

PEACE NEWS LETTER

Published by and for the New York State Peace Council
Rev. Alan B. Peabody, Editor

SFC 261, No. 62 - 126
January 22, 1962

SCIENTISTS AND SURVIVAL One of the most encouraging efforts from the scientific world came at the 128th annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Seven of its nine-member Committee on Science in the Promotion of Human Welfare brought in an historic report on the problem of survival in the nuclear age. PNL is happy to reproduce extensive excerpts from this report:

"War is today a social problem of catastrophic force and overshadowing urgency. The basis of war is power, and power is a product of science. Science is therefore deeply involved in this problem, and scientists have a particular duty toward its solution...

"One nation arms to deter a possible attack from the other; fearing that these arms may be for aggression rather than defense, the second nation responds by an even greater armament and the process continues. Defensive measures such as shelters follow the same pattern, for they too will tend to elicit a more powerful offense...

"In general, the development of a shelter program cannot greatly influence the conclusion that a massive nuclear attack would have the immediate effect of destroying the social structure. A particular shelter system is designed to resist a certain assumed intensity of attack, and its success depends on the validity of this assumption. But an opponent can be expected to respond to such a defensive move by stepping up the intensity of attack. Any shelter system short of one that places the nation's entire population and industry permanently underground can be negated by a corresponding increase in the attacker's power.

"The long-range problem is vastly more complex than the immediate one. It presents the following general questions: (I) What lasting effects would the great fires and radioactivity have on the biological system (soil, water, air, plants, and animals) on which man depends? (II) How would the increased death rate, widespread disease, and genetic effects of the war affect the validity and viability of the survivors? (III) Would the immediate destructive effects of a nuclear war cause major irreversible changes in the economic, social, and political organization of our society? (IV) How would the foregoing effects influence the behavior of human beings?..."

Here follows a review of the discussion of economic recovery from nuclear war.

"We must conclude that society can no longer be defended by an unlimited war. If we permit such a war to occur in the future course of human history, we run the risk of ending human history altogether. Peace, which was until now a human want, has become a human need.

"We believe that science has a commanding responsibility to help mankind survive. Whether society shall continue to rely on war -- which is now so dangerously unfit for its protective function -- is a social decision. If this crisis is to be resolved by rational social action, the public must become aware of it. To accomplish this educational task, scientists will need to overcome certain difficulties. One problem is to remove the obstacles which now tend to obstruct the flow of technical information to the scientific community. Much of the information about war is not easily accessible. It often appears in special reports which rarely find their way into the scientists' libraries.

"Another difficulty is caused by the political tension that is naturally associated with the problems of war and peace. Any scientific finding about these issues is almost certain to be construed as supporting some political beliefs and contradicting others, and there may be a tendency to social pressure against the scientist who attempts to disseminate it. Such constraint is a hazard to the rational development of social decisions. If scientists have the obligation to inform their fellow citizens about grave issues, citizens have a reciprocal duty to defend the scientists' right to be heard without prejudice.

"We believe that if the complexity of the problem is not only recognized but accepted in advance as inescapable, it can be solved. In the past, the physical, biological and social sciences have been separated by their reliance on different approaches. Today, to meet the new needs of the entire human species the concepts and methods of all the sciences must be combined. We can then hope to devise new social inventions to protect all mankind from self-destruction...

"We call for the establishment of a new collaborative science, the science of human survival, which will apply the full strength and wisdom of all the sciences to the solution of the crisis created by the obsolescence of war..."

PROJECT involves a plan by the Atomic Energy Commission to conduct a nuclear excavation
CHARIOT experiment on the northwest coast of Alaska, a long heralded plan to find another peaceful use for nuclear power -- to move dirt and excavate harbors.

Alaskan Indians, encouraged by the Association on American Indian Affairs, are protesting the proposal to experiment in an area inhabited by them. The Atomic Energy Commission has pledged not to proceed with the experiment if studies indicate that the Eskimos and their way of life will be endangered by it. Scientists do not agree on these effects.

A group of University of Alaska scientists say that the blast will contaminate a lichen on which Caribou feed, and they point out that Caribou meat is an important part of the Eskimo diet. AEC scientists say their studies confirm that there would be no appreciable danger from fallout.

Prof. Leslie A. Viereck of the University of Alaska was among those employed on the AEC environmental study. He resigned from the group charging that it is motivated by political rather than scientific considerations and that its findings are contrary to those of other scientists working in the field. Dr. Viereck has written:

"Because of the repeated inference that all of the biologists are in favor of the [nuclear] shot and that it has been proven that there will be no biological damage, I feel that I can no longer have my name associated with the project.

"Because the Project Chariot study is not a purely biological study but one intimately connected with AEC politics and directed by an environmental committee that is biased in its decisions and membership, I wish to resign from the project..."

The Eskimos in a November meeting claimed aboriginal rights to the land in question, and have demanded that the Bureau of Land Management revoke the use permit it has granted the AEC.

-- Christian Science Monitor, Dec. 16, 1961

PLIGHT Eskimos, like all American Indians, have received short shrift from their
of THE native land, which for centuries has been controlled by palefaced immigrants.
INDIAN William Appleton Williams, (Contours of American History p. 136-137) offers
this comment on a law passed by the Continental Congress in 1784: "'You are
a subdued people,' it told the Indians... 'We shall now, therefore, declare to you the
conditions on which alone you can be received into the peace and protection of the
United States.' It would seem that the principles of unconditional surrender and total
war appeared rather early in American History."

Will Alaskan Eskimos be treated with as little consideration as New York State's Seneca Nation has, in recent years? A part of the answer may lie with readers of PNL and the action they take, or do not take.

BREAKDOWN Le Monde (Paris) Dec. 17-18, 1961, contained a series of on-the-spot reports
in LAOS from Indochina (of which Laos is a part). Delegates of 14 powers at Geneva --
including the United States, Communist China, and the Soviet Union, have
attempted to make possible reunification and neutralization of the little Kingdom through
the formation of a coalition government (to be headed, incidently, by the same Prince
U. S. agents helped depose). Le Monde reports, "a little group of Laotian officers led
by General Phoumi Nosavan, Minister of Defense and supported by some U. S. and Thai
agents and military men, 'gum up the works.'"

"Almost every morning, the U. S. Ambassador, M. Brown, visits General Phoumi to persuade him to accept the formula of a coalition with the Communists, which is alone capable of permitting reunification of the country and reestablishment of peace. Every evening, an expert of [the U. S. Military Advisory Group] or of the Central Intelligence Agency comes to cheer up the General and incite him to oppose any entry of Reds into the government."

TIDBITS: At the University of California at Berkeley, a series of extension lectures on nuclear war and individual survival were cancelled when, instead of the expected 1500 participants, only 30 showed up!... Walter H. Uphoff of the University of Minnesota has described the Civilian Defense program as "a psychological Maginot line which makes us believe we can bluff and threaten instead of negotiate."

Bulk Rate
U. S. POSTAGE
PAID
Syracuse, N. Y.
Permit No. 2380

RETURN POSTAGE GUARANTEED
Syracuse Peace Council
841 University Building
Syracuse 2, N. Y.

PEACE NEWS LETTER

Published by and for the New York State Peace Council
Rev. Alan B. Peesbody, Editor

SPC 262, No. 62 - 127
February 12, 1962

The Necessity of Adjusting by Ralph Lynn

(Dr. Lynn is Professor of History at Baylor University, Waco, Texas and during the fall has been Visiting Professor at Paul Quinn College.)

Part of the tragedy of man is that he wants, in his inner being of principles and loyalties, to remain unchanged in an ever-changing world. Unquestionably, the world will change; unquestionably we human beings will change. The only question is whether the changes will come in peace or in war.

Most of us find it fairly easy to adjust to external changes like anaesthesia, air conditioning, and super-sonic travel; but we do not understand that these external changes demand internal, psychological changes if our adjustments to the changing world around us are to be orderly. We find, for example that we are unable to make the appropriate response to the fact that rapid movement of men and messages has made ancient city-county boundaries obsolete. It is rigidity of mind alone which prevents solution of these technically simple local problems. If we have such difficulty with purely local problems, it is no wonder that it is impossible for all but the professional students to see that a world which is one in economic interdependence must eventually become one in political structure. Probably the only question on this point is whether world political unity will come in orderly, peaceful fashion as the result of adjustments in the minds of men or in the violence of a series of world-wide civil wars.

Very likely we are slow in making psychological adjustments to changing circumstances because we tend to identify as sacred principles the practical responses we or our parents have made to specific problems. Perhaps these practical responses were wise and useful in their times and places; but constant repetition does not, in the view of rational men, establish customary behavior as the ultimate in wisdom nor transform temporary solutions to local problems into eternal, universally valid principles.

Most of us are troubled at this point by the commendable notion that we must not, even at the cost of ultimate sacrifice, abandon our "principles." But there is always the possibility that our "principles" are really unexamined habits or uncriticized prejudices. Perhaps the basic principle by which we should measure all social arrangements can be stated in a question: What arrangements, in this time and place and in these circumstances, best serve human dignity? By this standard, the Tories of 1776 and the Southern leaders of one hundred years ago cherished the wrong "principles"; they were too blind and too rigid to make the indicated adjustment. When the French abandoned the three-class structure of society in 1789, one of the noblemen was so true to his principles that he "met" by himself in the hall formerly assigned to the nobles, calling for old and new business and then adjourning, until the keepers of the asylum for the insane came for him. There are some principles worth dying for - or going mad for; but no thoughtful, self-critical man will sacrifice for a cause outmoded by developments and condemned by the conscience of mankind.

Clearly, mankind cannot avoid tragedy. But perhaps he can reduce its ravages somewhat without sacrificing the nobility of clinging to principles. These three suggestions could be helpful. First, we should all realize that it is impossible not to change in a changing world. Second, we should continually examine our principles so that we will not confuse selfish aims or practical solutions to passing problems with eternal principles. Third, we should school ourselves to listen respectfully to our fellows, realizing that the areas in which any man is competent to judge are small indeed.

will change; unquestionably we human beings will change. The only question is whether the changes will come in peace or in war.

Most of us find it fairly easy to adjust to external changes like anaesthesia, air conditioning, and super-sonic travel; but we do not understand that these external changes demand internal, psychological changes if our adjustments to the changing world around us are to be orderly. We find, for example that we are unable to make the appropriate response to the fact that rapid movement of men and messages has made ancient city-county boundaries obsolete. It is rigidity of mind alone which prevents solution of these technically simple local problems. If we have such difficulty with purely local problems, it is no wonder that it is impossible for all but the professional students to see that a world which is one in economic interdependence must eventually become one in political structure. Probably the only question on this point is whether world political unity will come in orderly, peaceful fashion as the result of adjustments in the minds of men or in the violence of a series of world-wide civil wars.

