

pat & dick lupoff's JOHN BOARDMAN, it was not by intention that
+ + I seemingly copped out on yr
+ o p o 5 9 + question embodying that quotation from the
+ + NY Post, the one involving the Vietnamese
august 20th, 1965 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 situaiton leads to that most
remarkable string of coincidences stretching back almost to the
beginning of our century: each time we've had a Democratic admin-
istration 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?

pat & Dick Abbott's
+
+ o p o 2 2
+
+ August 50th, 1965
the whereabouts of his father & other VC
boy who was induced by US soldiers to reveal
the one involving the Vietnamese
question embodying that question from the
I seemingly copied out on yr
JOHN BOARDMAN, it was not by intention that

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 decision, 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
relative country has, they executed 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?

For don't I, but unlike our daily press, our other
political 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
idiotries that brought the United States into the present miserable
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 way not of their making, those soldiers
did the right thing.

All of this discussion of the Vietnam situation leads to that most
recurring theme of colonialism stretching back almost to the
beginning of our century: each time we've had a Democratic admin-
istration 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 idiotic, needless war.
Would any of our peace-loving leftist members care to comment upon
this phenomenon?