepared to do all that was necessary in order to defend our forces as they withdrew. Then he went on to say, he wanted to make special reference to a particularly irresponsible statement made by Hans Morgenthau, a professor from the University of Chicago, in which he had spoken of the possibility of using tactical and atomic weapons in southeast Asia. The United States did not contemplate such use and would not use them. He dismissed this suggestion out of hand. We have long since learned that when a President cites a columnist in a give and take he has taken that columnist seriously, that columnist has made a suggestion which cuts

close to the bone. I began to try and research this ~~significant~~ suggestion.

Hans Morgenthau in an article in The New Republic of February 1920 called "What Price Victory?" tried to analyze the possible alternatives for American action in southeast Asia. He assumed that we would not win on the ground with South Vietnamese troops what we could not win with our own troops, so he asked what alternatives are possible? He said there are three. The first alternative is unilateral withdrawal, the Algerian plan, and that the President has refused to accept. The second alternative is to so enrage the Chinese to force the Chinese to attack through North Vietnam which would unify the American people and create a global war in which the home front would be involved with a massive enemy and this, he says, is rejected throughout the Administration. The third response would be the response of trying to step up the effectiveness of our air power and only one weapon is left in our arsenal - that of tactical atomic weaponry. Tactical atomic weaponry which sounds so neat and so clean can be defined very simply. The bomb which was dropped at Hiroshima would be classified today as a tactical nuclear weapon. We would so destroy the countryside, we would so pollute the air with atomic fallout, that in a sense no life could subsist under this kind of attack; we would be able to seal off southeast Vietnam from enemy attack and, therefore, give the South Vietnamese the time that they require. Now had Hans Morgenthau imagined all of this in his fertile mind? Not at all. I reminded myself that I had read of this suggestion earlier and I discovered that on November 12 C. L. Salzberger reporting from southeast Asia from Saigon spoke of a high level briefing which he attended in which the generals present

discussed the possibility and feasibility of tactical nuclear weaponry. They dismissed it. But, obviously, it's on the table, it's in the air and there are very few other alternatives left. The present alternative of South Vietnamese ground forces and of massive American air power fails to achieve our undertaking.

Southeast Asia is a tragedy. What can we do but sit, wail and bemoan our fate. There are times when that's all we can do. The Administration is embarked on one course. We will have an opportunity here in a few months to vote out an administration if it has failed to make good on this course. There are very few alternatives to pressure the government. The alternatives are desperation and demonstrations. They seem to have little long range effect. Many in America are satisfied with Vietnamization. The reverse of it is the Cooper-Church Amendment because both of these undertakings limit our own debt, limit the cost to the American people. The President can get up and say to an audience: I have reduced the cost of war to you by one half. He said that three days ago, from twenty two billion dollars to eleven billion dollars. Assuming the mathematics has been fudged there's still a reduction in the cost of the war. He can get up and he can say: I have reduced troop levels in southeast Asia by nearly a half and I have reduced casualties in southeast Asia, our casualties, five times. And all this is true, but there is the enlargement of the war. There is the vortex to which we are in a whirlpool and to which we are being sucked into Laos and Cambodia. There are even noises about an attack north across the demilitarized zone into North Vietnam. Does it end? Can it end? We are determined to have peace and honor, peace and victory, the kind of double goal which the President has

Remind ourselves constantly that every life is precious, yellow skinned, black

set for us. I don't believe it can be achieved. I don't believe that there is any alternative now nor has there been for some years except for the American people to stand up and look at the mirror and say to themselves: we have finally lost a war. We have been defeated by one of the smallest nations on the face of the earth. We undertook something which we should never have undertaken; we have no alternative now but to withdraw and regroup, to define new national priorities. Yes, defeat - but that's the last thing a proud people, a vain, glorious people wants to admit.

The world has known many a bitter time . I suppose that there have been more bitter times in our lifetime, in the lifetime of men, than happy times. I wish I could come before you and say here is a simple blueprint. Let's do this, let's vote for this man, let's organize this party and suddenly all will be right. We voted in one party, we voted out that party, and we voted it in again - the more it changes the more it's the same thing. I wish I could say to you that obstinate obdurate demonstration against the force of the government is the way for we've had these demonstrations in the last five or six years and they have not proven to have the force. We can amass millions of people in protest. Foreign policy is the prerogative of the Administration and Congress has been willing to go along with the President as long as the President was reducing our own cost and our own lives. It's not easy, it's not a happy thing to be an American today. We bear a large measure of guilt. We are burdened with a great sense of unhappiness. What should we do? Keep clear what must be done, not ever substitute passion for intelligence; speak what must be spoken; retain the courage of our convictions. Remind ourselves constantly that every life is precious, yellow skinned, black

skinned and white skinned and that because it is the yellow skinned man who is dying in southeast Asia in largest numbers today does not mean that there is any less guilt on our part for these tragic events.

