

25,000 In D.C. Protest

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1965.

The New York Times.

The Vietnam Debate

The Vietnam peace proposals, voiced with decorum during the recent "March on Washington," and the reply from Freedom House stem from sharply divergent attitudes toward the conflict. Yet the positions advanced by the two sides on this occasion—which presumably reflect their estimates of what the country is prepared to support—show interesting similarities.

The peace marchers, with a few exceptions, recognized that the United States cannot accept a Communist military victory or unilateral American withdrawal from South Vietnam. The Freedom House statement favored a United States effort "to seek the end of the war by negotiation" or other honorable means not in conflict with American obligations.

There are, of course, important differences stated or implied in the two positions. The peace marchers believe that "no party to the conflict, the U.S. included, has done all it can to bring about negotiations." They urge that the United States halt both the bombing of North Vietnam and the introduction of additional troops in South Vietnam, and they ask the other side to do the same. The Freedom House signers give quite a different emphasis by urging employment of "whatever national resources are required" to carry out the American commitment.

The peace marchers urge settlement based on the Geneva Accords of 1954, which would require the "eventual" withdrawal of "all" foreign military forces. The Freedom House statement speaks only of Communist withdrawal—while ostensibly supporting an Administration policy which, as clearly enunciated by President Johnson, is identical with the peace marchers' position on this point.

There are other differences. The Freedom House statement treats the war entirely as a North Vietnamese plot, while the peace marchers recognize that the conflict is also a civil war within South Vietnam. They urge that it be resolved, in part, by "constitution of a representative new government in South Vietnam." On its face, this is not necessarily at variance with the position of President Johnson, who has indicated a willingness to accept the Vietcong at the conference table and to include, in a settlement, new elections in South Vietnam. Ironically, nothing of this appears in the Freedom House statement, which purports to endorse the Administration view.

What is most important, however, about last week's exchanges is the tone in which—with a few exceptions—they were conducted. On the whole, they contributed to raising the level of the Vietnam debate—a debate that is vital and must continue in full vigor to help guide evolution of the nation's policy on a dangerous and critical issue.



A Call To Mobilize the Conscience of America

WE SEE no gain coming from the war in Vietnam. We see only the growing victimization of the Vietnamese people, the erosion of a better society at home, and the clear possibility of a world conflict.

Caught between terror, torture, and the senseless use of force, the Vietnamese people have seen their land turned into bloody testing ground by the Vietcong, the Saigon government, by the North Vietnamese and the United States. Caught between a commitment to eradicate racial injustice and poverty at home and a growing involvement in an Asian land war, the Johnson Administration will inevitably turn its resources and energies toward the military conflict.

Caught in a competition for the loyalties of the poorest nations, the Soviet Union and China will seek to prove their militancy by aiding North Vietnam, thus increasing the chances of a direct clash with the United States.

WE SEEK to end this war.

WE AFFIRM that no party to the conflict, the U.S. included, has done all it can to bring about negotiations, and since the war will ultimately end at the conference table, we ask new actions to speed that day.

WE AFFIRM our support for all the efforts, including those of the United Nations Secretary General, U Thant, and Pope Paul VI to bring the dispute to the conference table, and we welcome a wider role for the United Nations in bringing about negotiations and in implementing any agreement.

WE RECOGNIZE that the U.S. cannot negotiate an end to the war by itself, but we believe there are things our government could do which it has left undone, that could lead more quickly to negotiations. And we believe we can help build the public understanding through which our government can vigorously pursue the path of peace.

**MARCH ON WASHINGTON
FOR PEACE IN VIETNAM**

25,000 Peace Pickets Ring White House In Viet Protest

NEW YORK WORLD-TELEGRAM AND SUN, MONDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 1965

Norman Thomas Prods Johnson on Peace Role

President Johnson was challenged here today to "recover respect for what . . . he wants to be his role in history; that is, the hero of peace."

Norman Thomas, veteran Socialist party leader, said in a speech prepared for delivery during the March on Washington for Peace in Viet Nam that the President had "coldly rejected all feelers for peace, of which he never informed the people."

"Mr. President," he said, "you have a chance to live in history as the President of the most powerful nation in the world, who realizes the world cannot be saved by playing the old power-politics game, who knows that we must bring China, for example, into the family of nations. We must have coexistence or no existence."

Thomas was one of the speakers in a rally at the Sylvan Theater on the Washington Monument Grounds following the mass picketing of the White House earlier in the day.

Other speakers had these prepared comments on the war in Viet Nam:

MRS. MARTIN LUTHER KING JR.—"I am thankful that I am an American, and I am thankful for the things for which this country stands. If fact, these are the very reasons that I am here today. For I am convinced that unless America learns to respect the right to freedom and justice for all the peoples of the earth, then the very things which we hold dear in this country will wither away in the hypocritical ritual of the preservation of national self interest."

RONNIE DUGGER, Editor, The Texas Observer—"I seek to speak, not for burners of draft cards, and not for those who would lie their way out of the draft, and not for those who want the Viet Cong to win, for I am none of these. . . . Speaking just for myself, I seek also to speak in the consensus of the concerned—those many millions of us who are simply not convinced of the wisdom or the necessity of sending hundreds of thousands of American boys into a general land war in Asia."

