

THE REAL BOTTOM LINE: A HISTORY OF BUSINESS EXECUTIVES MOVE FOR VIETNAM PEACE

Douglas Karsner
Department of History
Bloomsburg University
dkarsner@bloomu.edu

In 1967, a group of American business leaders established Business Executives Move for Vietnam Peace (BEM) to pressure the US government to stop the bombing, de-escalate the fighting, and negotiate an end to the Vietnam War. Why would business leaders risk taking a public stand on an increasingly controversial political issue? This article will examine the reasons that BEM did so as well as analyze their changing tactics and goals. It will also analyze which business executives joined BEM, and consider their impact on the business community, the Vietnam War, and American society more generally.

In the two decades following World War II, a Cold War consensus developed in the United States. Most Americans believed it vital for the US to contain the spread of Communism. This belief seemed to be deep-rooted, yet President Lyndon Johnson's escalation of the Vietnam War would undermine the consensus. Furthermore, some were convinced it would undermine the economic prosperity the nation had enjoyed since the end of World War Two. It was in this atmosphere that Baltimore businessman Henry E. Niles contacted fellow business leaders asking them to sign a letter to the President urging him to end US involvement in the Vietnam War. This action would lead to the birth of Business Executives Move for Vietnam Peace, known as BEM during this period.

This study will present the efforts of BEM to influence US policy toward Vietnam. It will examine the motives of those who joined the organization,

and what type of business executive it attracted. It will chronicle the organization's strategy, tactics, and initiatives, and how these evolved over time. It will consider the external and internal issues with which the organization had to deal. Finally, it will place BEM in the larger antiwar movement, and explain what the organization revealed about the movement, the business community, and American society in general during this period.

Surprisingly, BEM has not attracted much scholarly interest.¹ For business historians, this is probably due to several reasons, including the challenge of how best to frame their activities. One possible approach is to place the group within the study of the corporate social responsibility movement. In Bert Spector's (2008) analysis of this movement, he argued that early in the Cold War many businessmen sought to defend capitalism and free markets against perceived communist threats. Thus, they had to take a more active role in defending the "good society" and not just focus on the bottom line. Another useful approach is to situate BEM in the historiography of American business and US foreign policy. Scholars who work in this area are concerned with issues such as the degree of influence that business executives have had on the nature of American foreign relations, and whether corporate leaders were more "hawkish" or "dovish" than their political or military counterparts.² This account wedges these two approaches. It contends that by the late 1960s, BEM activists redefined what it meant to defend American democratic capitalism. Rather than seeing the Vietnam War as supporting this goal, they perceived it as undermining this objective. Thus, to preserve capitalism and free markets, BEM argued that the US had to negotiate an end to the war in Vietnam. Otherwise, the American economy would weaken, to the advantage of the Communists. Moreover, BEM asserted that continuing the war would undermine fundamental American principles, such as freedom of speech and the balance of power among the branches of the federal government.

Henry Niles and the Origins of BEM

United States involvement in the conflict that became the Vietnam War began in the 1950s under President Truman. The turning point came in August 1964 with the Tonkin Gulf Incident, leading to the Tonkin Gulf Resolution in which Congress authorized President Johnson to utilize military force in response to perceived Communist aggression. In 1965 Johnson began

Business Executives for Vietnam Peace

the bombing campaign of North Vietnam and sent more than 180,000 troops to Vietnam. The following year troop levels reached 385,000. While most Americans supported the war effort at this juncture, opposition began to grow.

In the summer of 1966, author-lecturer Mary Cushing Niles, the wife of businessman Henry Niles, remarked to her husband that when she was speaking with Senator Joseph Tydings (D-MD) about why he should oppose the Vietnam War, the senator noted that he had heard from various groups who opposed the war such as clergymen and housewives, but not anyone from the business community. This conversation led Henry Niles to draft a letter to the president recommending a negotiated settlement to the war. Hoping to make a larger impression, Niles contacted other business executives, asking them to sign on.³

The sixty-six year old Niles was the board chairman of the Baltimore Life Insurance Company, a mutual firm with more than half a million policies. He joined the company in 1940 and reached the presidency seventeen years later. Simultaneously, he served his country in a variety of roles, including the Office of Price Administration during World War II, as a Marshall Plan consultant in Germany in 1951, and as a deputy director of the Point-4 program in India the following year. He and his wife joined the Society of Friends after World War II. Becoming Quakers undoubtedly informed their deep concern for issues of war and peace. As a result, Henry Niles became increasingly active in politics and social issues. He joined the Americans for Democratic Action.⁴ He also supported the local African American community by serving on the Board of Trustees at Morgan State College, helping lead the Baltimore Urban League, and making the Baltimore Life Insurance Company an early equal opportunity employer.⁵

