

October 13, 1960

To the Editor of the Herald Tribune:

Sen. Kennedy's stand on Quemoy and Matsu opens the way to a perilous road of appeasement for the free world. His arguments concerning the indefensibility of Quemoy and Matsu can be applied to any number of points in the freeworld that touch the Communist dominion: Hong Kong, Berlin, Macao, Laos, Tibet, and a host of other such places which tomorrow might include Key West. If we are prepared to give up every part of the free world not separated from the Communists by 100 miles of water, then we shall eventually wind up in exactly the position of isolation the Communists want us in.

Also, as is very well known, this East-West struggle is as much a psychological war as a military one. To abandon any part of the free world for any theoretical reason would register in the minds of everyone, and particularly those who count on us for defense, as an abject surrender to the Communists. It seems to me that the bright Senator from Massachusetts who prides himself on his knowledge of history, has completely forgotten Munich and what piecemeal appeasement brought the world.

If the free world is to win it can only do so by thinking in terms of an offensive strategy and not a defensive one. Sen. Kennedy's defensive strategy forgets the most vital and crucial point of all, that the ultimate goal of world Communism is world victory, and that no defensive line will ever be respected by them, whether it be one mile from the Chinese mainland or one thousand.

Samuel L. Blumenfeld

111 East 26th Street  
New York 10, N. Y.

November 19, 1960

To the Editor of the Herald Tribune:

Your editorial of November 18 supporting De Gaulle's efforts to obtain a new mandate on his Algerian policy overlooks several important facts. First, De Gaulle has already received a mandate to solve the Algerian problem along the lines of Integration. The two referendums in 1958 gave the General overwhelming support on this policy. Second, it is unjust and inaccurate to imply that the sole opposition in Algeria to an independent Algeria comes from those of European origin. There are at least as many Moslems who share the views of their European compatriots. In fact, the Front for French Algeria, is led by Said Boualam, a noted Moslem leader, and is widely supported by the Moslem population.

Another important point which must be recognized is that De Gaulle's policy, even if supported by a new mandate, will not lead to peace. The goal of the FLN is total victory and complete domination of Algeria. To attain this goal the FLN will just as well fight an independent Algeria as it has French Algeria. So, it is absolute folly to believe that De Gaulle's policy is wiser, saner or more moderate than what the Integrationists have offered.

Lastly, one must ask why De Gaulle has steadfastly refused to even try implementing the Integrationist solution. The only possible answer is that De Gaulle is too racist in his thinking to accept 8,000,000 Moslems as Frenchmen. He has said as much in a famous speech denying that French Algerian Moslems could be considered in the same category as Frenchmen from Brittany or Normandy. It is apparent therefore that De Gaulle's policy, far from having peace as its goal, has as its real goal the racial purity of the French nation.

Fortunately the French as a people have never been racist in their thinking and that is why in 1958 the vast majority of them were ready and willing to accept Integration. The more liberal, generous and fraternal solution has always been Integration, and it is to the credit of the French, who are 95% white and Catholic, that they have been willing to dilute this majority by one-fifth and radically alter the racial composition of their nation. Why this important and rather revolutionary aspect of the Integrationist position has been completely ignored by Western liberals is hard to understand.

Samuel L. Blumenfeld  
Secretary  
American Committee for France & Algeria