

WPC Services in Demand

The Peace Center is being called upon more and more by individuals in the Washington area who need help and advice. The demand for draft counseling is enormous. Many people stop in or call to ask for information on issues such as the ABM and the war. Even several Congressmen and a Senator have called for information or to ask about the Center and its activities.

A great variety of unfilled needs exist and can be filled by volunteers. The Center needs volunteer receptionists to meet and talk with visitors. The newsletter needs an artist and writers who can contribute concise but substantive book reviews or articles for the "After Vietnam/World in Revolution" series. Many other talents and abilities can also be utilized.

The Peace Center has one new staff member who can help in meeting some of these needs. Bob Falk, who is from Erie, Pa., is a CIO, currently doing alternative service. Bob has been in the Ph.d. program in political behavior at Rutgers.

Free Speech for GI's

The soldiers of the Fort Jackson 8, accused of violations of the Uniform Code of Military Justice after participating in a peaceful discussion of the Vietnam war outside their barracks on March 20, are still confined over a month later while the Army decides what kind of trial to put them through for the crime of free speech.

Information about the progress of legal proceedings on behalf of the Eight and about further demonstrations of support for the constitutional rights of American servicemen can be obtained from Ft. Jackson GI's United, c/o The Committee for the Presidio 27, Rm. 200, 1029 Vermont Ave., N.W., 638-4126, or from the Peace Center.

DC Peace Groups to Coordinate

Representatives from a majority of Washington area peace groups met at the Peace Center on April 17 to discuss the increasingly obvious need for greater co-operation within the movement. Several proposals were discussed:

1. A peace council, to be composed of one representative from each organization, to coordinate the activities of member organizations. The aim would be to avoid duplication of efforts and to more effectively channel the collective energies of the movement into specific actions.
2. A joint newsletter.
3. A building to serve as a center particularly for young people involved in movement activities. The building might also serve as headquarters for a draft counselling center manned by both full and part-time counsellors. Emphasis would be on encouraging greater participation from the black community.
4. A central calendar of events, to be maintained for the present at the Peace Center. Those planning activities were instructed to check with Mike O'Hara to see whether any other activities were planned for that day.
5. Another meeting will be held on Thursday, May 1, for further discussion of these matters.

The Long, Hot Summer?

WPC badly needs an airconditioner, before the arrival of Washington's fabled high-humidity, energy-sapping summer dog days. There are often anywhere from four to ten people working in the two small third-floor rooms occupied by the Peace Center in the Friends Meeting House, and that can get mighty uncomfortable day after day. Anyone with an airconditioner to donate would certainly be doing a good deed for peace... by ensuring that those who are daily working for peace avoid heat stroke.

* * * * *

APRIL-MAY	PEACE CALENDAR	APRIL-MA
Apr. 29, Tues. 8 p.m.	One of the D.C. Nine will speak at St. Stephens, 16th and Newton; sponsored by Federal Employees Against the War	
Apr. 30, Wed.	National Citizens Lobby, WSP, WILPF, and other groups will lobby members of Congress to end the war now, stop ABM, and fully fund the 1968 Housing Act. For information on anti-war lobby plans, contact Bernie Steele, WH 6-7930; for anti-ABM plans, Sylvia Lichtenstein, WH 9-4230.	
May 6-7, Tues. & Wed.	Business Executives Move for Vietnam Peace Emergency Meeting, Mayflower Hotel; Tues., all-day, speakers: Sen. Ralph Yarborough, Dr. George Wald, Cong. Paul Findley; registration fee, \$12.50; Wed., visits to Congress, appts. in advance. BEM, 1730 Eye Street, N.W., 298-8426.	
May 6, Tues. 7:30 p.m.	BEM dinner with Senator J. William Fulbright speaking on "Prevention of Future Vietnams"; cost, \$12.50; reservations: 298-8426.	
May 10, Sat.	Mother's Day Action: leafletting against the war sponsored by Women Strike for Peace; for information on Wheaton Plaza action, call Bernie Steele, WH 6-7930; in Prince Georges County, Jackie Lenchek, 345-1205.	
May 24, Sat.	A party, Women Strike for Peace fund-raiser, for a campaign against ABM.	