Nile's initial effort would reveal crucial issues that were to confront BEM throughout the Vietnam War. Most notably, some would wonder: was it appropriate for a business executive to take a public stand on a political issue—especially an increasingly controversial issue like the Vietnam War? If so, should they do so strictly as private citizens, or identify themselves with their firms? Of the executives Niles contacted in 1966, eighty-three agreed to endorse his letter to President Johnson. A number of others, however, refused. Speaking on behalf of the president of Keebler Company of Elmhurst, Illinois, Fred Baker, Public Relations Director, noted that “on issues which directly affect our employees and shareholders, he is reluctant to identify himself on

the issues...like this one [where] there obviously would be differences of opinion.” Others argued that the war was too complicated or that they did not have enough information to make an informed decision. Some took strong exception to Niles’s approach. Robert Dineen, President of Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Company in Milwaukee, contended that the “more noise we make” against the war the “more ammunition we give to those in Hanoi who are looking for an excuse to continue the struggle.” Niles responded diplomatically. He wrote to Dineen and several others who expressed strong objections, “I am most thankful that I live in a free country where we can express our opinions openly without fear of the secret police.”⁶ Clearly, he wanted to be seen as a patriotic American, not a Communist sympathizer.

Niles’s letter to President Johnson urged the president to “stop the bombing, de-escalate military activity in South Vietnam, negotiate with all parties which are now fighting.” It argued that the “war is against our national interest and world interest.” It subsequently appeared in full page advertisements in the *Washington Post* and *New York Times*, and attracted much press coverage. A February *New York Times* article pointed out that most of the business executives who signed the letter had “served in the armed forces”—a particularly important observation to make at a time when opposition to the war led to charges of being unpatriotic.⁷

A May *Washington Post* article entitled “Vietnam War Hurts Business, LBJ Is Told,” interviewed five executives who had just visited the White House and met with National Security Council staff member Donald Ropa. In the piece, Niles argued that the Vietnam War could escalate to the point where “we face the prospect of losing all our assets and all our customers” in a nuclear war. Erwin Salk, president of Salk, Ward & Salk, a major Chicago mortgage banking firm, contended that the Vietnam War could become a situation for the US like the Edsel episode for the Ford Motor Company. Salk’s Edsel simile generated significant press coverage. BEM repeatedly used this analogy to make the argument that businessmen were practical and flexible: if a policy was not working, then they must change it. Their bottom line demanded it. Thus, applying business principles to the war, the Johnson administration should realize that its policy was not working so they should change it.⁸

Business Executives for Vietnam Peace

In the wake of this, Business Executives Move for Vietnam Peace (BEM) was formally established in August 1967. On September 27, it held its first national meeting at the Statler Hilton Hotel in Washington, DC. The speakers list was comprised of several influential individuals including Republican Senator Thurston Morton of Kentucky, retired US Navy Rear Admiral Arnold True, former South Vietnamese Ambassador to the US Tran Van Dinh, and former Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board Marriner Eccles. The next day the *New York Times* carried front-page coverage of the event as Senator Morton—once a supporter of the administration’s policy—came out forcefully against the war. In his speech to 300 business executives he claimed that President Johnson “had been ‘brainwashed by the military industrial complex’ that the United States would win a military victory in Vietnam.” De-escalation—not escalation—should be America’s policy.⁹

Harold Willens, president of the Factory Equipment Supply Company of Los Angeles, which manufactured textile machinery, co-chaired the new organization with Niles. In an extensive interview carried in the *Chicago Sun-Times* on October 15, 1967, the fifty-two year old Willens explained that BEM was growing much faster than expected. He attributed this to a sentiment he termed “enlightened capitalism.” The enlightened capitalists were those who realized that the Vietnam War affected their personal as well as their company’s welfare. These people understood that to preserve democracy, to ensure social order, and to continue to operate a profitable business a resolution of the Vietnam dilemma must be imminent. BEM’s role was important because, he asserted, it offset the perception that protesters were “from easily disparaged types—hippies, academicians, theologians.” Willens contended that most people regarded business executives as “practical, responsible, and certainly patriotic. They can’t be much more dedicated to capitalism.” Moreover, Willens asserted, “it is a legitimate, responsible protest image we project.” BEM’s efforts to stop the mistaken war constituted “the highest form of patriotism and loyalty.”¹⁰ Willens’ political activism—especially his friendship with Senate Foreign Relations Committee chairman J. William Fulbright, who had become an opponent of the war—undoubtedly influenced his argument. Willens also most likely stressed these points because he was aware that the media’s tendency to focus on the more extreme elements in the antiwar demonstrations had led many Americans to believe that all protesters were unkempt, irrational, radical, leftists.¹¹ (The

