pat & dick lupoff's + + + + + + o p o 5 9 + + + + august 20th, 1965

JOHN BOARDMAN, it was not by intention that
I seemingly copped out on yr
question embodying that quotation from the
NY Post, the one involving the Vietnamese
boy who was induced by US soldiers to reveal
the whereabouts of his father & other VCong

guerrillas in exchange for candy. And in reply to your specific question, #Should this have happened? my immediate impulse was to recoil in horror from the described situation and reply "Of course not!"

But I've given further thought to the situation and the question, and the more I think about it, the more I am forced to reply, "Hell, yes!"

Why? Because the situation in Vietnam, in which we find ourselves, is war. Despite the legal niceties of a congressional declaration, which has never been made, and which ought to have been according to our Constitution, it is war. Despite -- or rather, because of -- the series of idiotic blunders by which we have botched and backed our way into it, it is war.

And, in the immortal words of General William Sherman, you know what war is.

Do you know how many Vietnamese and/or Americans that boy's father and his associates killed before they, in turn, got theirs? How many soldiers they killed in open combat? How many village headmen and other officials, about as close to legitimate indigenous leaders as such a primitive country has, they abducted or murdered? How many civilians they killed, tortured, maimed just for being on the "wrong" side? Or not even for that, merely for NOT being actively on the "right" side and as a calculated display in order to insure terrorized subservience?

You don't? Neither do I, but unless our daily press, our other periodical publications, radio and television and public officials from the President on down, are all but unanimous liars, the number is many thousands.

In war, you do your best to destroy enemy soldiers. Vietnam is war. Again, I repeat that I believe that Vietnam, even worse than Korea, is the wrong war, against the wrong enemy, being fought in the wrong place and at the wrong time. The political idiocies that brought the United States into its present unenviable position in Vietnam are a matter beyond the present discussion (although, of course, vitally relevant to it). But, being in the position they were in, in a war not of their making, those soldiers did the right thing.

All of this discussion of the Vietnam situation leads to that most remarkable string of coincidences stretching back almost to the beginning of our century: each time we've had a Democratic administration or series of administrations, we've had a war. Each time we've had a Republican administration or series of administrations, we've had, if not "peace," at least not an active, shooting war. Would any of our peace-loving leftish members care to comment upon this phenomenon?

Join Bornolan, it was not by intention that a: Thegus wold & dea ty no juo bedgoo vinalmees l question embedying that quotetion from the WY Post, the one involving the Vieunamese

august 20th. 1969

boy who was induced by US soldiers to reveal the whereaboute of his father & other Vone

querrillas in exchange for candy. And in reply to your specific quention, "Should this have happened?", my immediate impulse was to recoll in morror from the described situation and reply "Of

But I've given further thought to the situation and the question, and the more I think about it, the more I am forced "lest, "Hell, yest"

Why? Because the situation in Victnem, in which we find ourselves, is war. Despite the legal diceties of a congressional declaration, which has never been made, and which ought to have been according to our Constitution, it is war. Despite -- or rather, because of -- the series of idiotic blunders by which we have tiew at it it ofal yew two besided bon bedered

And, in the immortal words of General William Sherman, you know what war is:

how wany Vietnamese and/or Americana that boy's father and his associates milled before they, in turn, got theirs? How many soldiers they willed in open combat? How muny village needmen and other officials, about as close to legitlasts indigenous leaders as such a origitive country has, they abducted or murdered? Bow many civilians they willed, tortured, maimed just for being on the "wrone" side? GP not even for that, merely for MCT being actively on the "right" side and as a calculated display in order to insure terrorises subservience

You don't's detther do I, but unless our daily press, our other periodical publications, radio and television and public officials From the Frestdent on down, are all but wianimous liars, the number

in wer, you do your best to destroy enemy soldlers. Motes and Variable Variable of the Angle of the Vietnam, even dorse than Korea, is the group was, arainst the group enemy, below fought in the wrong place and at the wrong time. The political idicoles that beought the United States into its present usanviable notition to Viction are a matter beyond the present discussion (although, of course, vitally relevant to it). But, being in this position they were in, in a war not of their making, those soldings died the piece thick,

All of this discussion of the Pietter alteston leads to that most commission at the collection of collections of anthomorphism back atmost to the beginning of our century: ence time we've hed a Deliceratic adding lating or sortes of administrations, we've had a war. Then time wolve had a Republican administration on convex of administrations, . who rollooms, without an don denst de ", econg" fon it , had butter hode Stamos of erro gasamum delifiet anivolesusa tue to una Diset