Very likely we are slow in making psychological adjustments to changing circumstances because we tend to identify as sacred principles the practical responses we or our parents have made to specific problems. Perhaps these practical responses were wise and useful in their times and places; but constant repetition does not, in the view of rational men, establish customary behavior as the ultimate in wisdom nor transform temporary solutions to local problems into eternal, universally valid principles.

Most of us are troubled at this point by the commendable notion that we must not, even at the cost of ultimate sacrifice, abandon our "principles." But there is always the possibility that our "principles" are really unexamined habits or uncriticized prejudices. Perhaps the basic principle by which we should measure all social arrangements can be stated in a question: What arrangements, in this time and place and in these circumstances, best serve human dignity? By this standard, the Tories of 1776 and the Southern leaders of one hundred years ago cherished the wrong "principles"; they were too blind and too rigid to make the indicated adjustment. When the French abandoned the three-class structure of society in 1789, one of the noblemen was so true to his principles that he "met" by himself in the hall formerly assigned to the nobles, calling for old and new business and then adjourning, until the keepers of the asylum for the insane came for him. There are some principles worth dying for - or going mad for; but no thoughtful, self-critical man will sacrifice for a cause outmoded by developments and condemned by the conscience of mankind.

Clearly, mankind cannot avoid tragedy. But perhaps he can reduce its ravages somewhat without sacrificing the nobility of clinging to principles. These three suggestions could be helpful. First, we should all realize that it is impossible not to change in a changing world. Second, we should continually examine our principles so that we will not confuse selfish aims or practical solutions to passing problems with eternal principles. Third, we should school ourselves to listen respectfully to our fellows, realizing that the areas in which any man is competent to judge are small indeed.

-- Waco Tribune-Herald, Jan. 21, 1962

* * * * *

BLAST - OFF
AND
CAMP - OUT

Since the new goal of education's
A world of scientific nations,
And tots from nursery school through college
Must soak in heady nuclear knowledge,
A forward-looking parent ought
To see that junior's also taught
At least the rudimentary tricks
Of making fire with just two sticks.

-- Virginia Brasier
Saturday Review of Literature
January 13, 1962

SHELTERS An editorial in the Christian Science Monitor (1/24/62) summarizes important
AND questions concerning the shelter problem "on which Washington is not being
FEAR candid with the American people...."

"First, fallout shelters will not protect against blast and firestorm in a target area. A very large segment of the American people live in target areas..." (It appears from recent remarks of a high military officer in Waco that more and more people will live in target areas as new sites are developed for missiles. Ed.)

"Second, the official approach to guarding civilians is a statistical one. What the individual wants to know is what steps will assure protection for himself and his family. But if the government were frank, it would be forced to reply that it cannot offer such an assurance. A percentage will survive but individual reassurance is not practical.

"Finally, much too little has been said about the problems of emerging from shelters. This is not an affair of two weeks in the shelter and then sound the all clear. There might be a month thereafter of slowly increasing trips outside. And the government hesitates to specify what sort of a world would await outside and what would need to be done to continue survival.

"There has been intense controversy behind the scenes in Washington as to whether the public can bear honest information...." (Emphasis supplied. Ed.)

NEW YORK On November 9th, 1961, the Assembly of the State of New York in special session
FRAUD? adopted a bill which appropriated \$100 million on a matching fund basis for the construction of community fallout shelters and which also authorized the state Civil Defense Commission to recommend materials "including the names of specific trade products and their manufacturers."

Assemblyman Mark Lane (10th Assembly District, Manhattan, New York City) reports (Liberation, Jan., 1962) that in December, 1960, some eleven months earlier, the contents of the bill had been articulated by Benjamin Tessler, President of Lancer Industries, Inc. Lancer Industries, through a subsidiary, is either engaged in or wants to engage in the manufacture and sale of fallout shelters. One of its directors who also has acted as its attorney is the Speaker of the Assembly, Joseph Carlino. Contrary to earlier protestations, Carlino was forced to admit that he received a total of \$5,300 from the concern.

The bill, says Lane, was first seen by most legislators on the day it was passed. Most Assemblymen "didn't have time to read the fifty-page bill, much less evaluate its implications before voting on it." Lane's request for a delay to permit reading before voting was denied. Further, "no committee studied the bill... It was reported out by the chairman of the Rules Committee, who happens to be Speaker Carlino." Could it be, asks Lane, that the bill's sponsors recognized that it "is a fraud and cannot stand the test of logical debate and discussion"? Lane suggests that "this bill has turned out to be not only a political deception aimed at preparing the people for an unnecessary and suicidal war but also a fraud, motivated in part, by desire for personal profit."

Assemblyman Lane has introduced a bill intended to repeal the fallout shelter bill, and on February 12th he intends to introduce a motion seeking discharge of that bill from committee. It is anticipated that numerous persons will be talking with their legislators on that date regarding the fallout shelter bill and its repeal.

NEW Nuclear physicist Leo Szilard has recently made a number of addresses around the
PEACE country which he hopes will lay the groundwork for a vigorous and effective na-
FORCE? tional lobby for peace.

In a Los Angeles lecture, Dr. Szilard asserted that "war seems to be inevitable unless it is possible somehow to alter the pattern of behavior which America and Russia are exhibiting at present.

"You, as Americans, are not in a position to influence the Russian Government; it follows that you would have to bring about a change in the attitude of the American Govern-

This is not an affair of two weeks in the shelter and then sound the air clear. There might be a month thereafter of slowly increasing trips outside. And the government hesitates to specify what sort of a world would await outside and what would need to be done to continue survival.

"There has been intense controversy behind the scenes in Washington as to whether the public can bear honest information...." (Emphasis supplied. Ed.)

NEW YORK On November 9th, 1961, the Assembly of the State of New York in special session FRAUD? adopted a bill which appropriated \$100 million on a matching fund basis for the construction of community fallout shelters and which also authorized the state Civil Defense Commission to recommend materials "including the names of specific trade products and their manufacturers."

Assemblyman Mark Lane (10th Assembly District, Manhattan, New York City) reports (Liberation, Jan., 1962) that in December, 1960, some eleven months earlier, the contents of the bill had been articulated by Benjamin Tessler, President of Lancer Industries, Inc. Lancer Industries, through a subsidiary, is either engaged in or wants to engage in the manufacture and sale of fallout shelters. One of its directors who also has acted as its attorney is the Speaker of the Assembly, Joseph Carlino. Contrary to earlier protestations, Carlino was forced to admit that he received a total of \$5,300 from the concern.

The bill, says Lane, was first seen by most legislators on the day it was passed. Most Assemblymen "didn't have time to read the fifty-page bill, much less evaluate its implications before voting on it." Lane's request for a delay to permit reading before voting was denied. Further, "no committee studied the bill... It was reported out by the chairman of the Rules Committee, who happens to be Speaker Carlino." Could it be, asks Lane, that the bill's sponsors recognized that it "is a fraud and cannot stand the test of logical debate and discussion"? Lane suggests that "this bill has turned out to be not only a political deception aimed at preparing the people for an unnecessary and suicidal war but also a fraud, motivated in part, by desire for personal profit."

Assemblyman Lane has introduced a bill intended to repeal the fallout shelter bill, and on February 12th he intends to introduce a motion seeking discharge of that bill from committee. It is anticipated that numerous persons will be talking with their legislators on that date regarding the fallout shelter bill and its repeal.

NEW PEACE FORCE? Nuclear physicist Leo Szilard has recently made a number of addresses around the country which he hopes will lay the groundwork for a vigorous and effective national lobby for peace.

In a Los Angeles lecture, Dr. Szilard asserted that "war seems to be inevitable unless it is possible somehow to alter the pattern of behavior which America and Russia are exhibiting at present.

"You, as Americans, are not in a position to influence the Russian Government; it follows that you would have to bring about a change in the attitude of the American Government which, in turn, may bring about a similar change in the attitude of the Russian government."

"It is conceivable that if a dedicated minority were to take effective political action, they could bring about the change in attitude that is needed. But such a minority can take effective action only if it is possible to formulate a set of political objectives on which it can unite."

-- Christian Science Monitor, Jan. 24, 1962

Permit No. 2380
Syracuse, N. Y.
P A I D
U. S. POSTAGE
Bulk Rate

Syracuse Peace Council
841 University Building
Syracuse 2, N. Y.

PEACE NEWS LETTER

Published by and for the New York State Peace Council
Guest Editor \$1.00 per year

SPC 263, No. 62 - 128
March 27, 1962

THEREFORE CHOOSE LIFE The twenty-second annual Institute of International Relations for New York State, on this theme and under the joint auspices of the American Friends Service Committee and the Syracuse Peace Council, was held at the Yates Hotel in Syracuse, March 16-18, 1962. In numbers and enthusiasm, it was the largest in many years, attendance ranging from 150 on the opening evening to 500 when the SRO sign was out for Linus Pauling at the Saturday luncheon.

About 100 registrants gathered Sunday morning to see the "Roman Players" in a production of Philip C. Lewis' DocuDrama, WHICH WAY THE WIND, under the direction of Sarah S. Kent of Rome Community Players.

A similar number met with Syracuse Friends for the Meeting for Worship. Sunday dinner was served to 150 guests at Eastwood Baptist Church before the closing address by Herberto Sein.

A strong delegation of 80 high school and college students brought added vitality and enthusiasm to the conference. Both high school and college groups met separately in morning and afternoon sessions with AFSC student secretaries.

Literature sales, always a first-rate barometer of interest and response, totalled \$503.22.

Brief digests of major addresses follow:

AVA HELEN PAULING Vice President, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. Member, So. Cal. A.C.L.U. Board; Lecturer on civil liberties and human rights in U.S.A., England, Sweden, Mexico, India, Japan.

In her talk on **WOMEN SPEAK FOR PEACE**, Ava Pauling reviewed the efforts of women against war from Berthe von Suttner who won the first Nobel Peace Prize in 1905 to Jane Addams who founded the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom in 1915 to recent Nobel Prize winner, Emily Green Balch and the WISPS. She told of the work of the WIL in Geneva, Philadelphia, Washington and at the UN, and announced plans for the International Congress to be held in San Francisco in July 1962.

She noted the burgeoning new movements among women and students as the most hopeful signs of the times in the war against war and for freedom. She spoke of the General Strike on November 1, 1961 which involved 50,000 U.S. women; of the International Demonstrations on January 15, 1962 in 30 countries, including the USSR; and of the two-year old "Voice of Women" in Canada which will sponsor an international congress of women in Montreal in September.

The speaker observed that the world was once believed to be made up of protons, neutrons and electrons but that it now appears to be more largely composed of morons. She pledged that while life remains, women will not cease to strive for peace.

LINUS PAULING Professor of Chemistry, Caltech, Nobel Prize of 1954. Member, Royal Society, London; honorary member academies of science in France, Norway, USSR, Italy, Belgium and others. Vice-president, American Philosophical Society.