Chicago Sun-Times carried a number of articles on and political advertisements by BEM. For an example of a provocative ad by the Chicago BEM chapter see figure 1.)

“We Have Killed, Wounded or Burned More than One Million Children . . .”

“The Administration believes that the war in Vietnam is being made solely by communist interventions from without. This does not explain the tenacity of the Viet Cong . . .

“How can we reconcile what we are doing to the South Vietnamese under the guise of saving them from communism? We have destroyed vast areas of their country. We have killed, wounded or burned more than one million children, as well as countless parents, brothers, husbands and sons. The family has been smashed . . .

“The real tragedy [here at home] is not financial, it is the useless suffering of the millions of our people whose sons, husbands and brothers are drawn into this useless conflict unwillingly and are killed and maimed for life . . .

“The horrible Vietnam debacle, tragic as it is, may yet be a blessing in disguise if it forces us to recognize our staggering failures at home. Run-away crime, delinquency, the riots in our cities, loss of respect for law and order, and the rebellion of frustrated youth—all spring in part from this . . .

“It is tragic that the most powerful country in the world, with 6% of its population and producing 40% of its wealth, should have lost the respect of most of the world. The world, with few exceptions, would like us to leave Vietnam . . .

“History does not show that a nation that liquidates a bad venture suffers from loss of prestige . . . France moved out voluntarily from Algeria and Indo-China. Today she has more prestige than ever before. Russia pulled her missiles out of Cuba; her prestige has not suffered . . . It is possibly not easy for a proud nation to admit it has blundered, but throughout history great men and nations have gained stature by so doing . . .”

The Hon. Marriner S. Eccles, Chairman of the Board,
First Security Corporation, and former Chairman,
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System

From Mr. Eccles address to the national meeting of . . .

BUSINESS EXECUTIVES MOVE FOR VIETNAM PEACE

CHICAGO COMMITTEE

(Partial List)

James Alter, Exec. V. Pres.
Harry Alter Company
Len Bishop, Owner
Bishop Produce Company
William Blau, Pres.
Blau/Bishop & Associates
Julius Braun, Pres.
W. Braun Company
Marvin Chandler, Chairman
Northern Illinois Gas Company
Milton Colman, V. Pres.
Rollin S. Crow, Inc.
Howard Conant, Pres.
Interstate Steel Company
Ted Cox, Pres.
Ted Cox & Associates

Donald R. Dann, Sec.
Dann Brothers, Inc.
David Diamond, Pres.
Sam Diamond Knitting Mills, Inc.
Earl B. Dickerson, Pres.
Supreme Life Insurance Company of America
S. C. Engle, V. Pres.
John J. Grier Company
Charles W. Farnham & John M. Tittle, Partners
Stein, Roe & Farnham
Frank Friedl, Pres.
Triangle Theatre Productions
Joseph S. Grant, Pres.
J. S. Grant Mortgage Co.

Sam U. Greenberg, Ch. of Bd.
DeSoto, Inc.
I. A. Grodzins, Pres.
Commodity Warehousing Corporation
George Kaufman, Pres.
Premier Graining Co., Inc.
Ray Kielman, Exec. V. Pres.
Elliott Painter & Varnish Company
Robert B. Lifton, V. Pres.
American Printers & Lithographers, Inc.
J. Roderick MacArthur, Pres.
Marquette Life Insurance Company
Mervin Mandel, Pres.
Chicago Metals Corp.