Economic Resistance

On April 12 a group of 42 Washingtonians participated in a workshop lasting from 10 a.m. to 9 p.m. on the subject of "Economic Resistance", to explore the ways in which people vote with their money to perpetuate militarism and poverty.

Banks repeatedly attracted the attention of participants. Banks use their assets to buy war bonds and to collect interest from those who need to borrow. Banks also allow IRS agents to take money from people who refuse to finance the military; in fact, banks sometimes charge a \$5 "service" fee for letting an IRS man raid a customer's account.

Resistance can be applied to a very wide variety of economic institutions and practices through which everyone implicitly encourages militarism and poverty. Anyone interested in exploring ways to avoid these undesirable consequences of their economic activities is urged to contact WPC. Further discussions can be arranged with the aim of mapping out a variety of specific strategies which an individual could follow in his everyday life.

Books and Records Needed

Neighbors, Inc., a civic and educational organization in Northwest Washington devoted to maintaining a stable, integrated community, urgently needs books and records for its annual Art and Book Festival, scheduled for June 21 and 22 at Coolidge High School, 5th and Tuckerman Sts., N.W. Books and records of all kinds are acceptable, and donations are tax deductible. Free pickup anywhere in the metropolitan area arranged by calling: Mrs. Martha Freeman, 726-0555; Mrs. Brenda Bell, 723-2010; or Mrs. Anita Blake, 726-7203.

Friends Offer Sanctuary

The Friends Meeting of Washington has decided to offer sanctuary to draft resisters whose stand is the result of conscience and whose resistance is non-violent. The meeting house will be open to young men for shelter, a public statement of spiritual support will be issued for those who accept sanctuary, and a symbolic and non-violent confrontation will be carried out by members of the Meeting in the event that public authorities intervene.

A Generation Unsure That It Has a Future

THE
WASHINGTON
POST

Sunday, March 30, 1969

By George Wald

ALL OF YOU know that in the last couple of years there has been student unrest breaking at times into violence in many parts of the world: in England, Germany, Italy, Spain, Mexico and, needless to say, in many parts of this country. There has been a great deal of discussion as to what it all means.

Perfectly clearly, it means something different in Mexico from what it does in France, and something different in France from what it does in Tokyo, and something different in Tokyo from what it does in this country. Yet unless we are to assume that students have gone crazy all over the world, or that they have just decided that it's the thing to do, there must be some common meaning.

I don't need to go so far afield to look for that meaning. I am a teacher, and at Harvard, I have a class of about 350 students—men and women—most of them freshmen and sophomores. Over these past few years I have felt increasingly that something is terribly wrong—and this year ever so much more than last. Something has gone sour, in teaching and in learning. It's almost as though there were a widespread feeling that education has become irrelevant.

A lecture is much more of a dialogue than many of you probably appreciate. As you lecture, you keep watching the faces, and information keeps coming back to you all the time. I began to feel, particularly this year, that I was missing much of what was coming back. I tried asking the students, but they didn't or couldn't help me very much.

But I think I know what's the matter, even a little better than they do. I think that this whole generation of students is beset with a profound uneasiness. I don't think that they have yet quite defined its source. I think I understand the reasons for their uneasiness even better than they do. What is more, I share their uneasiness.

Some 1200 scientists, students and others gathered in Kresge Auditorium of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology March 4 under the aegis of the "March 4 Movement" protesting the misuses of science. The participants "were disturbed," according to the *Boston Globe*, "at the lack of focus in the day's numerous panel discussions and speeches" until Dr. George Wald rose to speak.

Dr. Wald is professor of biology at Harvard and 1968 winner of the Nobel Prize for medicine. As in his lectures at Harvard, he "talked extemporaneously, his head back, his eyes almost closed," said the *Globe*. "His words had an electric effect. A hush fell over the audience, broken just once by sustained applause midway in the speech and climaxed by a prolonged standing ovation at its conclusion."

