

CARTON 1:3

PERSONAL

JOHNSON, LYNDON B.

1965-1966

2017/193

201 East 165th Street
Bronx, New York 10456
January 28, 1966

President Lyndon B. Johnson
The White House
Washington, D.C.

Dear President Johnson:

I am writing to call upon you to support Senator Eugene J. McCarthy's proposal for a Senate investigation of the Central Intelligence Agency.

I have serious misgivings concerning certain activities of this agency. While there may be a legitimate need for intelligence activities, there can be no doubt that democracy has been dealt a mortal blow when it is revealed, as for example in the Bay of Pigs fiasco, that the CIA initiates and conducts a foreign policy different from that publicly proclaimed by the U.S. Government. Indeed, it is my understanding that the power of making and implementing foreign policy has never been mandated to the CIA. If this agency has appropriated such power, then it is the clear duty of you, the President, and Congress to remedy the situation and act to limit the CIA to those activities prescribed by law.

Furthermore, the CIA is responsible for disbursing large sums of the public monies, yet no accounting for these expenditures is made to the American taxpayers. I firmly believe that it is high time the principle of accountability be extended to include the semi-autonomous Central Intelligence Agency.

I think that if the above recommendations cannot be implemented within the present framework of the CIA, then perhaps the entire organization should be abolished and some more satisfactory arrangement found to replace it.

Sincerely,

Robert L. Allen

306 West 107th Street #5R
New York 25, New York
June 14, 1965

President Lyndon B. Johnson
White House
Washington, D.C.

Dear President Johnson:

I am writing once again to express my dissatisfaction with the course which your Administration is following in Vietnam. The recent decision to make American troops available for "combat support" in the Vietnam war, without approval or any discussion of this decision by Congress, violates the Constitution of the United States. The Constitution explicitly delegates to the Congress the sole authority to declare war. With U.S. airplanes daily bombing North Vietnam and U.S. soldiers now becoming actively involved in the Vietnam conflict, there can be little doubt that the United States is waging war - an undeclared and unconstitutional war.

Where are we going, Mr. President? At what point do the so-called "combat support" activities now authorized become transformed into offensive "clear and hold" operations? At what point will the American people be notified that they are committed to an all-out war against the people of Asia? This is clearly a disastrous course and I cannot believe that you desire your country to follow it.

I therefore again urge you to reconsider the policy being pursued by your Administration in Vietnam and to attempt a more reasonable approach to the manifold problems there. In particular, I urge you to take the following steps:

1. Call a moratorium on air attacks on North Vietnam. These attacks have clearly failed in their purpose, and to continue them is not only an unconstitutional act of war, but also increases the possibility that they may trigger an international catastrophe.
2. Encourage the South Vietnamese Government to seek a negotiated settlement by every possible means in order to create an independent government in Vietnam and to bring about the withdrawal of American troops.

Finally, as a citizen who regards the Constitution as the supreme law of the land, I must refuse to support or condone the unconstitutional war being waged by the United States in Vietnam. For some time I have strongly disagreed with fundamental United States policy in Vietnam, but when a government begins acting in an illegal manner it is necessary for citizens to withdraw their support from that government. Unfortunately, your Administration has become such a government. I therefore feel that I must refuse induction into the Armed Forces so long as these Forces are engaged in this unconstitutional war. I further intend to urge other young

men to earnestly search their consciences before accepting military induction at the present time. I hope that your Administration will reverse its illegal decision to wage war. Until this occurs I feel that I cannot support this activity on the part of the United States Government.

Respectfully yours,

Robert L. Allen, Jr.

REGISTERED NO. **441116**

Value \$ 92 Spec. del'y fee \$ _____

Fee \$ 60 Ret. receipt fee \$ _____

Surcharge \$ _____ Rest. del'y fee \$ _____

Postage \$ 8 Airmail

Postmaster, By _____

From Ralph Allen

306 W 107 St

To Pres Johnson

Washington DC

POSTMARK



SAVE THIS RECEIPT. Present it when making inquiry or claim.

Claim must be filed within 1 year from the date of mailing.

Consult postmaster as to fee chargeable on registered parcel post packages addressed to foreign countries.

