

August 4, 1963

The Mayor
The City of Atlanta
Atlanta, Georgia

Dear Mr. Mayor:

A right government, or a Democracy, has the power to rightly influence its people and to lift all to greater progress and freedom. But what kind of a Democracy is our nation?

When President Kennedy rebuked Castro and the Russians for their kind of governments, he was absolutely right. But! Do not the Catholics vote entirely for the Catholic candidates? And are they not influenced to believe that because a candidate is a Catholic, he already has the right

qualifications for the job?
Also, since John F. Kennedy
has become the President,
the Catholics have been
giving their votes ^{also} to all the
Democratic candidates -
to support their Catholic
President and to boost their
church.

In order to counteract
the greatest wrong, we
must possess and practice
the highest right. But are
not the Catholics doing
the same as the Communists?
Then how can we fight
wrong with wrong?

Sometime ago I heard
a Priest tell his radio
audience that "authentic
Christianity is Catholicism";
that church and govern-
ment must unite and
that Catholics should strive

2
to occupy as many seats
as possible in government
places.

(According to my
observations Catholicism
has not the slightest
resemblance to Christianity.
In the window of one
of the largest Catholic
shops there is a sign,
which reads: "Holy
pictures and holy statues
are just as pure and
holy as the living God."
What blasphemy! This
religion is an offense
against God.)

When the Speaker of
the House passed away,
President Kennedy helped
to put a Catholic in his
place. When the Chief of
the Central Intelligence
Agency retired, the

President appointed a Catholic in his place. When the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare resigned, Mr. Kennedy appointed another Catholic - to take his place and when the Under-Secretary of Labor replaced Secretary Goldberg, President Kennedy appointed still another Catholic - to replace the Under-Secretary.

Again I ask, what kind of a Democracy is our nation?

I have also heard a Priest tell that about half of the people of South America were Catholic and that their condition was so terrible they were breeding Communism. And he ended up by saying that the

3

Catholic people will just have to open up and support those people financially.

A few months after that speech, President Kennedy appropriated twenty billion dollars for the people of Latin America. We have now relieved the Catholics of their rightful responsibility and are helping to raise bigger, better and more Catholics. That religion is striving to produce a lot of Catholics and dominate the world. Then must we support them?

Right has the power to overtake and supersede wrong. But judging from what has been happening to our world, how correct is our concept of every "right"?

we have been clinging
to and upon which we
have been pouring out
our precious energy?
When we give our ap-
proval and support to
that which we have
been wrongly led to
believe is right, we
give it power to instill
us, to blind and to weaken
us, and to put us to sleep.

When President Kennedy
and Attorney General Kennedy
resorted to the use of
military force, in the Mis-
sissippi crisis, they pointed
to the fact that they possessed
neither the wisdom nor
the power to cope with
the situation. Is it enough
for a President and for an
Attorney General just to
be able to avoid themselves

4

of the law and power which their positions afford them? Should we not rather expect them to bring wisdom and power to their positions? Top Leaders should be able to understand, not only the right but also the nature and method of the wrong and Law to deal with it. All our American people deserve the same consideration.

The way the Kennedys handled that crisis was a major crime. They have shown that they lack, not only wisdom and power, which is a must in leadership, but also heart. They can have the credit for Meredith's "victory," but they are also responsible for the slain, the maimed, the more wounded and the

ugly mess. We can be
sure that they did not
increase our prestige
in the eyes of the world.

Now that Mr. Kennedy
is trying to set himself
up as a peacemaker, I
have a few things to say
about that, too.

Soon after the Presidency
was delivered into the in-
competent hands of John
F. Kennedy, the cold war
began to take on great heat.
The impetuous and trigger-
happy President did not wait
too long to inform the na-
tion and Russia of his inten-
tions to fight for Berlin and
for the unification of Germany.
He said: "We will do what
we want." But what he really
meant was: "I will do what
I want." And he substantiated

his promise by sending
thousands of troops to Berlin.
Secretary of State Dean
Rusk, in his dealings with
the Russians, was also
very wrong and his
approach most dangerous.
Needless to say, they greatly
aggravated the entire
situation.

I have long recognized
the fact that Communists
are not quite civilized
and that they need special
handling, and I was
aroused to awaken and
enlighten our government
leaders. After I acquainted
them with my views on
the collapse of the 1960
summit and explained
the German situation,
Mr. Rusk began to take
on patience and friendli-

ness and to gain the confidence of the Russians; and Mr. Kennedy withdrew the troops and wrangled a meeting with Nikita Khrushchev. In short, they all stopped behaving like a bunch of frightened cats ready for a spring at each others' throats!

In regard to the unification of Germany, the President told Mr. Adenauer that the Germans will have to handle that problem themselves.