"No dispute can justify nuclear war" declared the distinguished Nobel-scientist in a noon-time address that evoked a standing ovation at its close. The past 50 years might be called the golden years of science and technology and the next 50 might well be the golden years of medicine and biology, he asserted, IF the world is not destroyed by its concentration on war efforts.

He suggested that one of the hopeful signs today is the prospect for universal disarmament and a ban of nuclear testing. He quoted President Kennedy, "The risks inherent in disarmament pale into insignificance beside the risks inherent in nuclear war," but added that Kennedy has dealt a severe blow to our hopes by asking for a 25% increase in armaments and by his decision to renew testing. "For this we are responsible," he said, "we have not protested enough." He believes that President Kennedy has been feeling the pulse of the people and we have not convinced him. We should ask why he is exploding bombs on the eve of a peace conference.

Dr. Pauling was sharply critical of the false sense of security offered by the Fall-out shelter program which is a form of militarism, and of the economic advantages inherent in the arms industry.

DAVID HARTSOUGH Student, Swarthmore College and Howard University; University of Berlin, 1960-61. Other foreign experience includes work camping in Cuba and Yugoslavia, the Aldermaston March in England, a summer camping trip in the Soviet Union, 1961.

David Hartsough began by saying that as a Peace Caravaner in the U.S. he had often been advised to "Tell it to the Kremlin," so, he said, he thought he would! And he did.

Through a stimulating half-hour of beautiful colored slides and brief comments, David showed the preconceived ideas we have of each other; the partial information that we possess; and the essential friendliness, the basic humanity, and the burning desire for peace that exists on both sides. He was constantly reminded of the enormous losses

suffered during the war in which practically every family had lost one or more members. He reported conversations with a wide variety of people on the streets, in homes, at factories and in camps. He found no one-hour-a-week Christians in Russia but many people whose faith is a matter of full-time living and observed that ideal Christianity and ideal Communism have many social goals in common.

He quoted a Russian woman at one of the camp-sites who asked why, when they were all able to get along so well together, should they be taught to hate each other. He concluded that although we have many differences in ideology, there are none great enough to justify killing each other.

Here we see the college student and the distinguished scientist, from their widely different sources, reaching the same conclusion.

(NOTE: These colored slides and the taped commentary are available, on loan, from the MAR office of AFSC, 1500 Race St., Philadelphia 2, Pa.)

HERBERTO Distinguished Mexican educator, has served with the Mexican government at home
SEIN and abroad; Interpreter for many international conferences, including UN Charter Conference in 1945 and subsequently in eighteen other countries.

The concluding address on "Unchanging Duties in a Changing World" described the changing worlds of Algeria, Africa, Asia and Latin America; commented on changes going on in both communist and capitalist worlds, with particular reference to China and the Soviet Union, Western Europe and the United States.

Unchanging duties were listed as: to be alive, in body, mind and spirit; to accept Man; to accept the Universe; to enter the world of silence; to have moral purpose; to be fearless; to be involved; to cultivate a sense of humor; to grow in spiritual stature.

Each point was well illustrated from the speaker's rich fund of international experience. Con mucho gusto.

*** **

INSECTS "Dr. H. Bentley Glass is professor of biology at John Hopkins University and a
INHERIT member of the Advisory Commission on Biology and Medicine of the Atomic Energy Commission. Novelists, journalists, and unaffiliated thinkers may be dismissed as mere alarmists when they talk about a nuclear war destroying civilization, but not Dr. Glass. Speaking to a Smith College audience recently, Dr. Glass made some observations which should appall the pre-emptive war planners, if for once they would descend from game theory to the plane of facts.

"In the absence of fallout shelters for animals, Dr. Glass points out, all wild and domestic animals in the combatant countries would be exposed to lethal doses of radiation. Not only would the meat and milk supply go with the cattle, but an even greater disaster would be the destruction of the birds. Without birds to feed on them, the insects would multiply catastrophically. The insects, not man or other proud species, are really the ones fitted for survival in the nuclear age. They -- and bacteria -- are enormously radiation-resistant. Let a man absorb 600 roentgens and he perishes soon and miserably, but a hundred thousand roentgens may not discomfort an insect in the least. The cockroach, a venerable and hardy species, will take over the habitations of the foolish humans, and compete only with other insects and bacteria." -- from The Nation 3-3-62

PERSONAL We missed the gentle presence of our friend, Clara Burroughs, of Rochester, who was absent for the first time in many years. All good wishes.

TAIL The London Observer, in a recent report on the new U.S. civil defense booklet on
PEACE the advantages of underground shelters, ended the article with the comment that Khrushchev once said he would bury the Americans but they have always been a do-it-yourself-nation!

BOOK This month, AFSC begins the publication of a new series of disarmament studies under
END the general title "Beyond Deterrence." The series is based on the assumption that democracy does not have to surrender and does not have to commit nuclear suicide. The first pamphlet will be by Mulford Q. Sibley of Minnesota; others will be by Sidney Lens, Eric Fromm, Arthur Waskow.

Send this office one dollar for three of the first number or for one each of the first three. Excellent for private reading; better for discussion groups.

Bulk Rate
U. S. POSTAGE
paid
Syracuse, N. Y.
Permit No. 2380

Syracuse Peace Council
841 University Building
Syracuse 2, N. Y.

PEACE NEWS LETTER

Published by and for the New York State Peace Council
Rev. Alan B. Peabody, Editor

SPC 264, No. 62 - 129
April 20, 1962

ON THE DECISION TO RESUME NUCLEAR TESTS An editorial in Nation, March 17, acknowledged the numerous pressures on President Kennedy in favor of resumption of tests, pressures from the Defense Department, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, advisers like Edward Teller, and Republicans who were looking for another issue with which to discredit a Democratic Administration. Mail indicated that popular sentiment was divided. Nevertheless, Nation took the position that the decision was ill advised.

"What makes the President's decision wrong is that in the name of 'security' it chooses not the lesser evil, but the greater. It is wrong because neither world security nor American security is enhanced, but alike diminished. It is wrong also because it continues and exacerbates the arms race. Above all, it is wrong because the President, who has youth on his side and men of intellectual stature as his advisers, shows himself deficient in imagination. All he seems capable of doing is to follow the traditional path of reciprocal acceleration which has always ended in catastrophe. The new factor of mutual suicide he seemingly does not know how to deal with. Nor must it be forgotten that before the Russians broke the test ban, and as soon as Mr. Kennedy took office, he initiated a formidable increase in arms spending which now amounts to 25% above the Eisenhower level and, by all indications, will continue to rise. That may account in part for Soviet intransigence.

"In these matters everyone in power takes the short-term view, clinging desperately to short-term advantage of trying to increase it, while no one who thinks a few years ahead has any power to act. [Mr. Kennedy's position seems to be that] the Soviets must accept a permanent inferiority or we will race them to the finish, whatever that may be. This is a position we would not accept if the tables were turned. Nor does it matter, in any realistic sense, if the balance tips one way or the other. Both sides are saturated with overkill..."

THE BASIC POSITIONS of the two nuclear giants seems to be stated well in the following propositions:

"The Soviets want to test because they trail behind us in the somber skill of nuclear weaponry. For the same reason all other nations might feel justified to test.

"The leaders of the West want to have a superiority in nuclear striking power, in a dubious effort to negotiate successfully from threatening nuclear military strength. If they want to catch up and we want to keep ahead, when can we ever negotiate with tangible results?"

--- Herbert Jehle, Prof. of Theoretical Physics, George Washington University
letter in The New York Times, April 10, 1962.

ON THE GENEVA CONFERENCE Max Frankel, writing in The New York Times, March 14, as the Geneva Conference on disarmament opened, wrote:

"The big powers of East and West are here to preserve and improve the nuclear stalemate, to assure one another that disarmament is not possible on the other's terms and to grope for a few arrangements that might reduce the obvious danger of surprise or accidental attack. It is the growing suspicion of observers that the United States and the Soviet Union are also here to preserve their freedom to test nuclear weapons, to maintain their offensive capacities and to develop defenses against each other's missiles."

AN ADULT VIEW ON DISARMAMENT CONFERENCES "Disarmament conferences, one suspects, have been going on since our remote ancestors discovered the lethal uses of sharp stones. The fact that they have neither resulted in much disarmament nor prevented war for any great length of time is not an argument that they have no value..." ...[but] disarmament is impossible..."

"Doubtless, any responsible statesman would like to curtail armaments, in part to save tax money and in part to reduce the risk of war. But there are limits below which no responsible statesman can go in disarming. Since it is necessary to determine what the safe limit is, the statesmen must be accompanied to the conference by official and unofficial experts - army, navy, and air force officers and usually an assortment of munitions makers... who can be depended on to know pretty well what their opposite numbers have in the works. And this... is like sending clothing manufacturers to a nudist convention..."

The negotiators at a disarmament conference are confronted with a dilemma: "You cannot disarm until you feel secure and you cannot feel secure until you disarm."

Yet "disarmament conferences still have values. (1) Each country must impress its own people with its sincere desire for disarmament, lower tax burdens, and a peaceful

policy. (2) Each country must impress all the more or less innocent bystanders with its angelic qualities. (3) There is no sounding board more useful for all these purposes. (4) These conferences constitute part of the machinery for prolonging the inter-war period - a most praiseworthy objective..."

-- Dr. Ralph Lynn, Baylor University in The Waco Tribune-Herald, Feb. 18, 1962

ANOTHER VIEW ON DISARMAMENT "Year by year the problems of peace become inherently more difficult... The longer we let the problems grow, the less controllable they become. Indeed, the greatest danger of all we face at the moment is that most important issues, by the mere fact of their current importance, tend to become non-negotiable. The result is that negotiations, which almost everyone accepts as necessary, are more and more conducted for the sake of appearances. International conferences are reduced to methodology and propaganda. Moreover, I am very much afraid that this is the impression which we ourselves, with the assistance of Soviet propaganda, have created about our own attitudes on disarmament."

-- Chester A. Bowles in his Introduction to Richard J. Barnet's Who Wants Disarmament?, published in 1960.

THE CHURCH and DETERRENCE Varying views of the role of the Church in the current international situation are reflected in two recent statements by ecclesiastical officials.

On March 21, the Executive Council of the United Church of Christ adopted a statement in which it asserted that the Western powers must maintain sufficient military power to deter further expansion of Communism by force. While urging its churches and members to "engage in earnest and continuous private and public prayer" for the success of the Geneva negotiations, it affirmed that "for the present, military power at least equal to (the Communist) is necessary for the protection of the free world."

The New York Times, March 22nd, stated that "denominational leaders said they thought this was the first statement by a major Protestant denomination backing maintenance of strong military forces as background against which to negotiate."

