

November 12th, 1969

Citizens of Grinnell:

We ask you to think what it means locally in your lives for this country to spend \$30 billion a year on the war in Vietnam (or to put it another way, to spend 19¢ out of every tax dollar on the war). Since the war escalated in 1965, food costs have risen 15%; mortgage rates have zoomed from 5.7 to 7.9% and 40,000 Americans have died.

Grinnell, like every other community in the land, has suffered and felt the effects of this war. It has felt it in boys killed, in inflation and higher taxes, in less funds for education, health, agriculture, transportation. It has felt it in higher borrowing costs for school bonds, sewer bonds, mortgage loans. It has felt it in increased bitterness, frustration and divisiveness.

All wars demand sacrifices. Some wars deserve these sacrifices. The war in Vietnam has proved to be the wrong war, at the wrong time, in the wrong place. It is a war that has no longer, if it ever did, the national interest. In fact national interest and national priorities demand this war end.

Is it more patriotic, then, to continue this kind of war than it is to say
STOP?

Is it more patriotic to prevent discussion of these issues than to debate them freely?

Is it more patriotic to demand unquestioning support of the war than it is to hope that a united people might begin to deal with its real interests and real problems by ending the war?

Think about these matters, and if you believe that the process of withdrawal should be speeded up and the war ended soon, write your Congressman (John Kyle), your Senators (Jack Miller and Harold Hughes) and your President (Richard Nixon).

NOVEMBER 13-14 MORATORIUM

Fact Sheet on the Cost of the War

The following statistics are meant to illustrate the enormous drain on our economy caused by the war in Vietnam. 70 cents out of every dollar you pay in taxes goes to the cost of past, present, and future wars. This is money that is desperately needed for education, health, and other projects. Federal grants in these areas are harder to get than ever, and with each successive year of the war the drain gets worse. The United States needs to return some of this money to the economy, otherwise, it will simply keep spiraling up, taking costs with it. The choice is all of ours: a continued and ever increasing dollar drain and an inflationary economy where you are actually bearing much of the cost of the war twice, or the disengagement of U.S. forces from Vietnam and the redirection of that \$30 billion a year into the desperate needs of America.

The Vietnam war costs \$30 BILLION per year-----\$2.5 BILLION a month

At the rate of \$32 billion per year, the Vietnam war costs the U.S. \$61,128,040 per *day* ~~minute~~ or more than \$1000 per second. The cost of six seconds of war in the second half of 1968 exceeded the average starting salary of a grade school teacher in the United States.

The current administration has requested \$5.2 billion for ammunition to shoot at the Vietnamese. There are an estimated 240,000 North Vietnamese and Viet Cong in South Vietnam. Hence we pay \$216,66.67 for ammunition to shoot at each soldier. The administration requested \$3.2 billion for elementary and secondary school education for 72 million American school children, hence, only \$44. per child.

It costs \$52,000 to kill one Vietnamese guerilla.

The 1969 fiscal budget was \$157 billion. 74.4% was designated for war and war related programs, 12.2% for health, education and welfare services.

MILITARY FORCES.....	55.7%
VETERANS.....	4.4%
NATIONAL DEBT (over 80% war incurred).....	9.1%
FOREIGN RELATIONS (mainly foreign aid).....	2.6%
SPACE RACE.....	2.9%
POST OFFICE AND ROADS.....	5.4%
AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES.....	3.9%
COMMERCE AND LABOR.....	1.6%
GENERAL GOVERNMENT.....	1.9%
HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE.....	12.2%

The Selective Service System requests \$6,720,000 to process 347,000 inductees rather than the \$285,000 originally expected for this fiscal year.

A GRINNELL COLLEGE STUDENT WILL BE COMING TO YOUR HOME THURSDAY OR FRIDAY EVENINGS. WE HOPE THAT YOU WILL CONSIDER THIS MATERIAL AND FEEL FREE TO DISCUSS YOUR VIEWPOINTS ON THE WAR AND ITS POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS WITH HIM. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

WHAT THE WAR MEANS

- * It means a conflict that has escalated from a small force of 600 American technicians to over half a million men.
- * It means 45,000 men killed.
- * It means 255,000 wounded.
- * It means not knowing at any given moment precisely who the enemy is.
- * It means the most frustrating sort of war, with no front lines, a war which breaks out here and there, even across national borders in Laos and Cambodia, neither of which is involved.
- * It means spending over \$30 billion a year.
- * It means a further drain on an already inadequate gold supply, and an escalation of inflation.
- * It means enormous discretionary powers assumed by the President, with Congress asked to approve his actions after the fact.
- * It means a war where in the eyes of many Asiatics we are fighting against indigenous Asiatic nationalism, much as France did in the past.
- * It means the first war in our history fought not only on the battlefield but brought into the American livingroom, every day, through the raw emotionalism of today's mass communications.

Here at home this confusion, this frustration, has raised challenges within Congress, within colleges and universities, within the press, within the military itself---and all to a degree not experienced in the United States since the Civil War.

Adapted from The War in Vietnam, a report prepared by the Senate Republican Policy Committee.

Ask yourself what this means to you, your friends, your family.

Ask yourself how much longer the people of this nation must endure the strain of this most unpopular and longest war in our history.

On November 13 and 14, millions of Americans will be working in their communities to demonstrate their answer to these questions.