DR. BENJAMIN SPOCK—"For 11 years our government has been following policies which we consider not only unjust, not only unrealistic but disastrous. It has been futilely trying to impose on South Viet Nam a reactionary dictatorship which has never had more than lukewarm support of a small minority of the citizens. . . . Repeatedly, our top military men have warned us against the folly of our becoming involved in a land war in Asia—which is

just where we find ourselves today."

JOSEPH M. DUFFY, JR., assistant professor of English, Notre Dame University—"Pope Paul issued a call to every nation" in his United Nations speech. "If we read Paul correctly, we see in this country's involvement in Viet Nam a disregard of all the dead of those past wars and a breach of faith with the living, especially with the young whose freshness and confidence we betray in sending them to kill and to keep graves themselves deep in an alien land they overrun and they hate. In our action in Viet Nam we see an acquiescence to a new colonialism against which Paul admonishes and a swelling of national pride which in Paul's words 'disrupts brotherhood.'"

EDWIN T. DAHLBERG, past president, National Council of Churches of Christ—"It is imperative that the bombing cease, both in North and in South Viet Nam. This does not mean that we just walk out and leave a vacuum for the Communists to take over. It does mean, however, that the gunfire shall cease long enough so that there can be an approach to the conference table on the part of all the belligerents involved."

Thirty-one sponsors of the march were listed under a letter to be sent to Ho Chi Minh and the National Liberation Front. The letter said the signers wanted to "make it emphatically clear" that their demonstration could not be interpreted "as effective support for a military victory by the NFL." Efforts are needed in Saigon, Hanoi and among the NFL as well as Washington for negotiations rather than a military victory, the letter said.

Gottlieb said "several thousand" would-be marchers were prevented from coming from the New York metropolitan area by the refusal of some bus drivers to transport them. He complained bitterly about the action of members of the Amalgamated Transit Workers. Gottlieb, political action director of the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy (SANE), is a former labor union organizer.

Unconvinced by Marches, SANE Leader Plans More

Associated Press

WASHINGTON, Nov. 29—A leader of the weekend peace march on Washington, in which thousands protested American involvement in the Viet Nam war, said today that "a demonstration doesn't convince anybody."

Despite this, Sanford Gottlieb added in a telephone interview, more demonstrations are being considered by the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy (SANE).

Gottlieb is political action director of SANE, which sponsored Saturday's march and picket of the White House in protest of United States policies in Viet Nam. March officials estimated the turnout at 40,000 to 50,000; police placed it at 25,000.

"We were definitely pleased with the turnout," Gottlieb said, "despite the bus drivers who wouldn't drive people from New York and also from Baltimore."

More Considered

Future marchers are being considered, he said, because "at a time when a dramatic event is needed to publicize your point of view, there's nothing like a large demonstration."

"But a demonstration doesn't convince anybody," Gottlieb said.

March leaders issued a leaflet during the protest titled "What To Do Next." SANE advised protesters to write letters to newspapers, support politicians who favor a peaceful solution to the war and urge clergymen to discuss the moral issues of the Viet Nam battle.

"None of us has any illusions about the effect of any single march or even about marches as a form of action," Gottlieb said. To get results, recommendations such as offered in the leaflet "must be carried out week by week."

Nam war protest march on Washington deny charges the weekend rally served only the Communist cause.

Norman Thomas, patriarch of the U.S. Socialist party, and Dr. Benjamin Spock, noted pediatrician, said they were dedicated to America's welfare, but contended U.S. involvement in the war was hurting the nation and should be ended. Thomas and Spock yesterday appeared with Sen. Joseph Tydings, (D., Md.), and Georgia Gov. Carl Sanders on a televised debate (issues and answers—ABC).

March Monitors Credited by Police For Keeping Order

By Keith Reekie

Washington Post Staff Writer

Police are giving credit to the special "monitors" appointed by the coordinators of yesterday's March for Peace in Vietnam as a factor in the orderliness of the demonstration.

"We were able to talk to these people and have them direct the marchers," Deputy Police Chief Thomas Rasmussen said. "Other times we have had to speak directly to individual demonstrators."

About 300 persons were to have been given orange armbands identifying them as "internal policemen." This job was to keep the demonstrators moving and to ask that unauthorized placards be dropped.

But when the crowd around the White House swelled to 20,000 to 25,000, assistant March coordinator Curtis Ganz began handing out armbands to every responsible-looking person in sight and exhorting him to start policing the far fringe of the march down 15th and 17th Streets and in the Ellipse.

Deputy Police Chief Thomas Rasmussen was impressed by the orderliness of the White House marchers, who strung all the way around the Executive Mansion, down 15th and 17th Streets to Constitution Avenue and around the Ellipse.

The demonstrators were "of higher caliber than the people we have had here before," Rasmussen said.

A policeman on Pennsylvania Avenue said, "I expected to see a bunch of crazy-looking beatniks, but this is really a respectable-looking group. They seem to be sincere and not just out for kicks."

The march was intended to press the Johnson Administration for new efforts for a negotiated settlement of the war in Vietnam, including an end to bombings. A secondary aim was to show that not only "Vietniks," student rebels and fringe groups will demonstrate for peace.