Seymour S. Neams, Pres.
Specialty Coatings Company
Donald C. Nygren, Pres.
Nygren-Dahly Co.
Harold S. Patinkin, Dir. of Purchasing
U.S. Reductions Company
Robert Pollak, Partner
H. Hientz & Company
Earl Rappaport and Eugene Rappaport, Owners
The Rappaport Agency
Jerome D. Ripp, Exec. V. Pres.
Arthur E. Wolk Advertising
Arnold Rodin, Exec. V. Pres.
Imberman & DeForest

William F. Rupp, Asst. V. Pres.
Allstate Insurance Company
Alan Saks, V. Pres.
Saxon Paint Supermarkets, Inc.
Erwin A. Salk, Pres.
Salk, Ward & Salk, Inc.
Jack E. Schwartz, Director of Sales
Premier Graining Co., Inc.
Gordon Sherman, Pres.
Midas, Inc.
Saul Sherman, Pres.
Allied Products Corp.
Sethon L. Tallman, Owner
Tallman Agency
Seymour Waldman, Pres.
Rolled Steel Corp.

Additional given for identification only; corporate sponsorship is not implied.

If you are a present or retired top-management executive or owner of a business primarily engaged in manufacture, sales or service for a profit, and would like information to decide whether you want to join Business Executives Move for Vietnam Peace, write or call any one of the Chicago area executives listed above before January 10—

BEM

Send Before January 10, 1968 N

To: Business Executives Move for Vietnam Peace, Chicago Committee
Box 5164, Chicago, Illinois 60690

Gentlemen:
Please send me information on your Chicago Committee and national organization.

Name Title

(for identification only) Company

Figure 1

Full Page Advertisement in *Chicago Sun Times*, December 27, 1967,
Business Executives Move Records, Swarthmore Peace Collection

“We do not say that all wars are wrong. We say this war is wrong.”

The following year saw dramatic developments in the war in Vietnam, growing economic problems for the US, and widespread domestic political turmoil. At the beginning of 1968, more than 500,000 US troops were in Vietnam. BEM saw this escalation as counterproductive, so its members accelerated their letter writing campaign to the president and congress. Some letters were quite emotional, such as Edward Green’s January 19 note to Senator Hugh Scott (R-PA) in which he referred to a business friend’s son becoming “a double amputee in the horrible, unjustifiable, unethical, expensive, evil conflict in Vietnam.” His dramatic language may have undermined his plea to the senator to reconsider his support for the war. It was not what one would expect to hear from a businessman. The tone of Greene’s letter reveals how profoundly the war was affecting Americans. In general, business leaders emphasized pragmatic economic issues. For example, in a January 16 letter to Johnson, Harold King, President of David Pike Associates-Wantaugh, Inc, declared that the war “is the major cause of our economic difficulties.” King also expressed opposition to a proposed 10% surtax that was, he argued, “really a WAR TAX.”¹²

Such sentiments were only magnified when, later in January, the North Vietnamese and National Liberation Front launched the Tet Offensive against US and South Vietnamese forces. Though a military defeat for the NVA and NLF, Tet was a political and psychological victory for the Communists that profoundly shocked many Americans. It led President Johnson to decide not to run for re-election and begin negotiations with North Vietnam.¹³

In May, BEM held its second national conference at The Shoreham Hotel in Washington, DC. BEM initiated a major promotional effort, sending press releases to numerous media outlets. This reflected a change in BEM’s tactics, from trying to meet the president to attempting to directly influence public opinion. The morning session of the “Conference on Economic and Social Consequences of the War and Our National Goals” began with Congressman Henry Reuss (D-WI) speaking on “The Economic Consequences of the War.” He emphasized that the underlying reasons for the US balance of payments deficit was “our swollen military expenditures overseas.” Frederick Heldring, Senior Vice President of the Philadelphia National Bank, then addressed the “International Financial Consequences of the War.” Heldring explained that the Vietnam War was inflicting tremendous damage on the dollar “and the

whole international financial system that is so largely based on the dollar.” In the afternoon “Panel on Social Consequences and Goals,” five individuals from different backgrounds discussed issues such as the war’s effect on jobs, housing, social instability, and the suppression of dissent. Official statements emanating from the conference indicated a broadening of BEM’s goals. In addition to articulating the war’s negative economic impact, they argued that Americans should reject the increasing militarization of their own society that threatened the country’s fundamental principles. Moreover, the US should resign its “self assumed role of world policeman.” The conference attracted considerable media attention. In July, BEM sought to pursue another avenue of action. In a letter addressed to the mayors of large urban centers, Henry Niles asserted that many of the problems facing business executives and city officials came “from the same cause—our nation’s spending for the war in Vietnam.” Thus, they should work together to end American participation.¹⁴

BEM’s membership grew significantly during this turbulent year. They introduced four retired army generals and one admiral as members of their new “Military Advisory Group.” All five men—Brig. Gen. Samuel Griffith, Brig. Gen. Wallace Ford, Brig. Gen. Robert Hughes, Gen. David Shoup, and Rear Admiral Arnold True—had combat experience. This decision reflected concern that BEM’s criticisms of administration policy might not be taken seriously since businesspeople were not experienced military leaders.¹⁵ Moreover, in the increasingly polarized debate over the war in the US, former high-ranking military officers who had served their country with distinction would help protect the group from charges of being un-American.

