A little more than a month ago, the United States has said that negotiations—an action, incidentally, that put an immediate end to those conversations. And two years ago, the President was surprised to discover that poison gas was being used by American forces without specific White House knowledge or authorization. On an even more ominous level: Who authorized the present heavy bombing of South Vietnam cities? What kind of thinking is it that believes we can liberate a people by dosing them with dynamite and fire? We assert that our purpose in Vietnam is to save the Vietnamese from the Vietcong. But if we attack and kill Vietcong and non-Vietcong alike—the inevitable concomitant of our search-and-destroy policy and the bombing—then we are making a farce out of our proclamations.

EACH increase in the slaughter only enlarges the stage for yet more slaughter. The most prophetic voice in the whole tragedy may turn out to be that of Lyndon B. Johnson, Democrat president-elect for the Presidency in 1964. It was Mr. Johnson who foresaw at that time the folly of the bombing. It was Mr. Johnson who foresaw the absurdity of trying to pursue military victory. It was Mr. Johnson who said that the traditional use of force would only produce counter-force and would require the commitment of increasing numbers of American soldiers without changing the course of the war. It was Mr. Johnson who spoke of the primary need for a nonmilitary program that would give promise of social justice for the Vietnamese people and that was the best army against the Vietcong. And it was Mr. Johnson who said that the only way to end the war was at the negotiating table.

Everything that has happened in the past four years has served only to underscore the correctness of Mr. Johnson's original analysis. Is it possible that the same combination of forces inside the Government that President Dwight D. Eisenhower warned against in his farewell address was also responsible for the defeat of President Johnson's announced policies? Why, for example, would the State Department assert that there have been no serious indications by Hanoi of a willingness to get into negotiations, or even to explore their possibility, when it is a fact that several such opportunities did exist? To what extent does State Department thinking reflect the views of former Secretary of State Dean Acheson, who declared recently that "negotiations would be a pain in the neck?"

The course of events in Vietnam is serving mainly to prove that the Government of the United States is getting away from the American people, and, for all we know, from many of their elected officials. Our policies and actions in Vietnam are inconsistent with American history; they bear the mark of adventurism and loose handling of force. The American people have not been misinformed so much as they have been manipulated.

The most telling comment on the war so far came from James B. Reston of The New York Times when he said that we are beginning to resemble the fliers who captured the flypaper.
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in the South until the federal courts began, about 1940, to hear cases on Constitutional rights, many of which had been unstated since the Tilden-Hayes steal in 1876-77, in which Southerners enabled Hayes to be President in exchange for an end to Reconstruction. States rights were restored with this agreement. It included the state determination of Negro rights—the U.S. Constitutional rights, many of which had been untested since the Tilden-Hayes agreement. It included the state determination of Negro rights—the U.S. Constitution notwithstanding.

Disfranchisement of the Negro and his exclusion from jobs by the newly rising labor unions, especially that of the railroads and larger craft unions, came on quickly. A combination of laws, amendments of state constitutions, and party regulations bypassed the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments. These included such devices as the poll tax (also deliberately designed to restrict franchise of poor whites), property ownership as a suffrage qualification, and the franchise of poor whites), property ownership as a suffrage qualification, and various "rules." These "rules" required a voter to "read, understand, and explain" to "the satisfaction of the registrar" a section of the Constitution. Rare was the Negro applicant—and rarer still was one who could "satisfy" the registrar.

Therefore, there could have been no two-party development in the South until the white primary was ended by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1944, a mere twenty-four years ago. Nor was a "New South" possible until the U.S. Supreme Court school decision in 1954. It was the first of several necessary Constitutional decisions. There was, and is, much resentment and resistance by the states that were politically and economically freed by those decisions. The unanimous school decision of 1954 was followed, in 1964, by Congressional enactment of a broad civil rights act. This act created a legal, Constitutional base that removed discrimination in public accommodations, in federally assisted programs, in job opportunity, and in voting. This latter Constitutional right was more firmly established by an important complementary act to the one of 1964—a voting rights measure.

The myths of the old segregated order—school football and basketball teams to be integrated, Negro child was admitted. It was cried from the rooftops of state capitols, from klan klaverns, White Citizens Councils, pulpits and civic-club podiums, from newspapers, TV, and radio that the South's answer was "Never!" But there were Southerners aplenty who said otherwise. There were a handful of churchmen who opposed emotional idiocy. There were newspaper, TV, and radio editors and executives who did not join the mobs.

Sad to say, it was the dollar that really was most effective in allowing progress to be made. It was expensive to go into court and defend discrimination. Too, restaurants, hotels, and motels found public enriched them instead of destroying business. Retail customers did not care. There were a handful of churchmen who opposed emotional idiocy. There were newspaper, TV, and radio editors and executives who did not join the mobs.

The court's rulings should have produced a real year of jubilee. Nothing of the kind happened. Southern governors, Congressmen, mayors, legislators, ministers, and laymen fiercely demanded that they be allowed to remain in political bondage, to keep their children in inferior schools, and to be politically chained—all for the sake of a long-discredited, immoral, unconstitutional racial status quo.

Nevertheless, despite infamous and disgraceful delays, evasions, and dishonorable actions, progress was made. It was said that the schoolhouse doors would run red with blood before a single Negro child was admitted. It was cried from the rooftops of state capitols, from klan klaverns, White Citizens Councils, pulpits and civic-club podiums, from newspapers, TV, and radio that the South's answer was "Never!" But there were Southerners aplenty who said otherwise. There were a handful of churchmen who opposed emotional idiocy. There were newspaper, TV, and radio editors and executives who did not join the mobs.

Sad to say, it was the dollar that really was most effective in allowing progress to be made. It was expensive to go into court and defend discrimination. Too, restaurants, hotels, and motels found public enriched them instead of destroying business. Retail customers did not care. There were a handful of churchmen who opposed emotional idiocy. There were newspaper, TV, and radio editors and executives who did not join the mobs.

There is today a Negro member of the United States Supreme Court. Only the most rabid opposed confirmation of the able and experienced Thurgood Marshall. There are other Negroes in the federal judiciary. The list is too long to belabor. It can no longer be argued, however, that the present participation of the Negro in the American Government and in its elective processes is mere tokenism. The big problem nevertheless remains. The civil rights laws did not, and do not, (Continued on page 115)

"Our age-old dream of independence! All we do is start speaking French, then with General de Gaulle..." SR/March 9, 1968