Recently lay and ministerial leadership of the Syracuse Area of the Methodist Church issued a statement in which it declared: "We refuse to believe that mankind must choose suicide or surrender. We believe the abolition of war is an absolute imperative, that under God it can be achieved in our time. We affirm our belief in the power of the Christian gospel to change the minds and hearts of men. We believe that love is more powerful than hate, that peace, not strife, is God's will for all mankind and that millions of human beings yearn for committed men and women to lead the way to peace."

The "Call to Action for Peace" outlined a seven-point course of action which included the suggestions that Methodists "Give generously in the support of agencies working for peace over and above regular contributions to the church."

EASTER AND THE CROSS Mulford Sibley (Prof. of Political Science, Univ. of Minnesota), concludes his "Beyond Deterrence" pamphlet (35¢ from NYSPC) on Unilateral Initiatives and Disarmament with a section on "The Moral Issue."

"In the end, rejection of deterrence and adoption of unilateralism depend upon certain propositions about morality..."

"Among them is the statement attributed by Plato to Socrates that it is better to suffer injustice than to commit it. In the context of the arms race this means that it is better to risk injury and death than to threaten and inflict them... it still is better to disarm and undergo suffering without retaliation in kind than to base policy on the proposition that it is right to wipe out whole cities and destroy millions of human beings. The end result of an arms race is that we both die and kill. If we carry through on unilateral disarmament, it is possible that we die, but at least we do not kill... there can be little doubt about which alternative the moral man must select."

Bulk Rate
U. S. POSTAGE
P A I D
Syracuse, N. Y.
Permit No. 2380

Syracuse Peace Council
841 University Building
Syracuse 2, N. Y.

PEACE NEWS LETTER

Published by and for the New York State Peace Council
Rev. Alan B. Peabody, Editor

\$1.00 per year

SPC 265, No. 62 - 130
May 24, 1962

BACKGROUND ON LAOS

The recurring trouble in Laos coupled with recent enlarged American involvements in South Viet-Nam and Thailand, have probably found most Americans with an inadequate background to comprehend developments. The following is an attempt to outline the more significant developments, and is done at the risk of oversimplification.

The area involved (excepting Thailand) was familiarly known as French Indo-China. It was originally five states. During World War II, Cochinchina, Annam and Tonkin were combined into Viet-Nam. Since 1954 this has been two states, North and South Viet-Nam.

For centuries this area consisted of a series of small states which were independent at times, and at other times under the domination of Imperial China. As early as 1615, French Roman Catholic missionaries entered the area, but it was not until 1862-67 that France made definite inroads in the area. The old Viet-Nam yielded three Southern Provinces to France in the face of superior French arms, and France established a protectorate over Cambodia. In 1883, France took North Viet-Nam and in 1893 took control over Laos.

Nationalism lagged in the area due to the divergent local interests of the people of varied historical backgrounds and loyalties. However, during World War I, numerous Indo-Chinese went to France to aid the Allied effort where they came in contact with Western ideas. Nationalism received impetus. Ho Chi Minh emerged as the outstanding native leader, and he unsuccessfully demanded self-determination for Indo-China at Versailles. In 1925 he joined the French Communist Party, subsequently went to Moscow, and in 1930 organized a Communist Party in Indo-China which agitated for independence. Following the fall of France, Japan occupied Indo-China and discovered that Ho Chi Minh had already organized the Viet-Nam Independence League or Viet Minh.

From 1940 to March 9, 1945, the Japanese occupied Indo-China but left the French in nominal control. During this period the Nationalists received sympathy from the Japanese who were talking of Asia for the Asiatics, and suppression from the French. In March, 1945, Japan interned French troops and administrators, and its puppet, Bao Dai, declared the independence of Viet-Nam, with Cambodia and Laos following suit. Inasmuch as most public offices had been filled by the French for more than sixty years, an administrative vacuum was the result.

Moreover, whatever unity existed in Indo-China at this time was the product of a common opposition to French lethargy, cynicism, and poor administration. The masses were uninformed and without hope while the native elites were individualistic, divided in loyalty, struggling among themselves for power, frustrated and dissatisfied with French treatment, and with little administrative experience.

General de Gaulle had announced that a quasi-independent Indo-China would live in the French Union at the conclusion of World War II. At Potsdam in 1945 it was decided that the Chinese would accept the Japanese surrender in the North and the British in the South, pending a French return. But as quickly as Japan toppled, Viet Nam declared again its independence, and Bao Dai abdicated his throne in favor of a "republic" under the leadership of Ho Chi Minh.

Subsequently the French were to encounter little resistance to their return to Cambodia and Laos, but mild fighting broke out quickly in Viet-Nam, with each side blaming the other. Claude Buss says "French unwillingness to make concessions to Nationalism was a glaring mistake." War intensified, fueled by the Communist victory in China.

In 1949, France enticed Bao Dai to set up a rival Viet-Nam government in Saigon and recognized Cambodia, Laos, and Viet-Nam as independent states in the French Union. From 1946 on, civil war raged in the North. The Korean war of 1950 resulted in much U. S. economic and military aid to France and Bao Dai, aid which continued until the French defeat at Dien Bien Phu in May of 1954. In 1950 Ho received recognition from the Soviet bloc. Between 1946 and 1954, France spent \$4 billion and the U.S. \$2 billion on the war in Indo-China, and in March and April of 1954, some highly placed U.S. military and civilian leaders openly advocated direct military intervention on behalf of France.

The French defeat led to the first Geneva Conference. This resulted in the partition of Viet-Nam, supposedly on a temporary basis with nationwide elections to follow in 1956. These elections never came off. The Communists consolidated their control in North Viet-Nam, and South Viet-Nam faced an uncertain future, by now led by Ngo Dinh Diem who was encouraged and assisted by the U.S. France gave complete independence to Cambodia, Laos, and Viet-Nam.

The U.S. participated in the Geneva Conference of 1954, but did not sign the resulting agreements. Laos could maintain limited military relations with France, but with no other power. She was not to accept - by terms of this same Geneva agreement - any military supplies or personnel from other powers nor was she to enter into any military alliances until a political settlement was reached. The political settlement was to include the integration of all factions into a neutral buffer state.

In 1957, Prince Souvanna Phouma reached a partial settlement of various issues. The American Ambassador, J. Graham Parsons, is reported to have said, "I struggled for sixteen months to prevent a coalition government."

In May, 1958, elections were won by the Pathet Lao (Pro-communists) and fellow-traveling neutralists. Souvanna Phouma resigned as Prime Minister in July, intending to form a new cabinet without the Pathet Lao. He was unsuccessful and was succeeded by pro-American Phou Svanikone, under whose aegis U.S. aid and influence grew. Civil war broke out with the Pathet Lao winning gains in their old strongholds.

In April, 1960, rigged elections left the Pathet Lao and neutralists with no seats in the legislature. Resort to arms was the alternative open to the political opposition. Capt. Kong Le staged a coup which returned Souvanna Phouma to power with the King's sanction. The U.S. tried to get him into an anti-Communist combine with Gen Phoumi Nosovan and Prince Bhoun Oum. In November, right wing forces aided by the U.S. staged an uprising with limited success, whereupon Souvanna Phouma sought Soviet aid. By December there were two governments, Bhoun Oum's and Souvanna's, with King Le subsequently joining the Pathet Lao.

When the Kennedy administration took office, there were three possibilities: introduction of U.S. troops, abandonment of Laos, or work for a coalition government. It chose the latter, and this concept of a neutralist government was the one thing upon which Kennedy and Khrushchev agreed at Vienna (according to Averill Harriman).

In Laos there were now three factions, the Pro-Western under Bhoun Oum and Nosovan, the Neutralists under Souvanna, and the Pro-Communists under Prince Souphanouvong. The latter staged an offensive in March, 1961, which resulted in reverses for the Royal Laotian Army in Central and Northern Laos. In the Spring, Russia recognized Souvanna as the legal Premier, and Souvanna criticized the U.S. for its involvement and demanded the withdrawal of all foreigners.

In March and April, a SEATO Conference was held. Thailand urged immediate U.S. military intervention in Laos. France and Britain urged a neutralist regime. On April 25, Britain reached an agreement with Russia looking for a cease fire, and calling on India to reconvene the International Control Commission for Laos. On May 3d the Cease Fire began and on May 16, although the 14-nation Geneva Conference had bogged down, the three Laotian Princes agreed to form a provisional government under King Savan Vathma who selected Souvanna Phouma to head the coalition.

The U.S. official policy was to encourage Bhoun Oum, beaten on the battlefield, to enter the coalition. It has been suggested that U.S. military and CIA people worked against official policy. In any event, Bhoun Oum dragged his feet with it being reported (CSM 3/31) that Gen Phoumi Nosovan blocked formation of the coalition, possibly on the advice of his uncle, Sarit Thanavait, Premier of Thailand. The U.S. sought to force Bhoun Oum into the coalition by withholding a \$3 million monthly subsidy. However, it continued military aid and advice. The withholding of funds was an apparent acknowledgment that the Western-oriented right-wing faction was unpopular, and that an independent government would need a wider base to survive.

In early May it was revealed (CSM editorial, 5/5) that Soviet consent for a neutral Laos had been won when the pro-Western faction was rapidly losing control of the country, and when the U.S. threatened to intervene. But now the delay in carrying forward the agreements lay on the American side. "And more disconcerting, while the delay continues month after month, American military officers are continuing the build-up of the pro-Western forces... training Meo tribesmen as guerillas operating up north behind the Communist-held and neutralist-held areas."

Three days later (CSM, 5/8) it was reported that while the Pathet Lao attack on Nam Tha was a clear violation of the cease fire, a prior Royal Laotian build-up in the area was provocative and so described by Souvanna Phouma who warned of a possible pro-Communist counter attack.

Some observers feel that a frustrated Royal Laotian Army hoped by its action to provoke American military intervention. As we now know, this Army was beaten again, and the U.S. stuck by its policy of working for a coalition government even though the Pathet Lao forces, supplied from the Soviet bloc, had less need for compromise. An almost immediate U.S. show of force followed, made palatable by prior treaty commitments to Thailand. It may have contributed to the Soviet reaffirmation of the desirability of a coalition government. By May 16, the Pathet Lao had ceased military activity, Souvanna Phouma had agreed to return from France, and Bhoun Oum had given up demands that the ministries of defense and interior should be in the hands of rightists rather than neutralists. The concluding note is supplied by the Christian Science Monitor in an editorial on May 15: "The policy makers of the United States cannot expect Asians to fight efficiently if the governments for which they are fighting are unpopular.

"The United States is now supporting four unpopular governments in Southeast Asia, all threatened by an advancing Communist tide. They are Laos, Viet-Nam, Thailand, and Cambodia...

"The lesson of Laos is that political power overrides military power..."

Bulk Rate
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
SYRACUSE, N. Y.
Permit No. 2380

Syracuse Peace Council
841 University Building
Syracuse 2, N. Y.

