

60091
1210 Gregory Ave.
Wilmette, Ill.
April 28, 1966.

Mrs. Lucy Montgomery
875 Bridlewood
Northbrook
Ill.

Reference; My letter Apr. 14
Subsequent phone
conversation.

Dear Mrs. Montgomery ;

A group of leading lawyers, The Lawyers Committee on American Policy Towards Vietnam, after a careful legal analysis, has brought most serious charges against our Government ; those of gross violation of Law, Constitution, and sacred Treaties.

This group is prepared to send a prominent lawyer, Mr. Joseph H. Crown, Secretary to the Committee, to defend these charges in our Legal debate, at whatever date we set, on his own time. If we can pay his travel between New York and Chicago he will be grateful; if not he will pay it himself.

I do not despair that we can secure equally able legal talent to defend the Government.

You will agree that our primary concern, over-riding all else, must be to try to learn the truth regarding these charges, or at least as much of it as possible.

To this end I have suggested the procedures outlined on Sheets 1 and 5 attached and in the three sent you with my April 14 letter, amplified by the April 18 Progress Report.

As I see it, the difference between following this procedure conscientiously and wholeheartedly, and violation of it, in the search for truth in these charges, makes all the difference between possible success and almost certain failure.

Would you be so kind as to study over these attached sheets 1 and 5 and the Progress Report attached, in connection with the sheets previously sent, and let me have your frank and considered judgment? I shall be much indebted if you will do this.

Since Mrs. Louise Barry and Father Grant are interested in this question I am taking the liberty of sending each a copy of this letter.

Sincerely yours

Encl. Shts. 1, 5, Progress Report

Cy. Mrs. Barry
Father Grant

L.T. Wyly
L.T. Wyly

AD HOC NORTH SUBURBAN CITIZENS COMMITTEE
FOR STUDY OF U.S.POLICY AND CONDUCT IN VIETNAM

BRIEF PROGRESS REPORT Apr.18, 1966.

Committee Formation Four groups have now been formed locally of citizens joining the Committee at

Lake Forest College Glenview
Loyola University Wilmette

All have expressed enthusiasm for the Proposed Debates and signified their willingness to participate as outlined on p.3 of the First Draft of the Proposal.

Other prominent individuals have agreed to furnish moral support by allowing use of their names but find themselves unable to devote any time.

SUGGESTIONS Father Grant, who has joined the Committee, suggests ;

1. That each debate be repeated at Loyola University
2. That a third debate be staged.

LAWYERS COMMITTEE The Lawyers Committee has agreed to take the affirmative in the legal debate, and has tentatively designated Mr.Harold I.Cammer of the New York firm of Cammer and Shapiro to represent them.

Two prominent and conservative lawyers, members of the American Bar Assn. have told me that they feel the Government has acted legally, but that they would not be able to defend the Government in a debate.

On Friday, Apr.22 Mr.Cammer will be at 2800 North Sheridan, Amalgamated Meat Cutters Union, and free from 1 P.M. to 4:30 if any of the Committee wish to talk with him. I expect to be there and cordially invite any and all members of the Committee to be there.

ORGANIZATION I attach Sht.5 of the Proposal prospectus, being a first draft of General Specifications. I should welcome criticisms, comment and additions.

ORGANIZATION MEETING It appears to the writer that an organization meeting can be held about the middle of May or possibly a little earlier. Reverend Coe has told us we may meet in the 1st Congregational Church of Wilmette, provided we reserve early enough. I will communicate with each member in time on this.

NEW MEMBERS The most important activity now, I suggest, is recruiting of new Committee members. I have received valuable suggestions from Reverend Coe, Father Grant, and others, and am now engaged in interviewing these persons. Everyone who has so far joined the Committee has expressed considerable enthusiasm for the objectives.

May I urge each member receiving this report to try to secure further members ?

Cordially and gratefully

L T Wolsky

AN AD HOC CITIZENS COMMITTEE
TO SPONSOR PUBLIC VIETNAM DEBATES

TYPICAL UNCERTAINTIES REGARDING VIETNAM TODAY

- 1. The Lawyers Committee says Our Government has grossly violated the Law, the Constitution, and our Treaties.
- An American Bar Assn. Group says Our Government has acted within the Law, the Constitution and our Treaties.
- 2. Our Government says The U.S. entered Vietnam in response to a request for help against invasion from a legitimate government of the South Vietnamese People.
- Responsible Journalists say We entered Vietnam to help the French Colonialists with nearly \$2 billion given the French. In response to a request of a military dictator we have set up and maintained in power we have sent military forces to fight in Vietnam against native people engaged in a popular revolution.
- 3. Responsible Foreign Correspondents say ". . . thousands of Vietnamese women and children are being killed, crippled and wholly or half burned with napalm . . . U.S. authorities refused to allow crippled and burned children to be taken out of the country (South Vietnam) for medical treatment."
- Secretary McNamara says Less than about 200 civilians have been hurt in the Vietnamese War.

CONCLUSIONS

- 1. Undoubtedly large numbers on each side of the controversy believe firmly in one of the other of the above statements.
- 2. Probably neither side is entirely in the right.
- 3. It is all important to the American People, and to the rest of the world, to ascertain the truth as far as possible.
- 4. It is of vital importance to the American People to learn as much as possible of the truth in the above, and related, questions, SOON.

QUESTION

Why debates ? Why not just one sided "symposiums"?

Why must both sides be represented ?

ANSWER

Captain Dreyfus, an innocent man, spent ten years in Devils Island prison after conviction on the ground of ex parte evidence- false and maliciously inspired - evidence the existence of which neither Dreyfus nor his attorneys were permitted to know of, and which hence they could not examine and refute.