NEW YORK POST, MONDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 1965

A Responsible Protest

The thousands of peace marchers who journeyed to Washington to exercise their "right to protest" Administration policy in Viet Nam staged a spirited, responsible performance.

The far-out extremists were effectively isolated and controlled. As a consequence, the event constituted an effective antidote to the continual pressures of Richard M. Nixon and others for a harder policy and a plea for new diplomatic initiatives.

The message that 31 leaders of the march dispatched to Hanoi showed that its leaders were neither anti-American doctrinaires nor Communist-ruled. Their message made it clear the signatories had no interest in promoting "total victory" by any party in the Viet Nam war, including the Viet Cong. Their concern is with the urgency of negotiations and an honorable,

enforceable political settlement.

It was inevitable that the march would be seized upon by Hanoi and Peking and twisted to their own purposes. But that is the price we pay for freedom of debate and dissent. In propaganda exercises, the Communist leaders distort the meaning of the U.S. peace demonstrations. They must know from public opinion polls, however, that there is widespread support in this country for President Johnson's stated policy of refusal to flee under fire but readiness to conduct unconditional negotiations. We have urged him to reiterate this stand in even more dramatic terms. But the Communist response to the peace march would have been meaningful only if it had contained a hint of authentic conciliation from Hanoi's side. No such hint was audible.

25,000 March in District

New York Herald Tribune

At White House

By Douglas Kiker and Barnard L. Collier
Of the Herald Tribune Staff

WASHINGTON.

Thousands of sign-carrying peace marchers converged on the White House yesterday and formed one huge picket line around it to protest the Johnson administration's policy in Viet Nam.

More than 20,000 people, representing 140 organizations, came from cities and towns all over the nation to take part in the largest demonstration of national protest and dissatisfaction since the Negro civil rights march here in 1963.

There were a couple of scuffles and a few sideline arguments, but it turned out to be an orderly, well-disciplined event, on the whole.

The marchers got a sunny, crisp day; courteous but firm police control; a pleasant but unyielding White House reception, and a steady stream of jeers from a small group of counter pickets who carried signs supporting the Administration and condemning the demonstration.

Later in the day, the pickets left the White House sidewalks and gathered at the base of the flag-encircled Washington Monument to hear a long line of speakers urge President Johnson to stop the bombing, move for an immediate, United Nations-supervised ceasefire, and then try again for unconditional negotiations with the North Vietnamese.

Leaders of the demonstration conferred for 90 minutes at the White House with Chester Cooper, an aid to McGeorge Bundy. They rejected his proposal that they ask North Viet Nam to begin unconditional negotiations with the U. S. at once, saying such a proposal is unrealistic, because a ceasefire must come first.

Halfway around the world; meanwhile, the Viet Cong announced that two U. S. soldiers, held captive for two years, were being freed in honor of the demonstration. No evidence exists yet to show that the men actually were freed, nor were the demonstrators aware of this development as they made their White House rounds.

Yesterday began with a thunderstorm over Washington, and it looked like it would be soggy going for the marchers, until a freshening wind swept the clouds away and brought the sun.

By 10 a. m., 5,000 demonstrators were out. By noon there were 12,000 with more arriving every minute. Most of them were young, many of them had beards and long hair, but many were well-dressed, well-groomed and middle-aged.

The march was sponsored by the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy (SANE), which tried hard to control both its tone and its general atmosphere of dignity and restraint.

SANE-approved signs dominated the picket lines. They said, "Stop the Bombings," "Respect 1954 Geneva Accords," "War erodes the Great Society," and "Self-Determination—Viet Nam for the Vietnamese."

The signs reflected SANE's position, as stated by its president, Sanford Gottlieb. "This is not a protest march," he said. "It is in support of a negotiated settlement and not a pullout."

Nevertheless, there were many other, unauthorized signs carried in the marching ranks yesterday, representing a challenge to this position by more militant groups and especially by the Youth Against War and Fascism, which maintained in a handout that "it is a protest march. And the marchers do want a pullout!"

"Bring the GI's Home Now," "Stop Johnson's Dirty War," and "Freedom Now, Withdraw Now," their signs proclaimed.



While the picketing continued, a delegation met for 90 minutes in the White House with Mr. Cooper, who is an assistant to Presidential foreign affairs adviser McGeorge Bundy.

"We got very little that was satisfactory," socialist Norman Thomas said afterwards. "They expect a victory out of negotiations, but in the meantime, the war has to go on and the bombing and all."

Mr. Cooper, however, described the meeting as "A good exchange, amicable, forthcoming." Did he change their attitude? "I don't think they were ready to call off the march, but they all felt it was a useful discussion," he said.

Besides Mr. Thomas, the delegation to the White House included Dr. Benjamin Spock, renowned pediatrician, march coordinator Sanford Gottlieb, Mrs. Martin Luther King, Jr., and Rep. George Brown Jr., D., Calif. All of them spoke later yesterday afternoon at the Washington Monument.

Dr. Spock vehemently denied the accusation that the marchers are unpatriotic. He urged that 25,000 letters of protest be written each month to President Johnson and called for another rally in Washington in the spring.

Mr. Thomas, maintaining that no satisfactory settlement can be imposed by military victory of either side, urged, "upon our opponents, as we most emphatically urge upon our own government, the necessity of negotiation on honorable terms."

The New York Times.