By mid-year, about 2,500 executives had joined BEM. They came primarily from mid-size firms; approximately 60 percent were Democrats and 40 percent Republicans. Many members had served in the military; few were pacifists. BEM wanted to attract more executives from big business, but this was a major challenge. Robert Wright of the *New York Times* analyzed this predicament in a revealing interview with members of the New York BEM chapter. They explained that many large corporations had defense contracts that inhibited managers from joining the group. Equally as important, they argued that the “organization man” populated large firms, and he “is the most conservative man in American society. He’s got a good position in the establishment and he hesitates to do anything to rock the boat and endanger his position.” Thus, BEM aimed to recruit retired executives from large

Business Executives for Vietnam Peace

corporations who were not so inhibited. One prominent example was Theodore Yntema, retired chief financial officer of the Ford Motor Company. Before the year ended, BEM added several “Diplomatic Sponsors” to the organization, including Edwin Reischauer, former US ambassador to Japan, John Kenneth Galbraith, former US ambassador to India, and Roger Hilsman, former assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs. As with the military sponsors, this was intended to strengthen BEM’s position on Vietnam by adding experienced diplomats knowledgeable about Asia.¹⁶

BEM was very conscious of its image and message. It repeatedly stressed that it was not a peace group. As co-chairman Niles noted, “We do not say that all wars are wrong. We say this war is wrong.” BEM also desired to disprove the widely held belief that “war is good for business.” This emphasis was in sharp contrast to many in the antiwar movement who asserted that American corporations were making large profits selling war material. One corporation antiwar protesters increasingly targeted was Dow Chemical Company, the manufacturer of napalm, for making an “immoral product...that is used indiscriminately against civilians in Vietnam.” Dow’s argument that napalm constituted only 5 percent of their total sales did not persuade protesters to stop denouncing the firm. Activists appeared at the May 1968 annual shareholders meeting, demanding that Dow abrogate their government war contracts and nominate Marriner Eccles, president of the Utah Mining & Construction Company and BEM associate, as a director. Dow director Carl Gerstacker rejected their motions as out of order; he then asked shareholders their opinion. The impromptu vote showed overwhelming support to continue producing napalm. Outside the meeting protesters and counterdemonstrators clashed. One supporter of the firm carried a sign that read, “I Back Dow. I Like My V.C. (Viet Cong) Well Done.”¹⁷

As in the broader antiwar movement, tensions arose within BEM between those who wanted to stress that the war was “utterly immoral” and those who preferred to emphasize the war’s negative economic consequences, such as rising interest rates, declining home starts, and lagging R&D. There were also disagreements over tactics. In a letter to Niles, journalist Tristram Coffin, author of the *Washington Watch* newsletter sent to BEM members, asserted that using public relations to promote BEM’s message was “largely a waste of time, effort, and money.” Instead, he recommended that BEM focus its efforts on clergy, union leaders, teachers, and members of Congress. He

saw BEM's most important mission as educating Americans at the local level. Despite these differences, BEM's members were unified in their belief that the US needed to disengage from the war as quickly as possible while protecting the troops. The group sought—in the words of *Business Week*—to give “gray-flannel respectability” to the antiwar position, a sharp contrast to how most middle class Americans perceived the “youthful draft-card burners.”¹⁸

