



Sunday 26 October 1969

Dear Harry,

To say that we have been remiss in not communicating with you since your departure from Guam is a bit of an understatement. I particularly apologize for not having attempted some help in the report and talk you were scheduled for according to your last letter. Things have been more than a little bit hectic during the past few weeks but will, perhaps, settle down somewhat now here in San Francisco.

Our departure from Guam was a little more sudden than I had anticipated it would be. I was disappointed to realize that that job out there would still be rotated in one year. With all the mounting interest in that part of the world, particularly in the Trust Territories, and all the things that seemed to need doing now, I had not supposed that Washington would consider it less than a two year tour. With all the talking I have done since, together with that of several other people, I suspect that those who follow will not be moved so quickly.

Getting moved was, of course, a madhouse and is not yet over. We are reasonably settled in Yerba Buena Island but there is still one large shipment of household effects to come from storage in Honolulu and I don't have the slightest idea where we are going to put them all. The trip here was restful, we flew from Guam to Hawaii, spent five days there and took the Lurline from Hawaii to San Francisco. Most enjoyable all the way.

Mrs. C. has had one of the last news letters we put together in an envelope for you for some weeks now but I don't believe it has found its way into the mail. If I can remember when I finish this, I'll include it.

This Vietnam War is certainly not a popular one and this is, of course, more readily detectable back here in the mainland than it was in the islands. Not that I can recall any war being terribly popular but the national aversion to this one is a very real force in the nation today. It is very clear now that the United States will pull out of South Vietnam very soon as a result of the political pressures we can see all around. What we leave there will have the initial appearance of a reasonably strong self-governing country with the military and



economic assets to be a self-sufficient nation with a desire for democracy. This appearance will, unfortunately, be largely superficial. The take over of South Vietnam by North Vietnam backed by the communist fraternity will be inevitable and a matter of time. Following this will be the similar takeover of Laos, Cambodia and then Thailand. Given perhaps five years all of the peninsula will be in the communistic bloc.

The implications of this are many and tragic. We have long contended and sincerely believed that a liberal democracy is the form of government which best serves the needs of any civilized people, politically, economically and culturally. Because of the political constraints upon the war in Vietnam and now because of the political pressures at home, we are abandoning our support of the South Vietnamese toward the democratic form. This is depressing but it does, by no means, express the real depth of the decision.

As I've said to you before on occasion, we must look a little deeper into the motivation of things to appreciate the magnitude of what we are about to do.

Man is basically a selfish animal. Nations, being comprised of men, exhibit the same fundamental characteristic. Nations, like men, divide naturally into two categories, those who have and those who have not. Every form of competition, whether violent or non violent, is a manifestation of the constant struggle by those who have not to take from those who have and by those who have to hang on to whatever they possess. The things at issue can be associated with land, political power, freedom of enterprise or many others, but generally they are either directly associated with or lead up to things of a fundamental economic nature. Starting with food, man wants those things which make him more comfortable and insure him the highest possible standard of living. The job of the nation is to gain and insure these things to the individuals within it.

The United States, through the courage, ingenuity, energy and foresight of its people; coupled, of course, with reasonable natural resources, is the greatest of the "have" nations. Any struggle or competition in which this country enters has the direct end product of preserving what we have or preventing



someone else from taking it from us. All other purposes of a contest, no matter how altruistic or sincere, must support this one basic one.

This nation, great as it is, is by no means self-sufficient. A large segment of the economy of the country depends directly and almost all of the economy indirectly upon the resources of and trade and business with other parts of the world. Control of these things is equally fundamental to the other ambitious peoples and nations of this sphere. Gaining and maintenance of this control is the real issue eternally at stake.

The fact that the communist nations are our principal adversary at this time is important but it is immaterial to the theory. The United States was initially a "have not" nation. It wrested these controls from others long before communism was conceived. Communism and, for that matter, democracy are ideologies which have been contrived to serve certain purposes for a given people but which basically form the platforms from which the quest for economic development or the maintenance of it can be mounted. If the Soviet Union or China were monarchies or even democracies the problem would have different overtones but it would still be there.

So what does this mean regarding our motivation in Vietnam or any other scene of conflict in the World? It means that we want and need Vietnam and anyone else we can get on our side to the degree that we can do business in their sphere of influence. It means that the fall of Vietnam, or Laos or any other significant portion of the world to the adversary will result in their doing business with that adversary to our exclusion. The economic impact of the loss of Vietnam will not be immediately detectable. The stock market will not suffer much, the food on your table will not measurably shrink. But this is the beginning, however small, of the abandonment of the principle which has made and kept this Nation strong and its standard of living the highest in the world. When all of Southeast Asia goes we shall feel something. When the middle east, with its tremendous petroleum resources goes, the impact will be significant and so-on and on.

But the current attitude of much of the American public is so immediately self centered, so anchored on the: "What's in



it for me, just me" concept that it refused to look a little bit into the future. It is not your welfare or mine that we are trying to give up, it is that of our children and theirs. We have utterly lost our foresight. All of the opposition to and protests against this war, whether irresponsible (as most are) or sincere as a few are contain this strong thread of "give me mine now, the future is not of my concern". It is not those of you who have made the large sacrifice to our future who make these protests. You seem, somehow, to understand that the problem is not one of right now. It is those who have sat back and enjoyed the benefits made possible by you and generations before but have rather suddenly decided that the immediate threat is not to them and that they are sick and tired of paying for it.

Progress in the areas I have been discussing and in many others is founded to some degree on fear. Our citizens are willing to be taxed heavily or even to give up their sons when the threat has real meaning to the individual, his home or his business, even his freedom. But he will not be willingly taxed for someone else's problem or those of future generations. One of the major arguments against taxation for this war has been the contention that these monies could be so much better used at home on urban improvements or poverty programs. This, unfortunately is against the nature of the beast. The only man, in the long run, who will be willing to pay for poverty programs is the man threatened with or experiencing poverty. This is not the man, however, who has the money. The man who has it is not worried and will not go along with the gag to any large degree.

I could go on and on, but the point I'm making here is that this war is unpopular in our nation among those people who see nothing in it for them, are not personally afraid of its outcome and who refuse to look far enough into the future to visualize this nation constrained by the ramifications of many losses of which this is only the first.

That is enough philosophy right now. These are not original thoughts but they are sound.

It appears that the job here in MSTs is going to be altogether interesting, but quite different from most of the Navy. The



quarters are gracious and large and the living should be good. A lot different from Guam and many things available there in the way of services may be a little harder to find here. Borja and Chief Edwards came with me and are also in the throes of getting housing and settled down.

We hated to leave the Island but this will be great too.

Mrs. C. has not found the news letter so it will have to follow later.

I trust that everything is going as well with you as you hoped and that you are making the effort to insure the success in college. It takes a lot of hard work but it is awfully necessary.

Let us hear from you again and I will try to be more prompt with a response.

Sincerely;

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be 'P. C. C.', written in a cursive style.

P.S. Anne is in Lowell High School and seems to think it is pretty good. Getting started in a new one is always difficult. Not much time for her guitar.

PPC