This is the speech.



United Press International

An American Invention

WHAT'S BOTHERING those students? Some of them tell you it's the Vietnam war. I think the Vietnam war is the most shameful episode in the whole of American history.

The concept of war crimes is an American invention. We've committed many war crimes in Vietnam, but I'll tell you something interesting about that. We were committing war crimes in World War II, even before the Nuremberg trials were held and the principle of war crimes started. The saturation bombing of German cities was a war crime, and if we had lost the war, some of our leaders might have had to answer for it.

I've gone through all of that history lately, and I find that there's a gimmick in it. It isn't written out, but I think we established it by precedent. That gimmick is that if one can allege that one is repelling or retaliating for an aggression—after that, everything goes.

And you see, we are living in a world in which all wars are wars of defense. All War Departments are now Defense Departments. This is all part of the double talk of our time. The aggressor is always on the other side.

And I suppose this is why our ex-Secretary of State, Dean Rusk—a man in whom repetition takes the place of reason and stubbornness takes the place of character—went to such pains to insist, as he still insists, that in Vietnam we are repelling an aggression. And if that's what we are doing—so runs the doctrine—anything goes.

If the concept of war crimes is ever to mean anything, they will have to be defined as categories of acts, regardless of provocation. But that isn't so now.

I think we've lost that war, as a lot of other people think, too. The Vietnamese have a secret weapon. It's their willingness to die beyond our willingness to kill. In effect, they've been saying, you can kill us, but you'll have to kill a lot of us, you may have to kill all of us. And thank heavens, we are not yet ready to do that.

Yet we have come a long way—far enough to sicken many Americans, far enough even to sicken our fighting men, far enough so that our national symbols have gone sour. How many of you can sing about "the rockets' red glare, bombs bursting in air" without thinking, those are our bombs and our rockets bursting over South Vietnamese villages?

When those words were written, we were a people struggling for freedom against oppression. Now we are supporting real or thinly disguised military dictatorships all over the world, helping them to control and repress peoples struggling for their freedom.

Postwar Aberrations

BUT THAT Vietnam war, shameful and terrible as it is, seems to me only an immediate incident in a much larger and more stubborn situation.

Part of my trouble with students is that almost all the students I teach were born since World War II. Just after World War II, a series of new and abnormal procedures came into American life. We regarded them at the time as temporary aberrations. We thought we would get back to normal American life some day.

But those procedures have stayed with us now for more than 20 years, and those students of mine have never known anything else. They think those things are normal. They think we've always had a Pentagon, that we have always had a big army and that we always had a draft. But those are all new things in American life, and I think that they are incompatible with what America meant before.

How many of you realize that just before World War II, the entire American army, including the Air Force, numbered 130,000 men? Then World War II started, but we weren't yet in it; and seeing that there was great trouble in the world, we doubled this army to 268,000 men. Then in World War II, it got to be eight million.

And then World War II came to an end, and we prepared to go back to a peacetime army somewhat as the American army had always been before. And indeed in 1950—you think about 1950, our international commitments, the cold war, the Truman Doctrine and all the rest of it—in 1950 we got down to 500,000 men.

Now we have 3.5 million men under arms: about 600,000 in Vietnam, about 300,000 more in "support areas" elsewhere in the Pacific, about 250,000 in Germany. And there are a lot at home. Some months ago we were told that 300,000 National Guardsmen and 200,000 reservists had been specially trained for riot duty in the cities.

I say the Vietnam war is just an immediate incident, because so long as we keep that big an army, it will always find things to do. If the Vietnam war stopped tomorrow, with that big a military establishment, the chances are that we would be in another such adventure abroad or at home before you knew it.



"Wonder why grownups always have enough money for killin' and never enough for livin'?"

As for the draft: Don't reform the draft—get rid of it.

A peacetime draft is the most un-American thing I know. All the time I was growing up, I was told about oppressive Central European countries and Russia, where young men were forced into the army, and I was told what they did about it. They chopped off a finger, or shot off a couple of toes; or better still, if they could manage it, they came to this country. And we understood that, and sympathized, and were glad to welcome them.