SYRACUSE PEACE COUNCIL---NEWS LETTER--- June 22, 1962

ALAN PEABODY, who edits the attached pages, will be in the area late in July... A picnic will be planned for him, probably at Cazenovia Lake, so all his friends can greet him... Rev. Peabody is teaching at Paul Quinn College in Waco, Texas.

* * *

LINUS PAULING, who aroused such a furor when he spoke here in the spring, has won a \$16,000 out-of-court libel settlement against the newspaper in Bellingham, Washington... The suit was the result of letters to the editor which reflected on his loyalty... The paper also printed a retraction and apology... Dr. Pauling has big libel suits pending against other newspapers in the nation.

* * *

THE PEACE COUNCIL scored a major hit during its spring installation dinner at Rockefeller Methodist Church. The hit was MARY GROOMS, one of the women who chartered a plane and flew to Geneva to urge more serious negotiations at the disarmament conference... MRS. GROOMS told how the handful of women had button-holed both the American and Soviet delegates and suggested that one or both of them take one small but concrete step toward peace... She mentioned that the Americans could close just one missile base on the Russian border as a way to ease the Russian fears....

MRS. GROOMS said that she learned whose fault it is that the peace of the world is so shaky.... It's YOU.... "You and me," she said, because "we've not been willing to work for peace."

SHE PROPOSED that peace forces become the balance of political power in the nation.... This can be done, she said, by getting a thousand signers to petitions saying signers would vote for a candidate promoting peace... She would show these petitions to all congressional candidates in an attempt to get peace as the issue in the fall election.

* * *

DID YOU SEE that ad in the East Side Shopping Guide? The one showing Dr. Spock with the little girl? This ad noting how concerned Dr. Spock is by nuclear testing was sponsored by the local chapter of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. The ad cost \$62. If you can help pay that cost--and costs for similar ads--send a gift to the WIL, care of the Peace Council.

* WANT TO DO SOMETHING FOR PEACE? Help staff the Peace Center in *
* Hotel Onondaga, 361 S. Warren. Only two hours a week. Call Jane *
* Feld, GR 2-7926, to arrange a time. It's lots of fun.... And *
* don't forget to write to the President.... But even more impor- *
* tantly, write to Congressman R. Walter Riehlman, House Office *
* Building.... A dozen letters on peace will make quite a stack on *
* his desk.... And remember... peace work takes money. Be sure to *
* send a check to those groups working for peace. *

MESSAGE Some weeks ago, NORMAN R. LEE (RD 4, Fulton, New York) Chairman of the
 FROM Central New York Committee of 100, had some correspondence with Lord
 LORD Bertrand Russell, prominent in English efforts to arouse public concern
 BERTRAND about modern weaponry. Lord Russell, through Mr. Lee, has sent a mes-
 RUSSELL sage to the people of Central New York:

"HUMAN LIFE IS IN DANGER. WE ARE LIVING FROM MOMENT TO MOMENT UNDER
 THE IMMINENT THREAT OF THE NUCLEAR CLEARING OF LIFE FROM THIS PLANET.
 THE EARTH IS COVERED WITH ROCKET BASES; THEY REST ON A HAIR-TRIGGER;
 THEY DEPEND UPON RADAR TECHNOLOGY WHICH IS INCAPABLE OF DISTINGUISH-
 ING BETWEEN NATURAL PHENOMENA AND MISSILES. NUCLEAR WAR IS A MATTER
 OF NEAR-CERTAINTY UNLESS RADICAL CHANGE IN POLICY OCCURS SOON. IT IS
 INCUMBENT UPON US TO PREPARE A MOVEMENT OF MASSIVE RESISTANCE ON AN
 INTERNATIONAL BASIS, ONE WHICH WILL BE CAPABLE OF SYSTEMATICALLY OB-
 STRUCTING THE ENTIRE TECHNOLOGY OF MASS EXTERMINATION. THERE IS TIME
 FOR NOTHING LESS."

* * *

DOES THIS QUESTION is the title of the second pamphlet released in the "Beyond
 DETERRENCE Deterrence" Series being produced by the American Friends Service Committee.
 DETER? The author, D. F. FLEMING, is Emeritus Professor of International Relations
 at Vanderbilt University who recently published a twelve-year study of The
 Cold War and Its Origins, 1917-1960, in two volumes. (This study lays grave responsi-
 bilities upon the United States in this matter.)

IN THE PAMPHLET Dr. Fleming writes:

"The game of war is one of humanity's oldest and most cherished
 institutions. It is now clearly outmoded, obsolete and tragically
 absurd, but we cannot bring ourselves to give it up, because our
 fears, suspicions and hates of other peoples and systems will not
 let us. Their will to power - and ours also - forbids that. We
 therefore give heed perpetually to that oldest handmaiden of war,
 the doctrine that if we would have peace we must prepare for war."

DR. FLEMING examines this doctrine in its historical context, with particular reference
 to the present East-West Cold War, and he concludes:

"The deterrence of other great powers on the far side of the globe
 from possible bad behavior, as we define it, is a self-defeating
 undertaking. It only generates rapidly the very power we fear and
 when it leads to intolerable insecurity on their frontiers, it
 impels even the defiance of our nuclear lightning."

YOU WILL WANT to read the entire pamphlet for yourself to get the argument, and to
 better equip yourself for the task of Peacemaking, 1962! Order your copy through the
 New York State Peace Council, 841 University Bldg., Syracuse 2, N. Y. 35¢

* * *

ISSUE SOURCES USED in preparing last month's special issue on the background of the
 ON Laotian Crisis were:
 LAOS

Chubb, O. Edmund, "The Lesson of Laos," Progressive, May, 1961
 Buss, Claude A., Southeast Asia and the World Today, Princeton, N. J.,
 D. Van Nostrand, 1958. Anvil paperback, \$1.25.
The Christian Science Monitor - several recent issues.
The Worldmark Encyclopedia of the Nations
The World Book Encyclopedia and especially its 1962 Yearbook.

POWER DR. HANS J. MORGENTHAU, professor of History and Political Science at the
SHIFT University of Chicago, warns that in the United States "the power of the
military forces has enormously increased as over against the power of the
people."

Dr. Morgenthau, director of the university's Center for the Study of American Foreign
and Military Policy, continues:

"Certainly and fortunately in our country the primacy of civilian control
is so firmly established not only in the Constitution but more directly in
the mores and ethics of the American people that there have been only a
very few extreme situations in which the civilian authority over the mili-
tary forces have been challenged, and the conflict has been resolved in
favor of the civilian authorities.

"But this fortunate situation of putting firm civilian controls over the
military forces should not blind us to the actual shift in the distribu-
tion of power which has occurred here, which was bound to occur here as
elsewhere by virtue of modern technological developments of which the a-
vailability of nuclear weapons is the most important one....

"Not only has effective power shifted from the people to the government,
but within the government as well....

"Effective power has shifted from the civilian authorities - the consti-
tutionally appointed authorities - to certain elites, military and other-
wise, which are determined by their technological competence in view of
the modern technologies of communication, transportation, and weaponry."

ONE SUCH ELITE other than the military is the Atomic Energy Commission "which is for
all practical purposes exempted from popular control...."

"This situation is harmless as long as there exists a spirit of loyalty
to the Constitution and to the political processes under it.... But we
should not forget the point which the founding fathers made time and
again in the Federalist Papers and of which the Constitution itself is
a living manifestation - that you cannot rely when it comes to the exer-
cise of political power upon the self-restraint derived from ethics.

"Where great power exists unchecked, it is likely to be abused sooner or
later. And the fact that the great power which today is in the hands of
the technological elites within the government has not yet been abused
is no guarantee against its being abused in the future...."

Interview by Godfrey Sperling, Jr., Christian Science Monitor, June -
4, 1952

IN SUM, DR. MORGENTHAU is forcibly directing our attention to the fact that interna-
tional tensions existing in the context of nuclear weapons and missiles are having the
effect of eroding American democracy by giving to some groups in our society power
which cannot be effectively checked and restrained by other units of government or by
the people themselves.

BOOK AWAKENED CHINA by Felix Greene is one of the few observations that has been
END written about modern China. The Syracuse Public Library has a copy.

Enc. Local Sheet

Bulk Rate
U. S. POSTAGE
PAID
Syracuse, N. Y.
Permit No. 2380

Syracuse Peace Council
841 University Building
Syracuse 2, N. Y.

PEACE NEWS LETTER

Published by and for the New York State Peace Council
Rev. Alan B. Peabody, Editor

\$1.00 per year

SPC 267, No. 62-134
September 28, 1962

THE MONROE DOCTRINE "PRESIDENT JAMES MONROE'S famous message of 1823 contained three elements of vital importance to hemispheric affairs. First, the powers of the Holy Alliance were warned against extending colonization to the new world. Second, the United States would not tolerate any interference in the political affairs of the American states. Third, the United States had no intention of meddling in the affairs of Europe..." (Emphasis supplied.)

Charles P. Schleicher, Introduction to International Relations, N. Y., Prentice-Hall, 1954, p. 532-533.

* * *

The repeated plea from Congressmen, Senators, and private citizens that President Kennedy should "enforce the Monroe Doctrine" with respect to Cuba overlooks certain facts: First, Latin Americans have lost some of the enthusiasm with which the doctrine was first received in 1823; Second, the Doctrine was a unilateral declaration of a President of the United States and was not passed by any international deliberative body or embodied in any multilateral treaty; Third, that the United States agreed to refrain from meddling in the affairs of Europe in return for European non-interference in the affairs of the Latin American nations.

CORRESPONDENT JOHN MORLEY, speaking at Baylor University (9/24/62), told of comments made to him in Eastern Europe by Communist officials: "Some day we will have bases breathing down your neck and then you'll know how it feels." Morley commented that Kennedy cannot enforce one part of the Monroe Doctrine - with regard to Russian intervention in Cuba - without embarrassing another part, that which has to do with American participation in the affairs of Europe, with immediate reference to American military bases along the so-called Iron Curtain.

* * *

MILITARY SUCCESSFULLY RESISTED Last spring the U.S. Army announced plans to hold training maneuvers on a vast territory in Central Texas, with Fort Hood being the base of operations. In order to do so, the Army needed permission from 75% of the landowners in the area to use their land, and it wished to secure permits at \$1 per year for a period of five years from each individual owner, promising to pay damages to any land used.

THE COMMANDER of Fort Hood held meetings with landowners throughout the affected area trying to convince them that the proposed maneuvers were necessary to adequately train troops in an atomic age, and that the costs of transporting troops to other maneuver areas in the United States would be prohibitive. This fall, a General Adams flew in from Florida to make another effort to convince the ranchers and farmers that they should make their lands available to the army. While General Adams was in the area, Central Texas Citizen's Committee for Military Preparedness placed an advertisement in the Waco paper (and presumably others) urging the farmers and ranchers to make their lands available. Significantly, the advertisement did not list any Committee members.