Someone said that there's a light at the end of every tunnel. A correspondent by the name of Halderstand said the other day that at the end of every tunnel in South Vietnam there's another tunnel. We come from a people who have lived underground, behind walls and in tunnels. We have found that the day, the night, the years, may be long, dark, but somehow there is a light. We must not lose faith in that light, but I cannot tell you when it will come and I cannot tell you that the cost^{ly} lives, may not be very high.



*Deeper Into
Asian Mud*

MARCH 12, 1971

MR. JACK KALISH
5900 WYNNWOOD ROAD
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA 55422

DEAR JACK:

THANKS FOR YOUR NOTE--IT WAS NICE TO HEAR FROM
YOU AND TO LEARN THAT THINGS ARE GOING WELL WITH
YOU.

CONCERNING YOUR REQUEST, I AM REFERRING YOUR NOTE
TO RABBI SILVER'S SECRETARY. I DO NOT KNOW WHETHER
THE SERMON YOU REQUEST HAS YET BEEN TRANSCRIBED,
BUT I AM SURE THAT A COPY WILL BE SENT TO YOU AS
SOON AS MISS MIHOK IS ABLE TO GET COPIES MADE.

BEST REGARDS TO YOU AND YOUR FAMILY.

CORDIALLY YOURS,

THE TEMPLE

LEO S. BAMBERGER
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

LSB:AF

5900 Wynton Road
Minneapolis, Minn 55412
Feb. 28, 1971



Mr. Le S. Bunker
The Temple
Cleveland, Ohio.
Dear Sir:

In the few years we have been in Minneapolis, we have
enjoyed receiving the weekly copies of the Temple Bulletin.
In a sense, it has helped keep us informed and in
contact and we would thank you for our subscription.
Sending us copies just a few years ago.

I notice that the theme of Rev. Dr. Johnson's sermon
today is "Dope, Drugs, and Death." Would you please

send me a copy of the sermon? I will have
a copy of Rev. Dr. Johnson's sermon in the next issue.

on Wednesday of it has helped in discussions I've
had with people here on the subject.

I hope you and your family are well.
Sincerely,
Jack Kallay

The support of the American people during the remainder of the conflict required a diminishing US involvement

sweep us toward an isolationism which would be as disastrous as excessive zeal

I want to end the war to save the lives of those brave young men in VN

I want to end it in a way which will increase the chance that their younger brothers and their sons will not have to fight in some future VN some place in the world

Others urged that we liquidate our presence immediately, cut our losses, and leave the Viet Nameese on their own. I have repeatedly explained why I consider this a Disastrous path. For the South Vietnamese people who could have lost their collective individual lives. For other non Communist countries, especially in Asia, among whom not a single leader recommended such a policy. For the global credibility of the US word. For those Americans who have made such heavy sacrifices, And for the integrity of American security in the post VN era.

political choice and countless



Kaddish

Friday ~~Feb. 26~~
Sunday 28

Those who passed away this week

MILDRED M. GOLDSTEIN
SYLVIA GOTHAM
MINNIE KLEIN

EDWARD J. SCHWEID
YETTA SPERO

Yahrzeits

MINNETTE S. LIEBENTHAL
LIZETTE RITTER MYERS
DINAH SILVER
WILLIAM SCHWARTZ
PAULINE L. GLICK
ANNA WIRTSCHAFTER RICH
WILLIAM BENSON
JOSEPH J. COPENHAGEN
CHRISTINE PALADY
ISIDORE EISENMAN
DORA MARKS STRAUSS
LENA E. KLEIN
ROBERT B. MYERS
LEO WEIDENTHAL
CHARLES ROSENFELD
SAM WEITZ
MOLLIE ROCKER SCHONBERG
MOSES W. HABER
ARTHUR E. WIESENBERGER
ARTHUR A. NEIGER

MAX EMERLING
SARAH STERN
ANITA S. FERTEL
ESTHER MELLMAN
HERMAN KEMPNER
JACK W. HELLER
RAYMOND DEUTSCH
SIDONIA L. KORACH
HERMAN GIMP
ESTHER L. BENSON
SAMUEL WEISS
DR. HERMAN C. SMITH
- DR. IRWIN E. YOELSON
- READ ON SUN. FEB. 28 ONLY
HARRY H. KOZMAN

V.N. is an American ambassador - a refugee & brother American
must act. The 1990 election suppression
The fall will indicate it

The President said it is an unusual request to appear in the
Office of US Foreign Cooperation review just and today.