Our Government has shown us that a wrong government has neither the might nor the understanding to stand up against the trials that befall a nation. Sincerely
Enclosure (Miss) Ethel Acklachs

On the Collapse of the Summit
June, 1960

The reason for the collapse of the Paris meeting is so clear to me, I cannot understand why others do not see it. Mr. Khrushchev turned against the Summit conference when President Eisenhower announced that he asked Vice President Nixon to stand by and be ready to take his seat at the conference table. The President had expected to leave Paris and return to Washington to attend to "important" business.

The purpose of the summit was to discuss ways and means of safety and security for the benefit of

the entire world. Was not this important enough? This was to have been the very first summit during the Eisenhower Administration and was to have lasted only ten days. Since the summit was meant strictly for the specified Leaders who are at the highest point of leadership, then, without the presence of President Eisenhower and with Mr. Wilson in his place, that would not have been a summit.

For a long time the Russians were ready and most anxious to meet with the top Leaders of the Great Nations not only for the sake of discussing important

problems but even more
for the sake of prestige.
The fact that there was
absolutely no progress
made at the Geneva
Conference should have
been enough reason
for our President to take
matters into his own
hands. The other leaders
were willing to meet
but our President was
against it. However,
finally he, too, agreed,
and all the arrange-
ments were made (I
pointed the way, which
also led to the place we
experienced after the
Camp David talks).

Then came the news
about the new plan. Since
Mr. Eisenhower announced
his decision to the people,

That shows that that
was not a mere tentative
plan but a carefully
planned idea. Even if
Mr. Nixon did not have
anything to do with the
planning of that idea,
he should have had
enough insight to
reject it. The President's
decision indicated, ac-
cording to the Russians'
way of thinking about
us, that he did not con-
sider the Summit or Mr.
Khrushchev of too great
importance. Our President
and Vice President for-
got about their dignified
positions and became a
pair of "brilliant" politicians.

If Mr. Khrushchev ^{had} suddenly
came up with an excuse
to leave the Paris meeting

3

and with an idea to send Gromyko or someone else to take his place, how would that have sounded to us? The fact that the Russian Leader had gained confidence in our President and was preparing, no doubt, one of the grandest celebrations in the history of Communism in his honor, only made matters worse.

Khrushchev thundered that Eisenhower has no will-power and that he lets Herter (Geneva Conference) and Nixon (Paris Conference) run this country. When he praised Mr. Franklin D. Roosevelt, he was referring, no doubt, to the late President's willingness and readiness

& attend Summit, or Big
Game, meetings.

It will take great
patience and infinite
wisdom to reach the
Communists and gain
their confidence. The
Soviet Leaders have
mesmerized their people
and have made slaves
and puppets out of them.
But let us not forget
that these leaders and
deceivers, are also in
darkness, and in a
state of self-deception
and self-mesmerism.
They actually believe
that they have the answer
to peace and plenty
and the key to paradise.
I am not sympathizing
with the wrong, nor am
I interested in catering to

4

the Communists, but I do recognize the vital need for the light of an understanding friendship — & penetrate the dense darkness that has enveloped the lives of so many human beings.

My aim is not to boost the Communists, but to conquer them; and in order to conquer them, we have to come face-to-face with them. But the doors to friendship and to a better understanding between our two nations was open, yet our President could not see it. He was looking through the eyes of politics and was more interested in promoting the career of Vice President

Nixon. The trip to Russia, -
the parades, the ovations,
the glory - to this he was
willing to attend himself.
(He had no time for the sum-
mit, yet had planned to
visit Japan). The Eisenhower
personality was stretched
so far, it cast a shadow
over our nation.

But I know that our
prayers and efforts for
peace and for a better
understanding between
our two nations, especially
at the time of the Russians'
first visit in this country,
were not in vain.

Khrushchev's attacks were
mainly on Eisenhower
and Nixon and not on
the American people.
In one of his attacks, he
referred to us as "such a

great country."

And now a few words about Mr. Nixon. Because of an open argument with Nikita Khrushchev, he suddenly became a great hero. The Vice President was representing a great and powerful nation, then what was so brave about his talking back to Khrushchev? If he did express courage and loyalty in behalf of his country, this is expected of him. Besides, the United States Government was behind him; about sixty brave, topnotch reporters and officials were beside him; and Mrs. Nixon, too, was close enough to add her support. An argument is not always a sign of

strength, since strength
is wisdom and justice
and demands respect.

A man's importance
lies not in his title but
in the good that he does
for mankind. There is
no room for selfishness
in leadership.

* A statesman is a
man who has high ideals
and high ideas and has
the ability and power to
carry them out. A
politician is one who can
make others think that he
has the qualities of a statesman.

A statesman is interested
in promoting and progress-
ing his country and people.
A politician is more interested
in promoting himself and
in showing off what he can
accomplish. Ethel Schlacht



The Mayor
The City of Atlanta
The City Hall
Atlanta, Georgia

Miss Ethel Schlacht
47 Buckley Avenue
San Mateo, Calif.