Recently, the Army announced that inasmuch as only 30% of the farmers had agreed to make their lands available, the contemplated maneuvers would not be held, and the Army would hold smaller scale maneuvers at Fort Hood.

WHY DID THE FARMERS resist? Certainly for no idealistic reason. But several years ago the Army conducted similar maneuvers and was slow in settling claims for damage to the properties involved. Further, ranchers and farmers did not like the idea of tanks cruising across grasslands which had taken up to ten years to establish and cutting fences which would open up means for the escape of valued livestock. But whatever the motive, the Army did have to bow to the will of a group of citizens!

* * *

AT THE STATE FAIR WHILE WALKING THROUGH the State Fair Grounds at St. Paul, Minnesota in late August, the editor and family noticed a substantial exhibit prepared by the U.S. Navy. There was a lone picket walking back and forth with a sign: "Jesus said, 'Those who live by the sword shall perish by the sword.'" The grounds were crowded. A witness was being offered. It may not have moved many, but the testimony of conscience was being made by a courageous young man, and in the best of the American tradition, no one interfered with his right to make the witness.

* * *

RADIOACTIVE IODINE 131 "MINNESOTA," WROTE VICTOR COHN (Minneapolis Sunday Tribune, 8/19/62), "has become the first state to ask all farmers to take milk cows out of pasture 'until further notice.' The point is to give them aged feed to avoid loading milk with radioactive iodine 131. Repeated doses of radioactive iodine may cause

thyroid cancer, particularly in children."

* * *

A FEDERAL GUIDE on radioactive protection urges "strong and prompt" action to protect infants and pregnant mothers when the year's iodine 131 dose has reached 36,000 micro-microcuries. At Minneapolis, in the eleven months ending August 1, 1962, a person drinking a daily quart of milk would have taken in 33,000 micro-microcuries. The Russian resumption of tests brought a resumption of the fallout problem.

* * *

PREVIOUSLY, STATED MR. COHN, Strontium 90 had been the chief concern in fallout dangers. Now scientists are concerned about radioactive iodine 131 which has special dangers for children. In mid-May, 1962, high levels were recorded in several monitoring stations throughout the United States.

* * *

ON AUGUST 14, Minnesota Governor Elmer Andersen's Dairy Advisory Committee said, "until further notice" farmers should give feed at least 21 days old to all cows producing milk for drinking. Iodine 131 decays in strength by one-half each eight days. Therefore stored feed is safe, and manufactured milk products lose most of their radioactivity before they are sold.

* * *

COHN ALSO REPORTED that Salt Lake City had alarming concentrations of iodine 131 after the July tests in Nevada, and he concluded his article by referring to a Mr. Lawson of the Minnesota Department of Public Health. Mr. Lawson suggested that all radiation -- natural, X-Ray, fallout -- is potentially harmful. Small amounts can damage genes of a few people and cause much damage to future generations.

* * *

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS made so little progress during its first year that its chief, Teodoro Moscoso ordered his staff to forgo any celebration on August 19th and simply concentrate on the job to be done.

* * *

THE ALLIANCE WAS created to guide rather than crush the social revolution long overdue in Latin America. It is a program which aimed "to transform feudal societies into stable democracies," but thus far many Latin American nations have failed "to vigorously pursue land, tax and education reforms." "Only Chile, Columbia and Brazil have drawn up long-range economic development programs for use of aid funds. Many governments are meeting resistance to attempts to impose higher taxes and to divide up huge estates among poverty-stricken peasants." The denial of Constitutional Processes in Argentina and Peru, plus the reluctance of Latin American nations to join us in condemnation of Cuba are additional factors inspiring dissatisfaction among U.S. Congressmen with the program.

* * *

YET, AS THE Wall Street Journal (9/21/62) reports, tax-tightening steps have been taken in Venezuela, Columbia, Uruguay, Panama, El Salvador, Costa Rica, and Mexico. Moreover, Alliance administrators are devising more imaginative aid projects in home-building, education, and agriculture.

* * *

WHILE IT IS apparent that not all is gain in the first year of the Alliance, not all is lost, either. And the question remains, if we as a country do not work for social reform in Latin America by gradualist methods, and, on the contrary, continue to support the status quo, what alternative will be open to Latin American masses who no longer accept the necessity for poverty, degradation, and indignity?

* * *

HAVE YOU FILLED OUT the enclosed reservation blank yet? The Annual Fall Round-up of campus and community peace workers is being held October 20, at East Genesee Presbyterian Church -- and we hope you will be there.

THE LUNCHEON IS to be prepared by a local committee, with Irlavere Simmons and Jessie McGivern as co-chairmen, and will be served in the church dining room.

Permit No. 2380
Syracuse, N. Y.
PAID
U. S. POSTAGE
Bulk Rate

Syracuse Peace Council
841 University Building
Syracuse 2, N. Y.

PEACE NEWS LETTER

Published by and for the New York State Peace Council
Rev. Alan B. Peabody, Editor

SPC 268, No. 62-135
October 24, 1962

VOICES OF PEACE MUST SHOUT

WIRE * PRESIDENT KENNEDY AND WRITE CONGRESSIONAL REPRESENTATIVES TO PROTEST THIS ACTION OVER CUBA THAT MAY BE THE PRELUDE TO NUCLEAR WAR. *Public opinion message 15 words for 75 cents via Western Union.

CUBA The National Chairman of the Republican Party, Congressman Miller of Lockport, AN New York, has made it clear that Cuba will be an issue in this fall's electoral ISSUE campaigns for U.S. Representatives and Senators. It is not only an issue raised in campaigns for seats in the national legislature, but it is a vote-getting device used by at least one candidate for Governor.

Jack Cox, running for Governor of Texas on the Republican ticket, has struck a response in crowds when he has said he regretted what has happened in Mississippi's integration turmoil, and "hoped that the federal government will be just half as firm with Castro and communism in Cuba as they are with our own people in Mississippi." Like many others, Cox has called for a total economic blockade of Cuba. (Ken Towery, The Waco Times-Herald, 10/17/62.)

While the abortive revolt in Mississippi was being suppressed, printed postal cards were made available to persons in Waco, and presumably other southern cities, which could be signed and dropped in the mail. The card urged that the President withdraw troops from Mississippi and utilize them against the Castro regime in Cuba.

The 44th Annual Convention of the American Legion urged that the United States take military action against Cuba, and asked for a probe of whether this country should stay in the United Nations. (Waco Times-Herald, Oct. 12, 1962.)

Many voices have been raised in Congress demanding strong actions against Cuba, and few moderate voices have been heard. (See Congressional Record, 9/26-62.)

THE On October 5, Vice-President Lyndon B. Johnson, addressing a Democratic VICE-PRESIDENT Rally in Albuquerque, New Mexico, said that for the United States to invade Cuba would be like beating up a woman, and a blockade of Cuba could SPEAKS bring on World War III.

"Everybody knows we could invade Cuba, and whip Cuba," he said. He warned that those who advocate a tight blockade of Cuba apparently do not realize that "stopping a Russian ship is an act of war... Some people have more guts than brains.... And some don't have either."

The Vice-President defended the administration's policy of restraint, which takes account of treaty obligations not to interfere in the internal affairs of Latin America. We're still trying to explain our sending troops to Nicaragua..." (Waco Times-Herald, 10/6/62.)

One week later, speaking at a dinner attended by Ambassadors of a dozen Latin American nations, the Vice-President asserted that the United States "will not permit the Castro regime to export its aggressor purposes by force or by threat of force."

"We will prevent by whatever means are necessary their taking any action against any part of the Western Hemisphere." The aim of this country "is to get rid of the Castro regime and the Soviet-Communist influence in Cuba." If at any time a Cuban weapons build-

AN New York, has made it clear that Cuba will be an issue in this fall's electoral ISSUE campaigns for U.S. Representatives and Senators. It is not only an issue raised in campaigns for seats in the national legislature, but it is a vote-getting device used by at least one candidate for Governor.

Jack Cox, running for Governor of Texas on the Republican ticket, has struck a response in crowds when he has said he regretted what has happened in Mississippi's integration turmoil, and "hoped that the federal government will be just half as firm with Castro and communism in Cuba as they are with our own people in Mississippi." Like many others, Cox has called for a total economic blockade of Cuba. (Ken Towery, The Waco Times-Herald, 10/17/62.)

While the abortive revolt in Mississippi was being suppressed, printed postal cards were made available to persons in Waco, and presumably other southern cities, which could be signed and dropped in the mail. The card urged that the President withdraw troops from Mississippi and utilize them against the Castro regime in Cuba.

The 44th Annual Convention of the American Legion urged that the United States take military action against Cuba, and asked for a probe of whether this country should stay in the United Nations. (Waco Times-Herald, Oct. 12, 1962.)

Many voices have been raised in Congress demanding strong actions against Cuba, and few moderate voices have been heard. (See Congressional Record, 9/26-62.)

THE On October 5, Vice-President Lyndon B. Johnson, addressing a Democratic VICE-PRESIDENT Rally in Albuquerque, New Mexico, said that for the United States to invade Cuba would be like beating up a woman, and a blockade of Cuba could SPEAKS bring on World War III.

"Everybody knows we could invade Cuba, and whip Cuba," he said. He warned that those who advocate a tight blockade of Cuba apparently do not realize that "stopping a Russian ship is an act of war... Some people have more guts than brains.... And some don't have either."

The Vice-President defended the administration's policy of restraint, which takes account of treaty obligations not to interfere in the internal affairs of Latin America. "We're still trying to explain our sending troops to Nicaragua..." (Waco Times-Herald, 10/6/62.)

One week later, speaking at a dinner attended by Ambassadors of a dozen Latin American nations, the Vice-President asserted that the United States "will not permit the Castro regime to export its aggressor purposes by force or by threat of force."

"We will prevent by whatever means are necessary their taking any action against any part of the Western Hemisphere." The aim of this country "is to get rid of the Castro regime and the Soviet-Communist influence in Cuba." If at any time a Cuban weapons build-up menaces U.S. security, "We will do what must be done to protect that security and the security of our allies." (Waco Times-Herald, 10/13/62.)

Obviously the administration is in a dilemma. It wishes to resist those urging extreme measures while at the same time affirming hostility to the Castro regime so as to reduce criticism.

RADIO On October 5, Radio Free Dixie began broadcasting from Havana to the "gallant FREE Freedom Fighters" in America's southland who are opposing its racists. The station DIXIE features expatriate Americans who have sought asylum in Cuba.

Ted Szulc reports that the Racial Question in the United States has long been featured in Cuban propaganda in Latin America and to Negroes in the United States. Propaganda leaflets in English and Spanish have been circulated in Southern states and New York

predicting revolt in the U.S. and liberation of Negroes. The leaflets are signed "26th of July movement!" Their tone is that of Radio Free Dixie.