Now, by present estimates, 4000 to 6000 Americans of draft age have left this country for Canada, another 2000 or 3000 have gone to Europe and it looks as though many more are preparing to emigrate.

A few months ago, I received a letter from the Harvard Alumni Bulletin posing a series of questions that students might ask a professor involving what to do about the draft. I was asked to write what I would tell those students. All I had to say to those students was this: If any of them had decided to evade the draft and asked my help, I would help him in any way I could.

I would feel as I suppose members of the underground railway felt in pre-Civil War days, helping runaway slaves to get to Canada. It wasn't altogether a popular position then, but what do you think of it now?

A bill to stop the draft was recently introduced in the Senate (S. 503), sponsored by a group of Senators that ran the gamut from McGovern and Hatfield to Barry Goldwater. I hope it goes through; but any time I find that Barry Goldwater and I are in agreement, that makes one take another look.

And indeed, there are choices in getting rid of the draft. I think that when we get rid of the draft, we must also cut back the size of the armed forces. It seems to me that in peacetime a total of one million men is surely enough. If there is an argument for American military forces of more than one million men in peacetime, I should like to hear that argument debated.

There is another thing being said closely connected with this: that to keep an adequate volunteer army, one would have to raise the pay considerably. That's said so positively and often that people believe it. I don't think it is true.

The great bulk of our present armed forces are genuine volunteers. Among first-term enlistments, 49 per cent are true volunteers. Another 30 per cent are so-called "reluctant volunteers," persons who volunteer under pressure of the draft. Only 21 per cent are draftees. All re-enlistments, of course, are true volunteers.

So the great majority of our present armed forces are true volunteers. Whole services are composed entirely of volunteers: the Air Force, for example, the submarine service, the Marines. That seems like proof to me that present pay rates are adequate.

One must add that an act of Congress in 1967 raised the base pay throughout the services in three installments, the third installment still to come, on April 1, 1969. So it is hard to understand why we are being told that to maintain adequate armed services on a volunteer basis will require large increases in pay; they will cost an extra \$17 billion per year. It seems plain to me that we can get all the armed forces we need as volunteers, and at present rates of pay.

But there is something even so much bigger and more important than the draft. The bigger thing, of course, is what ex-President Eisenhower warned us of, calling it the military-industrial complex. I am sad to say that we must begin to think of it now as the military-industrial-labor union complex.

What happened under the plea of the cold war was not alone that we built up the first big peacetime army in our history, but we institutionalized it. We built, I suppose, the biggest government building in our history to run it, and we institutionalized it.

I don't think we can live with the present military establishment and its \$80-100 billion a year budget and keep America anything like we have known it in the past. It is corrupting the life of the whole country. It is buying up everything in sight: industries, banks,

investors universities, and lately it seems also to have bought up the labor unions.

The Defense Department is always broke; but some of the things they do with that \$80 billion a year would make Buck Rogers envious. For example: the Rocky Mountain Arsenal on the outskirts of Denver was manufacturing a deadly nerve poison on such a scale that there was a problem of waste disposal. Nothing daunted, they dug a tunnel two miles deep under Denver, into which they have injected so much poisoned water that beginning a couple of years ago Denver began to experience a series of earth tremors of increasing severity.

Now there is a grave fear of a major earthquake. An interesting debate is in progress as to whether Denver will be safer if that lake of poisoned water is removed or left in place. (New York Times, July 4, 1968; Science, Sept. 27, 1968).

Perhaps you have read also of those 6000 sheep that suddenly died in Skull Valley, Utah, killed by another nerve poison—a strange and, I believe, still unexplained accident, since the nearest testing seems to have been 20 miles away.

As for Vietnam, the expenditure of fire power has been frightening. Some of you may still remember Khesanh, a hamlet just south of the Demilitarized Zone, where a force of U.S. Marines was beleaguered for a time. During that period, we dropped on the perimeter of Khesanh more explosives than fell on Japan throughout World War II, and more than fell on the whole of Europe during the years 1942 and 1943.