REGISTERED NO. **443383**

Value \$ *N.V.* Spec. del'y fee \$ _____

Fee \$ *60* Ret. receipt fee \$ _____

Surcharge \$ _____ Rest. del'y fee \$ _____

Postage \$ Airmail



Postmaster, By *AK*

From

Robert Allen

306 W. 107 St.

To

*Pres. L B Johnson
White House
Wash. D.C.*

SAVE THIS RECEIPT. Present it when making inquiry or claim.

Claim must be filed within 1 year from the date of mailing.

Consult postmaster as to fee chargeable on registered parcel post packages addressed to foreign countries.

437111

95

REGISTERED NO. -----

Value \$ 20 Spec. del'y fee \$ -----

Fee \$ 60 Ret. receipt fee \$ -----

Surcharge \$ ----- Rest. del'y fee \$ -----

Postage \$ 08 Airmail



Postmaster, By

From Robert L. Allen

306 W 107 ST. #5A

To Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson

White House

Wash. D.C.

POD Form 3806—Oct. 1960

e48-16-70493-5

437112

95

REGISTERED NO. -----

Value \$ 20 Spec. del'y fee \$ -----

Fee \$ 60 Ret. receipt fee \$ -----

Surcharge \$ ----- Rest. del'y fee \$ -----

Postage \$ 08 Airmail



Postmaster, By

From DIT to

To Fed. Bd #62 Fed. Soc System

900 Peachtree St. NE

Atlanta Ga. 30309

POD Form 3806—Oct. 1960

e48-16-70493-5

REGISTERED MAIL
1950

SAVE THIS RECEIPT. Present it when making inquiry or claim.

Claim must be filed within 1 year from the date of mailing.

Consult postmaster as to fee chargeable on registered parcel post packages addressed to foreign countries.

U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE c48-16-70493-4

REGISTERED MAIL

SAVE THIS RECEIPT. Present it when making inquiry or claim.

Claim must be filed within 1 year from the date of mailing.

Consult postmaster as to fee chargeable on registered parcel post packages addressed to foreign countries.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE c48-16-70493-4

April, 1965

Letters To Pres. Johnson

&

Greyhound Bus Co.

Draft Board

152
35
187

Conrad Lynn
401 B'way
CA 6-5226

FBI interview
on OCT 12, 1966

306 West 107th Street #5R
New York 25, New York
April 5, 1965

President Lyndon B. Johnson
White House
Washington, D.C.

Dear President Johnson:

I wish to express my grave dissatisfaction with the United States' present form of involvement in the Vietnam situation. I find that I cannot approve of the manner in which the United States has conducted its efforts in South Vietnam. I am further strongly opposed to the recent policy of military aggression against North Vietnam, which can only lead to a wider and utterly disastrous war.

My reasons for taking this position are as follows:

1. Article 7 of the Geneva Agreement of 1954 states that "... general elections shall be held in July, 1956, under the supervision of an international committee..." These elections were never held. Thus, I cannot understand how your Administration can claim that the United States is present in South Vietnam to protect freedom and democracy. The governments we have supported there have not been mandated by the people. Indeed, it appears that we have supported a succession of undemocratic and dictatorial regimes that are opposed by a majority of the South Vietnamese people.
2. The military presence of the United States in South Vietnam violates the Geneva Agreement and the United Nations Charter (Chapter VI) since the United States has made no effort to "... seek a solution (in Vietnam) by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means..."
3. United States policy is based on the erroneous proposition that the Viet Cong is heavily supplied by and dependent for leadership upon North Vietnam, the Peoples Republic of China, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. I.F. Stone reported, (March 8, 1965), in reply to the State Department's White Paper, that in the 18 month period from June, 1962 until January 29, 1964 we captured 7,500 weapons from the Viet Cong, only 179 of which were of "enemy" (i.e., Soviet, Czech, Chinese, etc.) origin. These figures certainly do not seem to indicate that the Viet Cong is being massively supplied by "enemy" sources. Indeed, the primary source of supplies for the Viet Cong is American arms and ammunition captured from the South Vietnamese Army. Furthermore, Mr. Stone pointed out that the White Paper listed names of only six North Vietnamese infiltrees and no infiltrees of non-Vietnamese origin.
4. American soldiers are the only foreign troops on Vietnamese soil. Let us not forget that the North and South Vietnamese are one people. Therefore, even if there are infiltrees from the North I find it impossible to regard them as foreign invaders. United States troops

BOND

are the only clear and certain foreign agents participating in the civil war in Vietnam. I further cannot understand how a foreign government (the United States) can declare that it intends to "win" the civil war in Vietnam.