THE SUPPORT OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE During THE
REMAINDER OF THE CONFLICT REQUIRES A

DIMINISHING U.S. ENVOLVEMENT.

The President said and Y.E. Rosen was for both political &
purported reasons. The war and the STATE OF THE ECONOMY

could be seen more clearly in the 1972 campaign - the way was to
bring cases which are interlinked - the unhappy state of
LABOR - and the way are interlinked - the unhappy state of

our economy is in a very serious state to 2000 was
unstable. The will of the U.S. was not to be changed in any way -
was a fact.

2000 - a new effort to bring you and our way
new members, which is NIN, SVE, LOS AND
Caribbean is presented and to 200 - that is to
hospital, schools, industry, and the state, labor
and will have our work - the state of the unstable,
new, organization, dependent part and have been
united

2000 - a new effort to bring you and our way to
new members, which is NIN, SVE, LOS AND
a new idea new idea to bring you and our way to 200 - that is to

the heavy, & the required cost, the number, the
 color, the quality, the nature, the value, the
 size, the weight - each of the above matters of
 the E. C. O. P. program, on the whole
program - on the whole program will
 have no doubt been, as to the length of the program

V.N. is ~~the~~ conductor largely - It notes an old hand and a
base - many have off the name passed "out of sight" and
found " - Others have turned to investigate sub to find
Investigate - The War Days are over There are now many examples of
Conductors and Passes - at all times in the past in the past in the past
plot V.N. has been released and is now in the hands of the authorities
can be used in the future to help the authorities to find out the truth

NO! to anything to prevent war!
He prevented my to say in SEA - a whole lot!
but he is not a wise old man in NAIVE PACIFISM -
- keep the peace policy! ANOTHER family for
peace - an obstinate isolationism is not
WISDOM policy but an absence of policy - or to put it
again to prevent war against a self annihilant -
a deep and serious mind needed!

very important lesson - 1 1/2 of the way down the road -
Colgate - it was time to end Franco's reign - get out -

We could let the multitude of us say what
they thought - be represented as people

as one of the colours

of Spain, Barcelonians, Basques at all to be seen -

Francisco was imposed on us

We could perhaps be included in the Spanish

as well as of Francisco's glorious - Basques

we could get for free Spanish justice - Francisco

is now in a good state of peace - the city

are not yet as good as new -

I must obey the law - WRHS AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES SEA - the

is not as good as new - the city is not as good as new

is not as good as new - the city is not as good as new

is not as good as new - the city is not as good as new

is not as good as new - the city is not as good as new

Francisco - Spain

Basques has been freeing them for a generation -

is not as good as new - the city is not as good as new

is not as good as new - the city is not as good as new

Francisco

The printed ~~document~~ document document document - not to follow

De Gaulle's document

WRHS



He repeated today what he has been saying for over 2 years -

OTHERS WOULD THAT WE LIQUIDATE OUR
RESOURCES IMMEDIATELY CUT OUR LOSSES AND
LEAVE THE SOUTH VIETNAMESE ON THEIR
OWN. I HAVE REPORTEDLY EXPLAINED WHY
I CONSIDER THIS A DISASTROUS PATH! FOR
THE S. VIETNAMESE PEOPLE WHO WOULD
HAVE LOST THEIR COLLECTIVE POLITICAL INTEREST
AND COUNTLESS INDIVIDUAL LIVES, FOR
OTHER NON COMMUNIST COUNTRIES, ESPECIALLY
IN ASIA, AMONG WHOM NOT A SINGLE
LEADER RECOMMENDED SUCH A POLICY, FOR
THE GLOBAL CREDIBILITY OF THE U.S.
WORLD, FOR THOSE AMERICANS WHO HAVE
MADE SUCH HEAVY SACRIFICES, AND
FOR THE INTEGRITY OF AMERICAN SOCIETY
IN THE POST-VIETNAM ERA.

