October 3, 1966

Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Dear Mr. Jones:

I received your letter of September 19th concerning the war in Vietnam and appreciate having your views.

I do not claim to be a military expert but I do have opportunities to talk with military men. I think this administration should try to win this war at the earliest possible moment and I think the harder we hit North Vietnam and the Viet Cong the quicker they will want to negotiate instead of begging them to come to the conference table.

Personally, I would hit them so darned hard that they would be glad to discuss differences with us.

I am presently leading a fight to stop nations that get concessional sales from us from sending materials and supplies to Vietnam and Cuba. I am enclosing come copies of my correspondence with other Members of Congress.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

PAGE BELCHER Member of Congress

PB/bwm Encl.

Oklahoma City, Okla. September 19, 1966

Dear Sir:

Why are we fighting the Communist in Vietnam yet helping them everywhere else?

On July 1, 1965 the United Press reported that Soviet President Mikoyan and Yugoslav President Tito "joined in pledging all necessary aid to North Vietnam." So two weeks later Tito received 92,000 bales of cotton and 25,000 tons of vegetable oil from the United States.

On November 23, 1965 John Stormer summarized the setuation as follows: "...we must stop aid and trade with the Soviet Union, its satellites, and every nation which trades with them. The Soviet Union can't feed its own people without free world help. It can't sustain its slave empire in Eastern Europe without regular transfusions of American capital. If America and its allies cut off all aid and trade with the communist countries, the Soviet Union can't keep its economy going. It can't meet its commitments to the satellites. It won't have the rescurces to supply the weapons which are killing Americans in Vietnam."

Why fight'em in Vietnam, and help'em or pamper'em everywhere else?