5. Recent developments indicate that the policy of "punitive" attacks on North Vietnam is only going to provoke a stronger and more enraged response from the Viet Cong. In addition, as was pointed out in the New York Times Editorial for March 31, 1965: "There is no adequate reason to hope that a further escalation can succeed in anything but more death and destruction, and the grave danger of bringing in the Russians and/or Chinese, and also bringing them together." Are we seeking a war with Russia and China?

6. The use of napalm bombs and poison gas (no matter how "mild") is completely immoral and should be condemned by all Americans who are enlightened enough to regard foreigners as members of the human race.

I urge you to reconsider the policy being pursued by your Administration in Vietnam and to attempt a more reasonable approach to the manifold problems in Vietnam. In particular, I urge you to consider taking the following steps immediately:

1. Call a moratorium on attacks on North Vietnam to allow a "cooling off" period.
2. Encourage the South Vietnamese government to seek a negotiated settlement by every possible means in order to create an independent government in Vietnam and to bring about the withdrawal of United States troops.

Finally, let me say that I don't believe I can in good conscience serve in the United States Armed Forces so long as they are engaged in this vicious aggression in Vietnam. I regard myself as an American citizen who is loyal to the Constitution and the principles of the Founding Fathers, but I will not condone nor in any way support this policy of aggression. I think that there are many other young American men who feel as I do, and who would likewise refuse to participate in or support our military intervention in Vietnam. I hope that the opinions of such Americans will be taken into consideration in the councils of your Administration.

Very Truly Yours,

Robert L. Allen, Jr.

Registered Letter

306 West 107th Street #5R
New York 25, New York
April 3, 1965

President Lyndon B. Johnson
White House
Washington, D.C.

Dear President Johnson:

I wish to express my grave dissatisfaction with the United States' present form of involvement in the Vietnam situation. I find that I cannot approve of the manner in which the United States has conducted its efforts in South Vietnam. I am further strongly opposed to the recent policy of military aggression against North Vietnam, which can only lead to a wider and utterly disastrous war. My reasons for taking this position are as follows:

1. Article 7 of the Geneva Agreement states that "... general elections shall be held in July, 1956, under the supervision of an international committee..." These elections were never held. Thus, I cannot understand how your Administration can claim that the United States is present in South Vietnam to protect freedom and democracy. The governments we have supported there have not been mandated by the people. Indeed, it appears that we have supported a succession of undemocratic and dictatorial regimes that are opposed by a majority of the South Vietnamese people.
2. The military presence of the United States in South Vietnam violates the Geneva Agreement of 1954 and the United Nations Charter (Chapter VI) since the United States has made no effort to "seek a solution (in Vietnam) by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means ..."
3. United States policy is based on the erroneous proposition that the Viet Cong is heavily supplied by and dependent for leadership upon North Vietnam, the Peoples Republic of China, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. As I. F. Stone pointed out (March 8, 1965), in reply to the State Department's White Paper, in the 18 month period from June, 1962 until January 29, 1964 we captured 7,500 weapons from the Viet Cong, only 179 of which were of "enemy" (i.e., Soviet, Czech, Chinese, etc.) origin. These figures certainly do not seem to indicate that the Viet Cong are being massively supplied by "enemy" sources. Indeed, the primary source of supplies for the Viet Cong are American arms and ammunition captured from the South Vietnamese Army. Furthermore, Mr. Stone pointed out that the White Paper listed names of only six North Vietnamese infiltrators and no infiltrators of non-Vietnamese origin.
4. American soldiers are the only foreign troops on Vietnamese soil. Let us not forget that the North and South Vietnamese are one people. Therefore, even if there are infiltrators from the North I find it impossible to regard them as foreign invaders. United States troops are the only clear and certain foreign agents participating in the civil war in Vietnam. I further cannot understand how a foreign government (the United States) can declare that it intends to "win" the civil war in Vietnam.