Thousands Walk in Capital To Protest War in Vietnam

Demonstrators Decorous —3 White House Aides Meet With Leaders

By MAX FRANKEL
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Nov. 27—A great throng of young and middle-aged Americans from all parts of the country strolled decorously around the White House today to protest the war in Vietnam and urge negotiations to end it.

Variously estimated by the police to number from 15,000 to 25,000, and by their own leaders as high as 50,000, the demonstrators joined in what they called a March on Washington for Peace in Vietnam.

For two hours, they carried placards that for the most part bore cautiously phrased slogans, such as "Stop the Bombing" or "Supervised Cease-Fire," around three sides of the White House.

Then they went to the Washington Monument, stacking the signs neatly at the foot of the obelisk or dumping them into trash cans, and sat under a cloudless sunny sky to hear a series of moderate appeals for United States peace initiatives.

Some Vietcong Flags Shown

There were small clusters of fired-up youths in the crowd, some of whom carried the flags of the Vietcong.

There were some barefoot girls in Army fatigues holding hands with unshaven young men who discussed existentialism and nihilism.

There were the organized forces of Youth Against War and Fascism pressing upon the marchers signs that called for an immediate American withdrawal from Vietnam. The organizers of the march had tried to keep out such placards.

But most of the crowd would not have been out of place at the Army-Navy game. There were more babies than beatniks, more family groups than folk-song quartets.

Among the marchers there appeared to be as many differences of opinion, even about Vietnam, as in any large assembly. Some praised President Johnson's desire for peace and objected only to his "over-

reliance" on military advisers as one woman put it. Others condemned him as a hypocrite.

The President remained at his Texas ranch today and let three White House aides meet the leaders of the protest. Through a spokesman yesterday he had endorsed the right of protest in the United States but had also expressed the view that the great majority of Americans supported his policies in Vietnam. Public opinion polls appeared to support that judgment.

For Washingtonians, who have watched mass marches in their city develop in recent years as a fairly common form of protest, the one today was unusually sober and restrained. The more than 250,000 marchers for civil rights in 1963 had presented a moving spectacle. Last August, a large student demonstration over Vietnam which tried to get past police lines onto Capitol Hill, ended with hundreds of participants in jail.

Moderation Is Enforced

But moderation was virtually enforced on today by the demonstration's organizers. They attempted to "mobilize the conscience 'step by step.'"

Serious young marchers argued over the number of Western allies who were contributing to the war effort and over the shadings of meaning in past statements about negotiations by Administration leaders.

The antidemonstration demonstrators numbered no more than a few hundred, split into several competing factions as carefully kept away from one another as well as from the main line of protest by the capital's police force.

The overwhelming majority of the signs were those produced officially and expertly by the organizers of the march and limited to 17 studiously composed slogans, such as "New Action to Speed Negotiations," "Respect 1954 Geneva Accords," "No More War—We Never Again — Pope Paul." There were octagonal red signs reading "Stop the Bloodshed" and "Honor Peace—Stop the Bombing."

Home Towns Named

Other posters, crudely hand-lettered, identified the marchers as coming from Rochester, Albany, Troy and Syracuse; Tacoma, and San Francisco; St. Cloud, Minn.; Groton, Mass.; Detroit, Cleveland, Canada, Seattle, Martha's Vineyard, Northampton and Springfield, Mass.; the University of Texas, Wayne State University and Catholic University.

Why Sane initiated the March on Washington

Is the U. S. doing all it can to bring about negotiations?

The Johnson Administration has now been caught rejecting the peace talks it says it wants to end the Vietnam war. Worse, it has consistently given the impression that the only bar to negotiations was the attitude of Hanoi and the National Liberation Front (Vietcong). While it is possible to point to many rejections by Hanoi, and while talks might not lead to a settlement, it is not possible to justify this rejection and concealment by the Administration.

The most recent disclosure came only last week, confirming earlier reports: *LOOK Magazine*, November 9, 1965, "The Final Troubled Hours of 'Adlai Stevenson'".

By Eric Sevareid:

"In the early autumn of 1964 (Stevenson) went to U Thant, the U.N. Secretary-General, had privately obtained agreement from authorities in North Vietnam that they would send an emissary to talk with an American emissary, in Rangoon, Burma. Someone in Washington insisted that this attempt be postponed until after the Presidential election. When the election was over, U Thant again pursued the matter; Hanoi was still willing to send its man, but Defense Secretary Robert McNamara, Adlai went on, flatly opposed the attempt. . . . Time was passing . . . so (U Thant) proposed an outright cease-fire, with a truce line to be drawn across not only Vietnam but neighboring Laos. U Thant then made a remarkable suggestion: United States officials could write the terms of the cease-fire offer, exactly as they saw fit, and he, U Thant would announce it in exactly those words. Again, so Stevenson said to me, McNamara turned this down, and from Secretary Rusk there was no response, to Stevenson's knowledge."

Other accounts of this and similar negotiation offers follow:

The New York Herald Tribune
Sunday, August 8, 1965:

"The Johnson administration last fall rejected a proposal for Vietnam peace talks that had been accepted without conditions by Communist North Vietnam, it was learned yesterday. . . . The opportunity for a private and unpublished discussion with representatives of the Hanoi regime occurred early last fall. The chance of a meeting came at the height of the U.S. Presidential election campaign.