JOIN THEM * * * WORK FOR PEACE

The Johnson-Nixon policy in Vietnam continues

OPINION AND THE WAR

The course which President Nixon continues to follow in Vietnam is essentially the same course pursued by Lyndon Johnson and declared unsatisfactory by the American people in the last election. As a high Pentagon official phrased it, "We are going to reduce the fight to a level the American public will tolerate for a long pull." The direction of American policy is not aimed at substantive negotiations with Hanoi or even with the "Vietnamization" of the war, but at placating and reducing public opposition to this most unpopular war. It then appears that the present Vietnam strategy is directed more at soothing public opinion than at the crucial issues of withdrawal and peace.

OBJECTIVE OF PRESENT POLICY

The administration persists in pursuing the same objective in Vietnam as its predecessor—an objective which can only lead to more deaths, more destruction, and eventually, at some undisclosed date in the future, to a Korean-type solution.

That solution would mean the installation of a pro-Western regime. A military regime with a bare constitutional facade which actually guarantees its citizens few civil liberties, and a regime which demonstrates little responsiveness to the needs of its people. To support this type of government, the administration is prepared to maintain a reduced but considerable number of troops in Vietnam indefinitely. Even Korea, 15 years after the ending of that conflict, we still deploy 55,000 U.S. troops at a cost of \$600 million a year.

The main outlines of this program have appeared within the past year. In an article published in the July 1968 Foreign Affairs quarterly, Herman Kahn proposed that public opinion be appeased by (1) Vietnamizing the war, (2) reducing U.S. forces "in the next two or three years to between two and three hundred thousand men," (3) while keeping two or three combat divisions in South Vietnam for a considerable period in order to "deter a resumption of major hostilities."

The same idea re-appeared in Secretary Laird's recent interview with Time magazine (Aug. 29) when he suggested U.S. forces "could be cut in half, to about 250,000 men, and be kept in South Vietnam for an extended period." U.S. News and World Report (Sept. 22) said Nixon's hope last spring "was to have almost all 250,000 U.S. combat troops out of Vietnam by the end of 1970." That would still leave approximately 300,000 support troops in the war zone.

TOKEN TROOP WITHDRAWALS

This is the plan Nixon was following when he announced a second projected reduction of 35,000 troops by December 15. Even with this reduction, 484,000 troops would remain in Vietnam along with 28,000 Naval personnel, and about 45,000 Air Force men in Thailand. Thus, 557,000 American troops are likely to be still involved in the Vietnam conflict. This is hardly drastic troop withdrawal, nor is it likely to bring about a cessation of hostilities.

The Baltimore Sun of Sept. 16 quoted a "high ranking American official in Saigon whose views have been heard personally by Mr. Nixon" as having estimated that 100,000 men could be pulled out without seriously reducing the fighting ability of the allied forces. One reason, he said, is that the number of soldiers sent to Vietnam to build airfields, logistical bases and outposts finished their tasks last year. The announced reductions do not indicate a shift in policy and still leave us far from de-escalating this war.

POLICY BOUND TO SUPPORT OF SAIGON GOV'T

Supporters of the present policy assert that a phased withdrawal, coupled with an outspoken but obvious pledge that we will keep enough troops in Vietnam indefinitely to prevent collapse of the current Saigon regime will convince North Vietnam that its cause is hopeless and therefore encourage Hanoi to negotiate.

Senator Gore (D-Tenn.) sharply criticized this assertion in a Senate

speech on September 17th. "In my view," Gore said, "the history of the Vietnamese people does not support such a conclusion.

They are accustomed to long struggles, spanning generations of even centuries." The policy of phased withdrawal, he declared, "holds no more promise of success than did the policy of bombing North Vietnam." He continued that it might "buy time for the administration with the American people, but if it is used to tighten our embrace of the Saigon regime, the prospects for peace will be dim indeed."

Senator Fulbright (D-Ark.), supporting Gore, made the essential point when he told the Senate, "It does not matter how much we talk about settlement, the war cannot be settled as long as we insist upon maintaining the puppet government in South Vietnam." Since maintaining that puppet government controls the Nixon-Johnson policy, meaningful troop reductions and peace remain elusive and distant.

Even if we cut our troops in half, and the cost of the Vietnamese war in half, we would still be committed to spending \$12 to \$15 billion a year indefinitely in Vietnam. The Pentagon admits that the South Vietnamese army, though improved, is still less than adequate, and that it will be years before it can do without U.S. air, artillery, and logistics support.

COSTS AND EFFECTS

The enormous cost in American lives is known and deplored. In addition to the moral and emotional drain on this nation, the rise in consumer prices, taxes, and the painful effects of inflation are being felt as well. The financial pages speculate that the U.S. may have to pay the highest interest rates since the war in 1812. It is difficult to imagine that we can continue to spend \$30 billion a year, or even a third that much in Vietnam, while inflation eats away savings and racial-urban problems eat away the very foundations of our society.

It is the task of the growing number of critics of the war in Vietnam to make these facts known, to assert that the present policies pursued by the President and his advisors promise no stop to involvement and are designed not to end the war, but to soften the cries of those who demand a real disengagement from Vietnam.

Adapted from "The Con Game of 'Withdrawal' From Vietnam," I.F. Stone's Weekly, Vol. XVII, No. 17, Sept. 22, 1969