Some to President Nixon for S.V. Peace - I suspect that
S.V. Peace would be sent as an unofficial message
to force - by an official policy of U.S. Administration - which
is used from our to strengthen - current policy operation
and no large scale - 200 - 300 secretly sent

LOST 10 WHEELS from 2/26/62

Best Case

1) By your regulations - as I understand them -
regulations which are in fact intended to do -
as proposed - separated with

J. J. O'Brien

as prepared - separated - etc

2) of Vestimentaria - which has center of self-determination -
on support
draft in the
many places for the future
some draft work and of the free -
board - policy

DRAFT COPY -

MINUTE CASUALTY WITH DRIFT ONLY

Has SUN - 7008 to 1,1 miles

~~9008~~ 6 1, 1 million
~~Amos Earl~~ could 6 month 57

[Faint handwritten notes and stamps are visible across the top of the page.]

St. Louis, Mo.

3) The President is to be elected by the people of the United States in the year 1900. The President is to be elected by the people of the United States in the year 1900. The President is to be elected by the people of the United States in the year 1900.

Aug 1970 - report submitted by [unclear] in [unclear]
 of [unclear] - [unclear] out to [unclear] [unclear] [unclear]
 a year or so [unclear] in [unclear] - [unclear] [unclear]
 Khmer [unclear] - [unclear] [unclear] [unclear] [unclear]
 [unclear] [unclear] [unclear] [unclear] [unclear] [unclear]
 [unclear]

The [unclear] [unclear] [unclear] [unclear] [unclear] [unclear] [unclear]
 [unclear] [unclear] [unclear] [unclear] [unclear] [unclear] [unclear]
 on April 30, 1970 - [unclear] 60 day [unclear] [unclear]
 [unclear] [unclear] [unclear] [unclear] [unclear] [unclear] [unclear]

SIN [unclear] [unclear] [unclear] [unclear] [unclear] [unclear]
 The [unclear] [unclear] [unclear] [unclear] [unclear] [unclear]
 [unclear] [unclear] [unclear] [unclear] [unclear] [unclear]
 [unclear] [unclear] [unclear] [unclear] [unclear] [unclear]
 [unclear] [unclear] [unclear] [unclear] [unclear] [unclear]
 [unclear] [unclear] [unclear] [unclear] [unclear] [unclear]



But even if Portugal is right - of course we are not
surely not the terminated section - indeed a long one?

Policy - can you - will be able to find
Verdun - will of can be ? - will and
can SW be DM 2 (There should be
just be and || Verdun can be and

Per Ben. C.

2140 empty - correct

WRHS
 AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES
 1000

2nd @ - ~~see~~ ~~sup~~
 head -

last page of book
reads a fine

Summa Conf -

Day -

In Order my friend to make me right do ~~the right~~ ^{to make}

on your -
~~from~~

not good for

Do not ~~try to put my signature on~~
any ~~envelope~~ - except to read

near circular shape

of the ~~original~~ ~~original~~ + ~~control~~ ~~reduction~~

1. The first section of the report is a general introduction to the subject of the study. It discusses the importance of the problem and the objectives of the research.

No. 100

Nov 1917

W.R.H.S.

Am. Jewish Archives

100-100

Dr. Carter
It is now being
placed in

2. Explain the following

(a) Explain the following

(b) Explain the following

(c) Explain the following

(d) Explain the following

(e) Explain the following

(f) Explain the following

(g) Explain the following

(h) Explain the following

(i) Explain the following

(j) Explain the following

Don't want to be used for religious - usually at
the 6 years

H.M. - Feb 20 Near Hospital - West from U.S.

most of incidents of good men & women who
(escape - death) - so many have changed after
of years - just found / on to themselves (and
can not find religion any more - SHN can not find so
3000000

- 1) to find new religion
- 2) new rules of WRHS and new rules made
and people WRHS transcript
- 3) new religious community

[not good but new trial before C.L. Subjunctive NYT]
find out (all of them) [also look for religious
religious in new]

Pages - Special in - complete my
unity - new in copy and new pages
now, now in religious new

Danville

Payson Garland

Alfred passed me car 7 8 a - July 1 Denver

Looney

Carl to mother

Mr. Osborn Denver

Early family program