"The proposal, made by a non-Communist Asian diplomat, was accepted by Hanoi, which did not set forth any conditions. . . .

"Later proposals for peace talks were turned down by Hanoi, and the sources said yesterday that they believed the U.S. rejection of the Rangoon talks caused Hanoi to stiffen its resistance to negotiations."

The New York Times,
February 26, 1965:

"The Communist Government of North Vietnam has notified the Secretary-General, U Thant that it is receptive to his suggestion for informal negotiations on the Vietnam situation."

The Washington Post,
October 2, 1965:

"Ghana indicated to the United Nations today that North Vietnam might enter peace negotiations if the United States halted bombing the north for two months.

"Foreign Minister Alex Quaison-Sackey of Ghana offered the proposal in a speech to the General Assembly. It was the result of direct talks with Hanoi, the Foreign Minister hinted in his remarks."

The Washington Post,
October 7, 1965:

"A new indication that the Communist Vietcong may have softened its conditions for peace talks on the war in Vietnam was brought to the General Assembly today by Foreign Minister Janos Peter of Hungary.

"Peter hinted that the Vietcong no longer would insist on withdrawal of American troops before going to the conference table, although he repeated earlier demands that the United States suspend bombings of the North Vietnam. . . .

"In making his speech, Peter emphasized that he had been in direct contact in Budapest with officials of both the government of North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam. . . .

These are the facts that the Johnson Administration ignores in public statements on its Vietnam policies. These are the facts that indicate everything possible is not being done to end the war. There are others:

Did Hanoi agree to negotiate when the bombing was interrupted?

The truth is that when the bombing was suspended a few days in the Spring of 1965, Hanoi apparently made an effort to negotiate—which met with no response. SANE learned from reliable French sources that a representative of North Vietnam informed the U.S. via the French government that it was prepared to negotiate, and was not making troop withdrawal a prior condition. Nevertheless, the U.S. resumed the bombings. SANE has received confirmation from three Administration officials that the message was indeed received, but each official provided a different version of why this "signal" did not lead to negotiations.

SANE supports fully the urging of Senator J. W. Fulbright that the bombings be suspended once again, both for political and plain humanitarian reasons.

How willing is the United States to negotiate and end the war?

It has been said that negotiations are impossible only because of the intransigence of North Vietnam.

The truth is not so simple. As U.S. forces achieve some military victories, the U.S. seems less interested in negotiations, and some U.S. spokesmen are calling frankly for the complete military defeat of the Vietcong instead of negotiations:

"Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, former Ambassador to South Vietnam, expressed the opinion tonight that 'success' in the war in Vietnam required no formal surrender. . . . The end would come, he asserted, with the cessation of Vietcong activity and the 'eventual dissolution' of the guerrilla apparatus that the Communists have developed throughout South Vietnam. General Taylor thus appeared to align himself with those recently quoted but unidentified United States officials who suggested that the war did not necessarily have to end with negotiations but could merely ' peter out' "— *The New York Times*, October 28, 1965.

Too, the U.S. continues to refuse to negotiate directly with the NLF as well as with Hanoi. In this way, the U.S. seeks to maintain the myth that the NLF is only and entirely a creature of Hanoi and has no meaning or existence of its own.

The matter of the Geneva Agreements

The Geneva Agreements of 1954 ended the eight-year war between the French and the Vietminh, concluding the French effort to re-establish control over Indo-China. Under the terms of the agreement, a military demarcation line was established dividing the country for jurisdictional purposes between the French and the forces of Ho Chi Minh. This line was not to be a political boundary, but was to provide for regrouping of forces and to establish areas of administration until the elections provided for in the agreement for reunification of the country should take place in 1956.

Here are the actual words of the agreement and the declaration:

"A provisional military demarcation line shall be fixed, on either side of which the forces of the two parties shall be regrouped after their withdrawal, the forces of the People's Army of Vietnam to the north of the line and the forces of the French Union to the South."—Chapter I, Article I.

"(a) Pending the general elections which will bring about the unification of Vietnam, the conduct of civil administration in each regrouping zone shall be in the hands of the party whose forces are to be regrouped there in virtue of the present Agreements. . . . Chapter II, Article 14.

"The Conference recognizes that the essential purpose of the Agreement relating to Vietnam is to settle military questions with a view to ending hostilities and that the military demarcation line is provisional and should not in any way be interpreted as constituting a political or territorial boundary. . . . —Declaration of Conference, Article 6.

"... In order to ensure that sufficient progress in the restoration of peace has been made, and that all the necessary conditions obtain for free expression of the national will, general elections shall be held in July 1956 under the supervision of an international commission composed of representatives of the Member States of the International Supervisory Commission. . . . —Declaration of Conference, Article 7.

Other important provisions:

"The signatories of the present Agreement and their successors in their functions shall be responsible for ensuring the observance and enforcement of the terms and provisions thereof. . . . —Chapter V, Article 27.

"With effect from the date of entry into force of the present Agreement, the introduction into (north and south) Vietnam of any troop reinforcements and additional personnel is prohibited. . . . the establishment of new military bases is prohibited throughout Vietnam territory."—Chapter III, Articles 16, 18.