One of the officers there was quoted as having said afterward, "It looks like the world caught smallpox and died." (New York Times, March 28, 1968).

The only point of government is to safeguard and foster life. Our Government has become preoccupied with

death, with the business of killing and being killed. So-called defense now absorbs 60 per cent of the national budget, and about 12 per cent of the gross national product.

The Facts of Death

A LIVELY DEBATE is beginning again on whether or not we should deploy antiballistic missiles, the ABMs. I don't have to talk about them; everyone else here is doing that. But I should like to mention a curious circumstance.

In September, 1967, or about 1½ years ago, we had a meeting of MIT and Harvard people, including experts on these matters, to talk about whether anything could be done to block the Sentinel system, the deployment of ABMs. Everyone present thought them undesirable, but a few of the most knowledgeable persons took what seemed to be the practical view, "Why fight about a dead issue? It has been decided, the funds have been appropriated. Let's go on from there."

Well, fortunately, it's not a dead issue.

An ABM is a nuclear weapon. It takes a nuclear weapon to stop a nuclear weapon. And our concern must be with the whole issue of nuclear weapons.

There is an entire semantics ready to deal with the sort of thing I am about to say. It involves such phrases as "those are the facts of life." No—these are the facts of death. I don't accept them, and I advise you not to accept them.

We are under repeated pressures to accept things that are presented to us as settled—decisions that have been made. Always there is the thought: Let's go on from there! But this time we don't see how to go on. We will have to stick with those issues.

We are told that the United States and Russia between them have by now stockpiles in nuclear weapons approximately the explosive power of 15 tons of TNT for every man, woman and child on earth. And now it is suggested that we must make more. All very regrettable, of course, but those are "the facts of life."

We really would like to disarm, but our new Secretary of Defense has made the ingenious proposal that one must be practical. Now is the time to greatly increase our nuclear armaments so that we can disarm from a position of strength.

I think all of you know there is no adequate defense against massive nuclear attack. It is both easier and



"It's the American way of saving us."

cheaper to circumvent any known nuclear defense system than to provide it. It's all pretty crazy. At the very moment we talk of deploying ABMs, we are also building the MIRV, the weapon to circumvent ABMs.

The Doomed Survivors

SO FAR AS I know, with everything working as well as can be hoped and all foreseeable precautions taken, the most conservative estimates of Americans killed in a major nuclear attack run to about 50 million. We have become callous to gruesome statistics, and this seems at first to be only another gruesome statistic. You think, Bang!—and next morning, if you're still there, you read in the newspapers that 50 million people were killed.

But that isn't the way it happens. When we killed close to 200,000 people with those first little old-fashioned uranium bombs that we dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, about the same number of persons was maimed, blinded, burned, poisoned and otherwise doomed. A lot of them took a long time to die.

That's the way it would be. Not a bang, and a certain number of corpses to bury, but a nation filled with millions of helpless, maimed, tortured and doomed survivors huddled with their families in shelters, with guns ready to fight off their neighbors, trying to get some uncontaminated food and water.

A few months ago, Sen. Richard Russell of Georgia ended a speech in the Senate with the words: "If we have to start over again with another Adam and Eve, I want them to be Americans, and I want them on this continent and not in Europe." That was a United States Senator holding a patriotic speech. Well, here is a Nobel laureate who thinks that those words are criminally insane. (Prolonged applause.)

How real is the threat of full-scale nuclear war? I have my own very inexpert idea, but realizing how little I know and fearful that I may be a little paranoid on this subject, I take every opportunity to ask reputed experts. I asked that question of a very distinguished professor of government at Harvard about a month ago.

I asked him what sort of odds he would lay on the possibility of full-scale nuclear war within the foreseeable future. "Oh," he said comfortably, "I think I can give you a pretty good answer to that question. I estimate the probability of full-scale nuclear war, provided that the situation remains about as it is now, at 2 per cent per year." Anybody can do the simple calculation that shows that 2 per cent per

year means that the chance of having that full-scale nuclear war by 1990 is about one in three, and by 2000 it is about 50-50.