5. Recent developments indicate that the policy of "punitive" attacks on North Vietnam is only going to provoke a stronger and more engaged response from the Viet Cong. ~~Further~~ In addition, as was pointed out in the New York Times Editorial for March 31, 1965: "There is no adequate reason to hope that a further escalation can succeed in anything but more death and destruction, and the grave danger of bringing in the Russians and/or Chinese, and also bringing them together."
6. The use of napalm bombs and poison gas (no matter how "mild") is completely immoral and should be condemned by all Americans who are enlightened enough to regard foreigners as members of the human race.

I urge you to reconsider the policy being pursued by your Administration and to attempt a more reasonable approach to the manifold problems in Vietnam. In particular, I urge you to consider taking the following steps immediately:

1. Call a moratorium on attacks on North Vietnam to allow a "cooling off" period.
2. Encourage the South Vietnamese government to seek a negotiated settlement by every possible means in order to create an independent government in Vietnam and to bring about the withdrawal of United States troops.

Finally, let me say that I don't believe I can in good conscience serve in the United States Armed Forces so long as they are engaged in this vicious aggression in Vietnam. I regard myself as an American citizen who is loyal to the Constitution and the principles of the Founding Fathers, but I will not condone nor in any way support this policy of aggression. I think that there are many other young American men who feel as I do, and ~~others~~ who would likewise refuse to participate in or support our military intervention in Vietnam. I hope that the opinions of such Americans will be taken into consideration in the councils of your Administration.

Very Truly Yours,

Robert L. Allen, Jr.

BOND
PRESS

STATEMENT ON VIET-NAM

So many conflicting statements are being made about Viet-Nam that it is useful to restate the bedrock truths about the situation there. First, the problem of Viet-Nam is Communist aggression. We are certainly there in force now, but the South Vietnamese asked for our assistance only when the Communist assault reached such proportions as to imperil the very existence of South Viet-Nam. Second, we have no desire for a military presence or base in Viet-Nam. Our goal is precisely to create a situation in which we can withdraw from a peaceful, secure and independent South Viet-Nam. That will be possible whenever the Communists decide to leave their neighbor alone. Third, until the Communists call off their assault, our withdrawal would simply mean turning over 14 million people to the Communists. A political settlement is possible only when the Communists are convinced they cannot win by force. Finally, the situation in Viet-Nam cannot sensibly be isolated from the general world situation. Viet-Nam is not the end of Communist ambition. After Viet-Nam there is Laos, and Cambodia, and Thailand, etc. And if we permit Communist armed subversion to succeed in Southeast Asia we will surely see it again--and soon--in Africa, in the Middle East, and in our own hemisphere.

It is certainly true that Viet-Nam is not an ideal place for a test of American determination. That is why the Communists chose it for the test. And it is true that there is much in South Viet-Nam and in the war there that is not as we would wish it to be. Your concern with the situation is understood and shared at all levels of this government. No issue commands more of the time and energy of the President and his advisors. Our policy has been examined and re-examined and is kept under constant review. As a result of this study it is the rooted conviction of this government's policy-makers that our involvement in Viet-Nam is essential to our security.

In the President's statement of February 7, it was pointed out that the strikes by United States and Vietnamese aircraft against barracks and staging areas in the southern area of North Viet-Nam were in response to provocations ordered and directed by the Hanoi regime. Such provocations are only made possible by the continuing infiltration of personnel and equipment from North Viet-Nam. This infiltration markedly increased during 1964 and continues to increase. As a result, our and the Vietnamese response is being carefully limited to military areas which are supplying men and arms for aggression in South Viet-Nam and is thus entirely defensive in nature.

The

The essentially defensive nature of our posture can perhaps best be appreciated by looking at the history of the 1930's. At that time, the Western democracies refused to face up to their responsibilities and tried to ignore events in such far-off places as Manchuria, the Rhineland, Ethiopia, Czechoslovakia, and Austria. We all know the results of such a stance: the holocaust of World War II. We would indeed be foolish to make the same mistake again and pull out of a difficult situation like Viet-Nam as soon as we found that there was no instant, easy solution. Aggression feeds on success, and it is far better to face up to the aggressors while they are still weak and unsure of themselves, rather than to try to ignore them and have to oppose them later on when they have grown strong and confident.