"With effect from the date of entry into force of the present Agreement no military base under the control of a foreign state may be established in the regrouping zone of either party; the two parties shall ensure that the zones assigned to them do not adhere to any military alliance and are not used for the resumption of hostilities or to further an aggressive policy."—Chapter III, Article 19.

The United States issued its own statement, which said in part:

"... My Government is not prepared to join in a declaration by the Conference such as submitted. . . .

"... The Government of the United States . . . declares that it will refrain from the threat or the use of force to disturb (the agreements) and will view any renewal of the aggression in violation of the aforesaid agreements with grave concern and as seriously threatening international peace and security. . . .

"... In the case of nations now divided against their will, we shall continue to seek to achieve unity through elections supervised by the United Nations to insure that they are conducted fairly."

"... The United States reiterates its traditional position that peoples are entitled to determine their own future and that it will not join in an agreement which would hinder this. . . .

Both France and the United States bear responsibility for disruption of the Geneva agreements. In a note of April 3, 1956, France served notice of her decision to withdraw from South Vietnam. Before the time scheduled for the elections France had disengaged entirely.

Ngo Dinh Diem, with United States support, had been appointed Premier by Bao Dai, the puppet Chief of State under French rule. On July 16, 1955, the Diem government announced with American backing that it would defy the provision calling for national elections. Thus the U.S. departed from the position taken in its own unilateral declaration; and France in acquiescing, abandoned the responsibility which she had accepted a year earlier.

The United States and France thus prevented the unification of Vietnam under a single government, and set the stage for all that was to follow.



The matter of the Viet Cong

There is disagreement on how and at what time the Vietcong became an organized force in opposition to the Diem regime (the term, "Vietcong" was coined by Diem's government). A guerrilla war against Diem began as early as 1957; the National Liberation Front, political parent of the Vietcong, was created in 1960. The NLF derived impetus from two directions; from the oppression of the Diem dictatorship, and from the realization by the Ho Chi Minh government in the North and the nationalists and communists in the South that a permanent, client state of the United States was being established in violation of the Geneva accords and in contradiction to the war of independence against the French.

The matter of Atrocities

Both the NLF and the South Vietnam army employ terror, torture and murder as weapons in the war. As the tempo of the war has increased, so has the brutality on both sides.

For the U.S., a new moral dilemma is posed. The U.S. has at the very least condoned the routine "interrogation" of prisoners by means of torture. In the best traditions of honesty and truth the American press has documented this course of action.

But all of the brutality practiced by the Vietnamese on Vietnamese of both sides is of small scale besides the enormity of the suffering, crippling and destruction visited on combatants and non-combatants alike by the U.S. forces in the indiscriminate use of weapons far too powerful to be confined to the supposed foe. Napalm (jellied gasoline) and high-explosive bombing of "suspected Vietcong concentrations" or of villages "suspected of being under Vietcong control" is a daily occurrence. The burning down of entire Vietnamese villages in reprisal for the "suspected" shelter of NLF troops still occurs despite U.S. military guidelines to the contrary. The incident at Camne received wide publicity because a newsman was on the spot.

A Saigon dispatch included the following paragraph relating to a recent bombing raid:

"...A number of officials suggest that from time to time villages are struck intentionally but in the erroneous belief that they are sheltering Viet Cong troops. Such cases do not get the publicity that is attracted by a more obvious mistake, such as the one at Deduc."—*New York Times*, November 1, 1965.

Widespread damage has been done in North Vietnam to civilian installations unreported in the U.S. press. The bombing of North Vietnam, now having been continuous for ten months except for a five-day pause, has predictably resulted in the opposite of the intended effect:

"United States Embassy officials acknowledged that the presence of two additional regiments indicated that one of the goals of American air attacks against North Vietnam, stemming the flow of infiltration from the North had not been achieved. The more we deter them, one official said, the more they infiltrate."—*The New York Times*, November 6, 1965.

It now becomes time to ask some plain questions about the U.S. rôle in Vietnam; What about the "commitments" the U.S. has pledged to honor?

The U.S. has said it is in Vietnam at the request of the South Vietnam government and that it must honor its commitment to "protect" that nation "against aggression" and "in defense of democracy".

The truth is that Diem wiped out the only democratic practices in Vietnam when he abolished the elected village councils in 1956.

The truth is that the government that invited the U.S. in was created by the U.S. and has long ceased to exist.

The truth is that South Vietnam is now ruled by the latest in a succession of military juntas underwritten by the U.S.

The truth is that the U.S. has ignored the provisions of the Geneva agreements and even acted

contrary to its own unilateral pledge to support "elections supervised by the United Nations."

The truth is that the U.S. "commitments" represent the U.S. view of what is good for Vietnam, a view that it is insisting upon imposing through force and any required degree of destruction.

The truth is that the U.S. has dishonored its primary obligation to the United Nations Charter in acting unilaterally in Vietnam, undermining the institutions of world law and development of world community.

What about self-determination for the Vietnamese?

The truth is that the U.S. had defined self-determination in its own way, and assumed the right to prevent the Vietnamese from choosing a regime governed by Ho Chi Minh. How does this U.S. action differ in kind from the system of values it claims to be fighting?

The truth is that the Vietnamese, North and South, have had no voice at all in the U.S. decision to "defend" them through an increasingly destructive war. If given the opportunity, most South Vietnamese would probably say that they find little to choose between U.S. firepower and Vietcong tactics.