A Dubious Future

I THINK I know what is bothering the students. I think that what we are up against is a generation that is by no means sure that it has a future.

I am growing old, and my future, so to speak, is already behind me. But there are those students of mine who are in my mind always; there are my children, two of them now 7 and 9, whose future is infinitely more precious to me than my own. So it isn't just their generation; it's mine, too. We're all in it together.

Are we to have a chance to live? We don't ask for prosperity, or security; only for a reasonable chance to live, to work out our destiny in peace and decency, not to go down in history as the apocalyptic generation.

And it isn't only nuclear war. Another overwhelming threat is in the population explosion. That has not yet even begun to come under control.

There is every indication that the world population will double before the year 2000, and there is a widespread expectation of famine on an unprecedented scale in many parts of the world. The experts tend to differ only in their estimates of when those famines will begin. Some think by 1980; others think they can be staved off until 1990; very few expect that they will not occur by the year 2000.

That is the problem. Unless we can be surer than we now are that this generation has a future, nothing else matters. It's not good enough to give it tender, loving care, to supply it with breakfast foods, to buy it expensive educations. Those things don't mean anything unless this generation has a future. And we're not sure that it does.

I don't think that there are problems of youth, or student problems. All the real problems I know are grownup problems.

Perhaps you will think me altogether absurd, or "academic," or hopelessly innocent—that is, until you think of the alternatives—if I say as I do to you now: We have to get rid of those nuclear weapons. There is noth-

ing worth having that can be obtained by nuclear war: nothing material or ideological, no tradition that it can defend. It is utterly self-defeating.

Those atom bombs represent an unusable weapon. The only use for an atom bomb is to keep somebody else from using it. It can give us no protection, but only the doubtful satisfaction of retaliation. Nuclear weapons offer us nothing but a balance of terror, and a balance of terror is still terror.

We have to get rid of those atomic weapons, here and everywhere. We cannot live with them.

All One Species

I THINK we've reached a point of great decision, not just for our Nation, not only for all humanity, but for life upon the Earth. I tell my students, with a feeling of pride that I hope they will share, that the carbon, nitrogen and oxygen that make up 99 per cent of our living substance were cooked in the deep interiors of earlier generations of dying stars.

Gathered up from the ends of the universe over billions of years, eventually they came to form in part the substance of our sun, its planets and ourselves. Three billion years ago, life arose upon the Earth. It seems to be the only life in the solar system. Many a star has since been born and died.

About two million years ago, man appeared. He has become the dominant species on the Earth. All other living things, animal and plant, live by his sufferance. He is the custodian of life on Earth. It's a big responsibility.

The thought that we're in competition with Russians or with Chinese is all a mistake, and trivial. Only mutual destruction lies that way. We are one species, with a world to win. There's life all over this universe, but we are the only men.

Our business is with life, not death. Our challenge is to give what account we can of what becomes of life in the solar system, this corner of the universe that is our home, and, most of all, what becomes of men—all men of all nations, colors and creeds.

It has become one world, a world for all men. It is only such a world that now can offer us life and the chance to go on.

A Proposal for the Police

Two Washington area residents, Thomas Inskip and Arthur Sweeney, have committed themselves to tackling one of the major problems with the police in an urban community: firepower. While granting that some kind of weapon is necessary for the cop on the beat, they argue that the current police arsenal is entirely inappropriate to an urban environment. Their thesis is relatively simple: it is that the ammunition presently used by Washington police is much too powerful. Because of the velocity and load behind the bullets used in a police service revolver, the patrolman is too often capable only of killing a suspect; he is unable to apprehend someone by the use of his revolver. If the policeman is forced to resort to his gun, the gun is likely to kill (through a tremendous shock to the nervous system and enormous tissue damage) rather than merely wound.