Curiously, while Castro praised Kennedy for sending troops to Mississippi, Radio Free Dixie, broadcasting from Havana, continued attacks on the United States for its treatment of Negroes. (N.Y. Times, 10/8/62)

WHAT Ronald Hilton, director of the Institute of Hispanic-American and Euro-Brazilian
LIES Studies at Stanford University, sees Cuba as an "Invitation to Disaster."
AHEAD? (Nation, 9/29/62)

Hilton thinks that "we have reached a collective frame of mind in which it is considered un-American to counsel prudence." The atmosphere is "strikingly similar to that preceding 1898, when the Hearst and Pulitzer Press both stimulated and echoed the demands that the United States invade Cuba. President McKinley was at first hesitant, but public opinion pushed him to an act which has had repercussions down to the present day" in terms of Latin American hostility to the United States.

The Advocates of invasion or blockade are legion, including such influential Senators as Capehart, Thurmond, Dodd, Smathers, Tower and Goldwater. President Kennedy and Senator Morse have urged caution.

Hilton reminds us that the Monroe Doctrine is regarded as a shibboleth almost everywhere but in the United States. Here leading periodicals are using it [inaccurately, as PNL pointed out last month] as justification for stepped up pressure on Cuba. The Toronto Globe and Mail has warned that Cuba could spark World War III as Spain did World War II.

Reports coming into the Institute at Stanford indicate that while Castro's prestige is declining among the middle classes of Latin America, it is still high among peasants. Yet "A disillusionment with Castro does not in any case mean enthusiasm for the United States or for U.S. police actions." Latin American republics fear intervention in Cuba could lead to a series of U.S. interventions throughout Latin America.

Feeling of hostile neutrality toward the United States "is heightened by the well-documented belief... that the aim of the U.S.... is to strengthen military regimes..."

While the Cuban government is paranoic, "Castro still holds the imagination of the Cuban masses. His regime has more popular support than those of most Latin American Caribbean republics..." Prof. Burks of the University of Michigan has warned that economic adversity could make the people more loyal to the regime we dislike. Hence, concludes Hilton, inaction by President Kennedy would have been in the best interest of the United States.

WHAT The United States has begun "to clap on the most sweeping curbs in modern peace-
WILL time history to stop the free world's ships from carrying cargoes from the Soviet
WE DO Union and its satellites to Communist-run Cuba..." Soviet bloc trade with Cuba
TO has increased enormously in two years, and free world shipowners have found it
CUBA? lucrative to transport such cargoes.

As Sylvia Porter puts it (Waco Times-Herald 10/11/62): "While our trade with Cuba has been slashed from 4.3 million tons in 1959 to a pittance 75,000 tons in 1961 (mostly medicines), the Soviet bloc nations have taken our place."

Under U.S. pressure, Turkey, West Germany, Italy, Denmark, Norway, and Greece are taking steps to prevent their shipping interests from transporting Soviet bloc goods to Cuba. Great Britain has been reluctant to comply with our requests.

Here's what the U.S. intends to do: "(1) We're going to close all U.S. ports to all ships of any country if any of that nation's ships carries arms to Cuba.

"(2) We're going to withhold any U.S. owned or financed cargoes from a foreign shipowner if any of that shipowner's vessels is used to carry Soviet cargoes to Cuba..."

sidered un-American to counsel prudence." The atmosphere is "strikingly similar to that preceding 1898, when the Hearst and Pulitzer Press both stimulated and echoed the demands that the United States invade Cuba. President McKinley was at first hesitant, but public opinion pushed him to an act which has had repercussions down to the present day" in terms of Latin American hostility to the United States.

The Advocates of invasion or blockade are legion, including such influential Senators as Capehart, Thurmond, Dodd, Smathers, Tower and Goldwater. President Kennedy and Senator Morse have urged caution.

Hilton reminds us that the Monroe Doctrine is regarded as a shibboleth almost everywhere but in the United States. Here leading periodicals are using it [inaccurately, as PNL pointed out last month] as justification for stepped up pressure on Cuba. The Toronto Globe and Mail has warned that Cuba could spark World War III as Spain did World War II.

Reports coming into the Institute at Stanford indicate that while Castro's prestige is declining among the middle classes of Latin America, it is still high among peasants. Yet "A disillusionment with Castro does not in any case mean enthusiasm for the United States or for U.S. police actions." Latin American republics fear intervention in Cuba could lead to a series of U.S. interventions throughout Latin America.

Feeling of hostile neutrality toward the United States "is heightened by the well-documented belief... that the aim of the U.S.... is to strengthen military regimes..."

While the Cuban government is paranoic, "Castro still holds the imagination of the Cuban masses. His regime has more popular support than those of most Latin American Caribbean republics..." Prof. Burks of the University of Michigan has warned that economic adversity could make the people more loyal to the regime we dislike. Hence, concludes Hilton, inaction by President Kennedy would have been in the best interest of the United States.

WHAT The United States has begun "to clap on the most sweeping curbs in modern peace-
WILL time history to stop the free world's ships from carrying cargoes from the Soviet
WE DO Union and its satellites to Communist-run Cuba..." Soviet bloc trade with Cuba
TO has increased enormously in two years, and free world shipowners have found it
CUBA? lucrative to transport such cargoes.

As Sylvia Porter puts it (Waco Times-Herald 10/11/62): "While our trade with Cuba has been slashed from 4.3 million tons in 1959 to a picayune 75,000 tons in 1961 (mostly medicines), the Soviet bloc nations have taken our place."

Under U.S. pressure, Turkey, West Germany, Italy, Denmark, Norway, and Greece are taking steps to prevent their shipping interests from transporting Soviet bloc goods to Cuba. Great Britain has been reluctant to comply with our requests.

Here's what the U.S. intends to do: "(1) We're going to close all U.S. ports to all ships of any country if any of that nation's ships carries arms to Cuba.

"(2) We're going to withhold any U.S. owned or financed cargoes from a foreign ship-owner if any of that shipowner's vessels is used to carry Soviet cargoes to Cuba..."

"(3) We're going to bar from all U.S. ports any ship which delivers even clearly non-military Soviet cargoes to Cuba and then tries 'on the same continuous voyage' to come to our ports to pick up cargoes to carry home.

"(4) We're forbidding all U.S. flagships of U.S. owned ships to carry goods to and from Cuba."

Permit No. 2380
Syracuse, N. Y.
p e d
U. S. POSTAGE
Bulk Rate

Syracuse 2, N. Y.
FIRST CLASS PERMIT NO. 2380

SYRACUSE PEACE COUNCIL - - - NEWS LETTER - - - October 24, 1962

Now that the Peace Council's first fall meeting, the Annual Round-up, is a successful memory, it is time to look forward to our second meeting.

CIRCLE MONDAY, NOVEMBER 12, on your calendar -- Dr. Julian Friedman of the Syracuse University Maxwell School will speak to the Peace Council.

HIS SUBJECT -- "Pangas* and Politics in Africa"

The TIME -- 8:00 p.m., November 12

The PLACE -- Eastwood Baptist Church, 3212 James Street

Dr. Friedman has recently returned from Africa, where he visited Kenya, Tanganyika, Nyasaland, and Southern Rhodesia. A professor of political science at SU, he has also taught at the University of California at Berkeley and the London School of Economics. He has worked for the State Department, was United States Attache in China, and while in Africa, did free-lance research while representing SU under the Ford Foundation Cross-Cultural Exchange program.

* * *

THE PEACE COUNCIL AND THE WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE for Peace and Freedom are jointly sponsoring a leaflet-ing of the Syracuse area churches on Veteran's Day, Sunday, November 11. A pamphlet on the dangers of accidental war is being prepared for ministers and parishioners.

* * *

THESE BRISK FALL DAYS remind us that Halloween is almost here again. Would your children like to help trick-or-treat in your neighborhood for UNICEF? If so, call Mrs. Morris Budin, GR 2-1898, before October 25.

Plans are being made for a UNICEF party for those children who participate. It will be held at the East Genesee Presbyterian Church, 1800 E. Genesee St., from 7:30 to 9, Halloween night. Money that has been collected will be turned in and UNICEF films will be shown to let your youngsters know how their "tricks-or-treat" will be used.

* * *

THE SIGHT OF PUMPKINS PILED HIGH at roadside stands reminds us also that, with autumn in the air, November and the election are not far off. We should be encouraged that at least 20 candidates are running for Congress in a dozen states on a peace platform.

Washington columnist Marquis Childs has written, "If these candidates, scattered across the country, share one thing, it is a deep concern over the drift and apathy that they fear will end in a third world war... The peace candidates are putting their convictions to the test at a considerable cost in time, effort, and money."

To help offset the cost, the National Committee of 1,000 to Elect Peace Candidates has been formed. Its goal is to raise \$100,000 this year to help those Americans who are seeking political power to carry out peace programs. Contributions are received by the National Committee of 1,000, Room 1406, 343 South Dearborn, Chicago 4, Ill.

* * *

TWO DAYS AFTER THE ELECTION, Mrs. Annalee Stewart, National Legislative Secretary for the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, and an ordained Methodist minister, will be in Syracuse to evaluate the election returns. She will speak to the local WIL on the new congressional delegation and how it is likely to affect peace legislation. This timely meeting is open to Peace Council members. It will start at 8:00, November 8, at

The TIME -- 8:00 p.m., November 12

The PLACE -- Eastwood Baptist Church, 3212 James Street

Dr. Friedman has recently returned from Africa, where he visited Kenya, Tanganyika, Nyasaland, and Southern Rhodesia. A professor of political science at SU, he has also taught at the University of California at Berkeley and the London School of Economics. He has worked for the State Department, was United States Attache in China, and while in Africa, did free-lance research while representing SU under the Ford Foundation Cross-Cultural Exchange program.

* * *

THE PEACE COUNCIL AND THE WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE for Peace and Freedom are jointly sponsoring a leaflet-ing of the Syracuse area churches on Veteran's Day, Sunday, November 11. A pamphlet on the dangers of accidental war is being prepared for ministers and parishioners.

* * *

THESE BRISK FALL DAYS remind us that Halloween is almost here again. Would your children like to help trick-or-treat in your neighborhood for UNICEF? If so, call Mrs. Morris Budin, GR 2-1898, before October 25.

Plans are being made for a UNICEF party for those children who participate. It will be held at the East Genesee Presbyterian Church, 1800 E. Genesee St., from 7:30 to 9, Halloween night. Money that has been collected will be turned in and UNICEF films will be shown to let your youngsters know how their "tricks-or-treat" will be used.

* * *

THE SIGHT OF PUMPKINS PILED HIGH at roadside stands reminds us also that, with autumn in the air, November and the election are not far off. We should be encouraged that at least 20 candidates are running for Congress in a dozen states on a peace platform.