What about the spread of Communism?

The truth is that the U.S. is bringing about very conditions that will speed the spread of communism. Nationalism and communism are closely interrelated in Vietnam. Ho Chi Minh became a national hero by leading the victorious fight against the French. A foreign army which appears in Vietnamese eyes as successor to the French can heighten nationalist feelings—unless that army is clearly identified with the aspirations of the people.

The truth is that "containment" of China or communism can much better be advanced through supporting national independence and reform, economic and technical assistance, without insisting that nations on China's doorstep become part of U.S.-backed anti-Chinese military alliances.

The truth is that the U.S. approach is driving the NLF, Hanoi and China closer together despite their differences. Vietnamese, North and South, have love for China and would strive, if left alone, to maintain their historical independence.

The truth is that sooner or later the U.S. is going to have to face up to the right of nations to choose any form of government they wish, without interference.

As Americans who believe in the greatness of their country we expect greatness in response to world problems. We do not believe the world is lacking the kind of leadership from the United States that it needs and could have. We initiated the Movement on Washington because a great and free society requires and deserves more than slogans and name-calling. It deserves a great debate on great issues. In the case of Vietnam, it also deserves the profoundest soul-searching of which the American people are capable. If the American conscience has meaning at all, we can do no less.

That is why we support fully the call for an end to the bombing, a cease-fire, and new efforts at negotiations and that is why we will join the Movement on Washington, November 27th.

Typical Marcher: Middle-Class Adult

By JOHN HERBERS

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Nov. 27—Caroline McCabe was not big enough to walk in the peace march but she appeared very alert riding in her buggy and wearing a cap with bunny ears as her mother carried a sign with bold letters saying, "bring the G.I.'s home now."

Mr. and Mrs. Robert McCabe, a conventionally dressed, friendly couple of New Bedford, Mass., seemed typical of thousands who turned out in protest of United States policy in Vietnam.

Mr. McCabe, a 29-year-old math teachers at Southeastern Technological Institute, said they had felt a need for a deeper expression of commitment against the war as well as for a holiday, so they had driven to Washington for the weekend and entered the march.

Most of the marchers appeared to be middle-class whites in a holiday mood, and they far outnumbered the student groups and the radical left.

The civil rights movement, which has become involved in foreign policy protest, was barely evident even though three national rights leaders were among the sponsors and Mrs. Martin Luther King Jr. was one of the speakers.

S.N.C.C. Singers Give Up

A small group of youths who identified themselves as members of the Student Non Violent Coordinating Committee tried to start freedom songs in a line of marchers at the northeast corner of the White House lawn but gave up saying "there's too many white folks here."

About 20 members of the United States Committee to Aid the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam gathered in

front of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation building at noon and unfurled four Vietcong flags and one tattered American flag.

The Vietcong banners were unauthorized by organizers of the march, as were the signs the group carried seeking contributions to the Vietcong. The small group moved tentatively toward Pennsylvania Avenue and the main group of marchers. When no one stopped them they slipped into the line and were soon lost in the crowd.

Other groups carrying unauthorized signs—"McNamara Get Human" and "No More Murder"—included the Students for a Democratic Society, Youth against War and Fascism and Group for American Anarchism. There were several demonstrations against the demonstration.

Joseph Shallit, 44 years old, a free-lance writer, of Philadelphia, paraded on the sidewalk in front of Lafayette Park with a sign saying, "Support America's Stand in Vietnam."

Liberal Democrats

Mr. Shallit said he was there with his wife and son, Jonathan, 13, "because we're upset that this whole thing has become so polarized, as a right-wing, left-wing business."

Mr. Shallit said he and his wife were "liberals and middle of the roaders" who had supported Adlai E. Stevenson, President Kennedy and President Johnson. "We're civil righters," he said. "We feel that someone should know that people like us support President Johnson's policy in Vietnam."

The student groups met last night and voted to carry whatever signs or symbols they pleased. The national Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy (SANE), coordinator of the march, had issued a list of

authorized signs that were designed to keep the protest "restrained and responsible."

Authorized signs were predominant throughout the march, carried by members of organizations such as SANE, Women Strike for Peace, Women's International League and Americans for Democratic Action.

Only 15 Arrests Mar Mild Tone Of Peace Appeal

A throng estimated by police at 20,000 to 25,000 persons marched around the White House and then massed on the Washington Monument grounds yesterday in an orderly and strangely silent appeal for peace in Vietnam.

The day long demonstration was remarkable for its mild mannered tone. Marchers were surprisingly neat for the most part, many of them middle-aged and middle-class in appearance.

Isolated scuffles and alleged refusals to move along resulted in 15 arrests, unnoticed by most of the demonstrators.

Some of the trouble came from the Vietcong flags unfurled by members of the Committee to Aid the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam. A few of the flags were hoisted, but only one survived marchers' appeals to put them down, and it was surrounded by American banners.

assembled 1,500 students before the Sorbonne on the Left Bank and attempted to march toward the United States Embassy for a demonstration. The police dispersed them on their way.

Opposition in Germany

Special to The New York Times

BERLIN, Nov. 26—More than 100 scientists, writers and university professors from West Berlin and West Germany protested today against American military actions in Vietnam, calling on the West German Government to halt its "financial and moral support" for the war.