Inskip and Sweeney are approaching the problem from a technical rather than a polemical point of view. Inskip, a high-reliability technician and weapons expert, has developed a safer alternative to the .38 caliber revolvers presently in use, which have several severe defects. According to Inskip and Sweeney:

1. The high-velocity bullets which the police now use can ricochet off buildings and pass through one or more bystanders.

2. While the bullets can pass through five people at once, they have very poor knockdown capability. The Treasury Department recently lost two agents while apprehending a gunman who had been hit 12 times with a .38.

3. The guns are very loud and are, therefore, likely to attract a crowd to a dangerous situation.

Inskip has gone back to Civil War technology to find his alternative. Called a "one-shot", his bullet has less than half the velocity of presently-used bullets. It will not ricochet, and will not pass

through people. According to Inskip, it is far less likely to cause death from nervous shock, yet its "knockdown" power is far greater than that of .38 bullets.

The three-pound weapon which fires it would resemble a small, light shotgun. It would have larger, simpler, more reliable parts than a revolver, as well as greater sight accuracy, and would be semi-silent. It could hang from an officer's belt like a nightstick.

In short, Inskip and Sweeney feel that their weapon could significantly lower the level of unnecessary violence caused by police guns, while enabling the police to stop dangerous gunmen more quickly.

Resistance to the new guns and bullets comes from the ammunition industry, and from the police themselves. Says Inskip, "The industry is interested in profiting from high-priced munitions, so it encourages hysteria among those who are demanding greater and greater 'protection.'"

Relations between the industry and the nation's police amount to a sort of mini-military/industrial complex. Older men in the Washington department to whom Inskip and Sweeney have talked appear convinced that society has given them the right to kill, and they are not interested in relinquishing any of their capability of doing so. Younger men on the force, however, have indicated that they feel the need for alternatives to their present death-dealing weapons.

So far, Inskip and Sweeney have been able to open only a few small doors within the system. As technically qualified professionals, however, they feel that their approach can be fruitful. They are currently in contact with the offices of several City Councilmen, and are awaiting the chance to present their case to them.

Those of us who see violence as an evil which should be halted are often hard pressed to propose viable means to our goal. Inskip and Sweeney feel they can help society take an incremental step toward lowering the level of violence, and they are devoting time, money and energy to this task.

The End the War Now Ad Committee of the Washington Area is collecting at least 1,000 signatures of Washington Area people who will attach their names to the statement below and contribute \$5 toward the cost of an ad embodying the statement.

"The time is coming very soon when the U.S. no longer will have the right to ask American boys to die in the Vietnam war." So said Averell Harriman on February 11.

We say the time has now come!!!

The undersigned believe that a military solution to the Vietnam war is impossible and that a continued war will only mean more bloodshed--American and Vietnamese. We urge the following as the road to peace.

1. Halt all offensive military operations in Vietnam, including search and destroy missions.
2. Commit ourselves to withdrawal of all our troops within one year, and begin withdrawal immediately.

You are urged to lend your name in support of this effort. Fill in the information below and send it with your contribution to the Ad Committee, P.O. Box 1314, Wheaton, Md. 20906.

Name _____

Address _____

Tel. No. _____ Signature _____

Contribution \$5 for Ad / / Additional for Expenses / /

Free Theatre

WPC's Free Theatre has finished a highly successful film series at the Institute for Policy Studies. Attendance each Saturday night was 2-3 times the average during earlier seasons. A new series is now being planned. It will not get underway until a new location is found, however, since IPS is no longer available.

No Saturday Hours - The Peace Center has discontinued its Saturday morning hours.

* * * * *

"I think that people want peace so much that one of these days governments better get out of their way and let 'em have it." - Dwight Eisenhower
September 1, 1959

WASHINGTON PEACE CENTER NEWSLETTER
2111 Florida Ave., N.W. 20008

NON-PROFIT ORG
US Postage Paid
Washington, D. C.
Permit #42613

C L O S E D Saturdays

Bill Gerson, SDS
Student Union Bldg
U. of Md. 20742

Phones: Draft Info: AD 4-6211; WPC: AD 4-2111
Winter hours: Mon-Fri. 9-5

RETURN REQUESTED