

Ellsberg Feared A-War

Daniel Ellsberg, alleged source of the New York Times and Washington Post exposes of some 20 years involvement in Southeast Asia, told editors of The Examiner six months ago of being driven by fears of nuclear weapons being used in Vietnam.

"Unless dissent takes different forms than it has in the past, much more involvement in Congress, much more initiative by a lot of influential people, then I think we're going to be bombing North Vietnam within the next two years and before the next presidential election, Ellsberg told the editors last December.

"There may well be nuclear threats accompanying those bombings by this administration. I even think there is a significant chance — it doesn't have to be very large, one percent, five percent, or 10 percent — of nuclear weapons being used within the next two years."

Executives

Ellsberg was brought to The Examiner by a representative of the San Francisco Chapter of Business Executives for Vietnam Peace, who described his organization as "the rightwingers of the peace movement."

He left a resume of his biography which contained

mention of participating from June, 1967, to April, 1970 "in studies of U. S. decision making process in Vietnam."

This was the top secret study which resulted in the 47 volumes on origins of U. S. participation in Vietnam from President Truman on which the Times and Post began publishing last week.

Ellsberg mainly based his fears of nuclear bombing of Vietnam on a conviction that President Nixon plans to do more than the public understands him to say he will do.

"Nobody, first, can be certain what the President has in mind, or what he will do, whatever he has in mind," Ellsberg said.

"What the President wants is not a total withdrawal policy, but a Korean one.

"If he could get Korea, I would accept it," Ellsberg said although he expressed some doubts about the success of Korea.

"But the North Korean Communists are in North Korea. The Vietnam Communists are in Vietnam and will stay there and die, and that is the difference."

Ellsberg said President Nixon is getting advice from the military that the "only

acceptable permanent presence in Vietnam, in order not to admit defeat" would be 200,000 men.

"But faced with an indefinite U. S. presence, or even the possibility or ambiguity about a U. S. presence, the North Vietnamese will take casualties to give us a black eye.

"The President has made this a test, has defined this as a challenge of the United States. He has told us what he would do in the face of that challenge. I believe him.

"People who think there will be no escalation, who think we will be out of there in a year, or two or three years from now, don't believe him.

"They can think of why he would react to such challenges forcefully, but not mean it.

"Given that combination of that presence under threat — American boys and their lives at stake, plus the President's attitude, which is no different from past Presidents' — but that's my criticism, that American prestige has to be safeguarded by retaliation and, if necessary, escalation — put these together with the North Vietnamese, and I say you should bet on escalation.