PARIS, Nov. 26 — A petition urging the United States Government to settle the Vietnam War through negotiation was presented to the American Embassy here by a group of Americans residing in France.

The petition, with about 200 signatures, asks that bombings be stopped in both North and South Vietnam before an internationally controlled ceasefire as a first move toward a peace accord.

Sorbonne Students Assemble

Special to The New York Times

PARIS, Nov. 26 — Another "Peace in Vietnam" bid was made here late this afternoon by French student organizations. In a surprise move, they



ON SPECIAL TRAIN: 'RESISTANCE LOOK'

Demonstrators Young, Tired, Hungry and Enthusiastic

By BERNARD WEINRAUB

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Nov. 27—A 20-car train, packed with demonstrators protesting the war in Vietnam, moved out of New York early today for a day-long trip to Washington that resembled the start of a rollicking college weekend.

By 8:30 A.M., as the train sped past the wet, leaden flatlands of New Jersey, a half-dozen women from Westchester were sipping Bloody Mary's, four young men were playing poker, three women were playing scrabble, two youths were starting a chess game on a miniature board and Morton Pandis of the Bronx was writing a letter to the President of the United States.

"I just don't think we're making a real effort to negotiate," insisted Mr. Pandis, a hefty dark-haired psychological counselor who woke up at 4 A.M. to make the trip. "I've got to protest."

Like Mr. Pandis, most of the 3,500 demonstrators who boarded two separate trains at Pennsylvania Station at 6:50 A.M. and 7:20 A.M. were youthful, tired and hungry. Only a few slept.

'A Resistance Look'

"It's a picnic, almost holiday spirit," said Mrs. Lorraine Gordon with a grin. "Everyone's aboard — students, teachers, families, doctors, union leaders, chic women—and they all have a single look, right? a Resistance look!"

As an officer in Women Strike for Peace, the organiza-

tion that sponsored the train, Mrs. Gordon and several others were busy most of last night arranging transportation for demonstrators, many of whom were suddenly affected by a boycott of bus drivers. At the last minute, motor pools were set up and extra train tickets were sold.

Today at dawn, while a soft drizzle fell on the empty, midtown streets, Pennsylvania Station swarmed with demonstrators. They waited on line at a machine for a container of coffee, yawned, read the morning papers, bought bagel-sized buttons reading "Peace in Vietnam" and complained. ("Don't ask me how I am. I really can't see at this hour.")

Boarding the 7:20 train, many passengers rushed through the aisles, found seats or saved seats for friends and immediately pulled out cellophane-wrapped chicken sandwiches, turkey legs, carrots, hard boiled eggs, raisins, tangerines and apples. Several opened magazines—The New Republic, The New Yorker—and books, "The Fall," "May Man Prevail," "The Brothers Karamazov."

Teaches Bridge to Group

As the train started, Dr. David Kimmelman, an ophthalmologist, began teaching a group of friends the first steps in bridge. Nearby, three women — a painter, a housewife and an anthropologist — were opening up a Scrabble board. A couple in the rear of the coach, wearing identical brown coats, embraced.

Walking slowly down the aisle, an 81-year-old woman stopped at a water cooler. She signed heavily.

"If my presence can do anything to end the war," said the woman, Marie Pensolle, "then I'm glad to be here. I have seen enough wars. I know what we get from them—misery, sorrow—and for what, for what?" In an adjoining coach, the Rev. Donald H. Brown, pastor of the Hilton Methodist Church in Maplewood, N. J., sat alone and gazed out of the rain-flecked window.

FOREIGN REACTION

Britain, Italy Marchers Support Protest Here

LONDON (AP)—Hundreds of demonstrators marched through London last night in a torchlight protest against the war in Vietnam.

The British march was in support of the mass demonstration in Washington seeking to persuade President Johnson to halt bombing of North Viet Nam and push harder for truce talks.

The London marchers, including nuclear disarmament campaigners and other left-wing peace group followers, marched from the Royal Albert Hall across the center of the city. Many carried lighted torches and candles and banners bearing the slogans "Peace on Earth" and "Peace in Viet Nam."

TOWARD THE GOAL OF A NEGOTIATED SETTLEMENT IN VIETNAM

WE ASK that our government call for a cease-fire, and to this end;
Halt the bombing of North Vietnam;

Halt the introduction of additional men and materiel, and ask the other side to do the same.

WE ASK that our government state the conditions under which it will accept peace in Vietnam, and to this end;

Reiterate U.S. support for the principles of the 1954 Geneva Accords—the eventual withdrawal of all foreign military forces, a prohibition against military alliances, the peaceful reunification of Vietnam, and self-determination for the Vietnamese people.

Declare U.S. acceptance of negotiations with all concerned parties including the Vietcong, a primary combatant;

Declare U.S. agreement to constitution of a representative new government in South Vietnam as part of the settlement.

Declare U.S. support for U.N. or other international machinery and guarantees to supervise the cease-fire, provide for peaceful establishment of a new government in South Vietnam, protect the rights of minority groups and protect the neutrality of North and South Vietnam.



National Committee for a
SANE Nuclear Policy, Inc.
17 East 45th Street,
New York 17, New York