Washington columnist Marquis Childs has written, "If these candidates, scattered across the country, share one thing, it is a deep concern over the drift and apathy that they fear will end in a third world war... The peace candidates are putting their convictions to the test at a considerable cost in time, effort, and money."

To help offset the cost, the National Committee of 1,000 to Elect Peace Candidates has been formed. Its goal is to raise \$100,000 this year to help those Americans who are seeking political power to carry out peace programs. Contributions are received by the National Committee of 1,000, Room 1406, 343 South Dearborn, Chicago 4, Ill.

* * *

TWO DAYS AFTER THE ELECTION, Mrs. Annalee Stewart, National Legislative Secretary for the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, and an ordained Methodist minister, will be in Syracuse to evaluate the election returns. She will speak to the local WIL on the new congressional delegation and how it is likely to affect peace legislation. This timely meeting is open to Peace Council members. It will start at 8:00, November 8, at the home of Mrs. Virginia Hickernell, 506 Allen St.

* * *

AFTER SIX MONTHS OF SERVICE, our Peace Center on Warren St. has closed, and we would like to take this opportunity to express our gratitude to Jonathan Holdeen, owner of the Onondaga Hotel, for making the room for the Center available to us.

Mrs. Virginia Gilmore, Center chairman, also would like to thank Peace Council members who worked at the Center. During the six months it was open, the Center was used for a presentation of Jules Feiffer's play, "Crawling Arnold," and for local display of the "Art for World Friendship" exhibit. Greatest local interest probably was generated by our window displays of peace literature.

*knives

THE
THIRD
MEETING
OF THE
SYRACUSE
PEACE COUNCIL
FOR 1962-1963
**** WILL BE A ****
FACT-FINDING SESSION,
****IN ANTICIPATION****
** OF THE NEXT CRISES **

Dr. Rajendra Nanavati will discuss
Berlin and Viet Nam, Thursday evening,
December 6, at 8:00, at the home of
Gene and Virginia Gilmore, 940 Lancaster.

The Gilmores are on the
Drumlins bus line.*****
***** SEE YOU THERE!

GENE AND VIRGINIA GILMORE were among the campaign workers for Harrop Freeman, who polled 4,400 votes in his race for Congress in New York's 33rd Congressional District (the Elmira, Ithaca, Binghamton area). Freeman, running on the Liberal ticket with a peace platform, received 3.2 per cent of the vote. The education that went on during Freeman's campaign -- as well as the campaigns of other peace candidates -- was worth a great deal to the peace movement.

In Massachusetts, H. S. Hughes, running for the United States Senate as an independent on a peace platform against Ted Kennedy and George Cabot Lodge, polled 49,000 votes, 2.4 per cent of the vote. Freeman and Hughes were among at least 20 candidates for Congress running on peace platforms in a dozen different states.

HAVE YOU RECEIVED RACHAEL FALLICK'S letter for the Finance Committee? This year's Peace Council budget has been put at \$6,500 to make provision for a decent salary for Lena Gray, for at least the minimum hourly wage for Aurel Coe, and for the rise in mailing costs.

The money will be used to carry on a continuing peace education in the community through democratic methods, to encourage the seeking of peaceful alternatives to violent conflicts, to educate people to accept disarmament, and to promote understanding between peoples of all countries. If you haven't already done so, won't you help by putting your check in the mail now?

WHILE YOUR PEN IS OUT, you might want to write Senator Hubert Humphrey to express appreciation to him for conducting research on the economics of disarmament. Recently Senator Humphrey sent out questionnaires asking how readily American industries could convert from a wartime to a peacetime economy. Copies of his findings are available through his office.

DE FACTO SEGREGATION IN THE SYRACUSE PUBLIC SCHOOLS will be the subject for discussion at the December 12th meeting of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. Viewpoints of the Congress on Racial Equality and the State Commission for Human Rights will be presented. The history and present status of segregation in Syracuse schools will be explained so that WIL members will be able to participate in future action. The meeting will begin at 8:00, Wednesday, December 12, at the home of Mrs. Lillian Reiner, 1009 Cumberland. Peace Council members are welcome.

ANY EXTRA S&H GREEN STAMPS? Through the American Friends Service Committee, these stamps can be turned into blankets for Algerian refugees. Send your stamps to Katherine Karsner, AFSC Warehouse, 23d and Arch Streets, Philadelphia 3, Pennsylvania.

Warm clothing and blankets for Algerian relief are being collected through the AFSC here in Syracuse. Your answer to this appeal can be made by bringing contributions from your closets to the Dotterer and Becker Hardware Store, 722 North Salina.

QUESTIONS OF WAR AND PEACE, ACADEMIC FREEDOM, and civil liberties will be among the public issues considered by a new discussion group -- the Syracuse Area Faculty Group on Public Issues. The organization is open to interested members of the academic profession in the Syracuse area -- including the faculties at Syracuse University, LeMoyne College, the Community College and the Upstate Medical Center. For further information, contact either Dr. Arnold Honig, of the physics department, or Dr. Raj Nanavati, of the electrical engineering department, at Syracuse University.

PEACE NEWS LETTER

Published by and for the New York State Peace Council
Rev. Alan B. Peabody, Editor \$1.00 per year

SFC 270, No. 62-137
December 18, 1962

WISDOM FROM AN INTERNATIONAL CIVIL SERVANT

"I also take this occasion to reaffirm my oath of office to exercise in all loyalty, discretion and conscience the functions entrusted to me as Secretary General of the United Nations, to discharge these functions and regulate my conduct with the interests of the United Nations only in view and not to seek or accept instructions in regard to the performancy of my duties from any government or other authority external to the organization....

"I now look at the years ahead. I would hope that these years would be marked by an improvement in the international climate, and by better understanding of the difficult problems which the world faces today. These problems can be solved only by good will and mutual understanding, and, by a spirit of 'give and take.'

"When the future of mankind itself is at stake, no country or interest-group can afford to take a rigid stand, or claim that its position is the only right one, and that others must take it or leave it.

"No difficult problem can be solved to the complete satisfaction of all sides. We live in an imperfect world, and we have to accept imperfect solutions, which become more acceptable as we learn to live with them and as time passes by."

-- U Thant, Secretary-General
of the United Nations.
November 30, 1962

WHAT IS DEMOCRACY? Democracy means many things to many people. But central to the thinking of many modern political theorists is this thought:

"the democratic process has been a method of arriving openly, through discussion and compromise, at decisions in keeping with the reasonable wishes of the majority, and then of pursuing these decisions with the fullest respect for the legitimate rights of the minority."

-- Clinton Rossiter, "The Democratic Process" in Goals for Americans, p. 61.

THE DEMOCRATIC PROCESS AND PRESIDENTIAL ADVISORS Much attention has been given in recent days to the role which Adlai Stevenson played as an advisor to the President during the recent Cuban crisis. If democracy is government by discussion and compromise, and if it is impossible for all citizens to be involved in the discussion and decision-making process, then it may be very important for varied points of view to be represented among those who serve the President of the United States as advisors in order that all proposed solutions to problems are thoroughly tested before actions are taken. One of the most perceptive contributions to this discussion came from a resident of Schenectady, New York:

"Beneath discussion of Adlai Stevenson's participation in conferences on Cuba lies a principle which, if of governing importance, threatens the decision-making process.

"Comments about Mr. Stevenson do not imply that he took action in any way inconsistent with the policy laid down by the President. Rather, the claim is that Mr. Stevenson proposed a course of action that differed from the policy decided by the President after consideration of all points of view.

"If this is to be considered valid criticism of Mr. Stevenson, it must be based upon the premise that an advisor is not entitled to propose a course of action different from the views of the majority. There are two dangers in acting upon this premise. One is that the President will soon be surrounded by advisors who either think alike and advise alike or who suppress their thoughts and simply utter what they think is likely to be acceptable policy.

"The second and more significant danger is that the decision-making process will be undermined. The difficulties facing the United States are of great complexity and the possible alternatives of action are so varied that one cannot draw sharp lines between the blacks and whites.

"Under these circumstances the President requires advice from people with differing points of view. Moreover, the decision that is ultimately reached is likely to be a consensus of these differing views. The suppression of one view from the beginning is likely to change the consensus and thus produce a slightly different decision.

"If each time a decision is reached the advisors who originally proposed a different course of action are removed, the group of advisors will soon become single-minded. There are few problems facing the United States Government so easily solved that a single mind will suffice."

-- George D. Braden, letter, New York Times, December 7, 1962

THE SECRET is the title of an article which appeared originally in L'Express, a
NORSTAD Paris newspaper, following the resignation of General Norstad. The arti-
COULDN'T cle is concerned with Western military policy in Europe and begins with
KEEP the assumption that Russian or East German troops have invaded West Berlin.
What does one do? There are three possibilities which the author sees:

First, one can do nothing but protest. This would lead to the collapse of NATO because of the repudiation of American assurances that Berlin would not be abandoned. "The war has been lost before it has begun."

Second, the war could be fought on the spot "with conventional weapons" to "reconquer Berlin. That is impossible." The Soviet Army is much larger than Western military forces in Europe.

Third, the invasion of West Berlin might be considered adequate cause for unleashing atomic war. "That is absurd."

"In every respect, even if the West has a superior striking force, atomic war means a terrible massacre and the end of white civilization. Is the Western half of Berlin worth that kind of collective suicide?"

The author points out that politicians can live with a difficult and uncertain situation since by definition they must "cope with the unforeseeable," but military commanders must "have a detailed, well-organized response ready for the question which may come up at any moment.

"This being the condition of the nuclear age, three kinds of military commanders have emerged.

"The first is the irresponsible type. He thinks that the threat of atomic reprisal is the only way to keep the enemy from attacking anywhere at all -- and he is always ready to carry out this threat....

"Then you have the reappraiser. He questions the whole strategy based on atomic weapons. Wisely adjudging it impossible to condemn three-quarters of humanity to death to gain a local objective, he concludes that one must maintain, in addition to an atomic arsenal, conventional forces sufficiently strong to stand firm anywhere.... This is the theory of ... Maxwell Taylor. His theories are militarily sound, but economically?

"Between the two you have Norstad. He knows that the West's only chance, militarily speaking, of defense lies in atomic weapons. Repugnant as he may find this monstrous prospect, he is also aware that he does not know whether the United States... would accept the responsibility of giving him such an order. Yet under the terms of the Atlantic Charter he is responsible for European security. What then? Then he ages thirty years in five and resigns."

The secret is uncertainty. "If in the last resort the chances of nuclear war are slight, it is because neither side really can know how his adversary will react. Thus neither can measure the risk; the risk is the supreme unknown quantity, and this uncertainty is our best protection."

-- Jean-Jacques Servan-Schreiber, Atlas, October, 1962

Bulk Rate
U. S. POSTAGE
PAID
SYRACUSE, N. Y.
Permit No. 2380

Syracuse Peace Council
841 University Building
SYRACUSE, N. Y.