The President and all of us in the United States Government regret that the Communists have forced us and the Vietnamese to take these actions. We seek no wider war, but whether or not this course can be maintained lies with the North Vietnamese aggressors. The key to the present situation remains the cessation of infiltration from North Viet-Nam and the clear indication by the Hanoi regime that it is prepared to cease aggression against its neighbors.

Neutralization or Negotiated Settlement in Viet-Nam

Suggestions for solving the Viet-Nam problem by neutralization or negotiation have come from several quarters. A negotiated settlement of hostilities in Viet-Nam was the intention of the Geneva Accords of 1954, but the Communists have worked ceaselessly to prevent the success of the treaty. Although the situation in Viet-Nam is a complicated one, the cause of the crisis is not. It is caused by the simple fact that the Communists in North Viet-Nam are attempting to conquer South Viet-Nam. It is Communist aggression which makes a negotiated settlement in Viet-Nam impossible at the present time. As of now the Communists are not interested in a neutral Viet-Nam. Hanoi has specifically rejected neutrality for itself. Their rule for negotiation is "What's mine is mine, and what's yours is negotiable." Neutralization would simply be a way station on the road to a Communist Viet-Nam--and after that a Communist Laos--and after that a Communist Thailand--and ultimately a Communist dominated Southeast Asia.

As President Johnson said:

"No negotiated settlement in Viet-Nam is possible, as long as the Communists hope to achieve victory by force.

"Once

"Once war seems hopeless, then peace may be possible. The door is always open to any settlement which assures the independence of South Viet-Nam, and its freedom to seek help for its protection."

United Nations Involvement in Viet-Nam

The United Nations has been involved in Southeast Asia in a variety of ways. In 1959 the Security Council sent a Commission to Laos. A UN representative has been working for some time on the border problems between Cambodia and Thailand. Last year the General Assembly sent a Mission of Inquiry to look into alleged violations of human rights in Viet-Nam. There is also a very substantial UN activity going on in connection with planning for the development of the Lower Mekong Basin, involving several of these states.

In May, the United States suggested in the Security Council a number of ways by which the establishment of a United Nations presence along the Cambodian-Vietnamese frontier could help reduce tensions in the area. The Security Council created a Mission of three members (Brazil, Ivory Coast, and Morocco) to examine the border situation and to make recommendations as to how further incidents might be avoided.

Hanoi and Peiping have condemned even this limited UN involvement in the Vietnamese situation. The Communist Viet Cong said they could not guarantee the safety of this Commission and would not accept its findings.

Subsequently, the UN Mission recommended, among other things, the establishment of a United Nations Observer Group on the border. While several Security Council members, including the United States, supported this idea, the Cambodian Government ultimately rejected it.

More recently on August 5, 1964, the United States requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider the serious situation created by the North Vietnamese torpedo boat attacks. After hearing the prompt report of the United States on the defensive measures taken in response, the Security Council suggested that both North and South Viet-Nam either participate in the discussions or provide information in any other manner they might wish. Hanoi once again demonstrated its contempt for the United Nations by stating that the Security Council "has no right to examine this problem" and by

refusing

refusing to respond to the invitation in any constructive way. In contrast, the Republic of Viet-Nam formally expressed its readiness "to offer the Security Council its full cooperation."

UN forces are extremely valuable in peace-keeping operations. But international peace-keeping machinery is most useful when the parties to a dispute are willing to work out and abide by a peaceful settlement. UN operations in the presence of the kind of fighting going on in Viet-Nam would be very difficult. However, just as the border and Tonkin Gulf cases came to the Security Council, it is entirely possible that other aspects of the situation in Viet-Nam might come to the UN at some point.

For background information on the Communist aggression in Viet-Nam, you may wish to obtain Department of State publication #7839, which was released in February of 1965, and demonstrates in all clarity, and with ample documentation, the fact that Communist North Viet-Nam is, and for some years has been, carrying out a full-fledged campaign of aggression against South Viet-Nam. This publication may be obtained from the Superintendent of Documents, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 20402, for 40 cents. Americans wishing to examine the record will wish to read this publication.

Office of Public Services
Bureau of Public Affairs
Department of State
Washington, D. C. 20520.