Amongst the other events of 1968 was a presidential election. As a non-partisan group, BEM tried to influence both major political parties. They hired Edward Flynn as public relations consultant to coordinate their activities. Flynn quickly realized that in addition to the debates in the ranks over priorities and tactics, there would be another about whether or not the organization should endorse a particular candidate for president. He noted in a July 12, 1968, letter to Niles that many members wanted BEM to officially endorse Democratic Senator Eugene McCarthy. Flynn cautioned against this approach: “As business leaders we must look at politics objectively and provide wisdom and counsel from our” non-partisan viewpoint which, he asserted, would be more effective. He then prepared to take BEM's message to both party's national conventions. On July 31, at the Republican convention at Miami Beach, BEM co-chairman Henry Niles spoke to the Republican platform subcommittee on foreign policy and national security issues at the Fountainbleau Hotel, urging the party to adopt a peace plank. That same day, retired Marine Corps Brig. Gen. Samuel Griffith, one of BEM's Military Advisory Group members, also spoke before the same committee. He asserted that if a Republican candidate was elected in November they had a “unique opportunity and the clear and inescapable responsibility to regain for America her lost freedom of action in Asia and to redeem our eroding moral position in the world.” To provide historical context for the current dilemma, he quoted Sir George Trevelyan's study of the American Revolution to the committee: “Many wars have...been waged...in pursuit of illusory ends and have been carried on long after the course of events had made it manifest that those ends were impossible of attainment.” Griffith thus urged the Republicans to seize the opportunity to negotiate an end to the war. BEM sent letters to every Republican delegate explaining their position on the war.¹⁹

Business Executives for Vietnam Peace

BEM then turned its attention to the Democrats. Prior to their convention in Chicago, Flynn wrote a letter to Niles recommending that all the peace groups that were attending should meet to develop a unified front on Vietnam. Five days later, Niles wrote across the top of Flynn's letter, "July 17 agreed over phone to drop idea." Though no reason was given for dropping the proposal, this turned out to be a very wise decision, as the massive turmoil which began in Chicago on August 23 would likely have hurt BEM's carefully crafted image of a respectable anti-Vietnam War organization. During the August 26-29 convention, Henry Niles and J. Sinclair Armstrong, former chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission and executive vice-president of United States Trust Company, appeared before the platform committee urging the party to adopt a peace plank. BEM also "hosted a lavish reception and discussion on the Vietnam War." According to a BEM press release, "approximately 250 corporation presidents were involved in the unique lobby, which found businessmen wining and dining delegates for peace instead of business contracts."²⁰

Despite these efforts at both conventions, neither party adopted the BEM peace plank. With many right-wing Republicans disgruntled with President Johnson for not prosecuting the war more forcefully, it was extremely unlikely that BEM's argument would have been persuasive. As for the Democrats, repudiating the administration's position on the war would have been difficult enough without the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia that began on August 20, undermining efforts by "peace" Democrats and groups like BEM.²¹ In sum, circumstance did not favor them.

On the first Tuesday in November 1968, Richard Nixon won an extremely close election. BEM greeted the new president on his inauguration day with a bold ad in the *Washington Post*: "Mr. President: Start right—Stop the war NOW. You can do it!" They listed the negative effects of the war and provided a four-step disengagement plan. In April 1969, seven BEM representatives met with Dean Moor, a National Security Council staff member. The meeting did not go well. According to Chicago BEM chairman Gordon Sherman, President of Midas International Corporation of Chicago, Moor's noncommittal stance reflected the administration's plan to "buy four, five or six months worth of time" without making major changes to US policy. Forty-one year old Sherman, who had transformed his father's auto parts business into a major corporation by franchising muffler repair shops,

had evolved from a “Hawk” to a “Dove” in response to the Vietnam War and the fallout from the 1968 Democratic National Convention. Disappointed with the lack of progress, his chapter sent fifty members to Capitol Hill to lobby Congress. At the same time, some Chicago business executives even picketed the White House, carrying sandwich boards inscribed “Annual Report to the Stockholders of the United States” which listed the war’s monetary and human costs. The decision to picket was uncharacteristic of BEM. It reflected a more activist attitude on the part of the Chicago chapter and growing frustration that led to more dramatic tactics.²² (For another example of the Chicago chapter’s impassioned approach, see the ad in Figure 2.) It also mirrored a mounting tendency in the broader antiwar movement toward more striking acts, as neither previous efforts nor a change in administrations seemed to promise a change in policy.

The “Striped Ties for Peace” Contest Nixon’s War

The key event BEM participated in during 1969 was the October 15 Moratorium. This event reflected a significant shift in the anti-Vietnam War movement’s tactics. Rather than holding huge demonstrations in one major east and west coast city on the weekend, Moratorium leaders decided to hold demonstrations in hundreds of cities and towns around the country during the workweek. Unlike many of the previous major protests dominated by more radical elements, this time the moderates and liberals took center stage. BEM chapters from many cities participated, with some members marching, some holding silent vigils, some giving their employees time off, and a few even allowing meetings about the war to be held on company property. A number of firms, however, strongly opposed the Moratorium. In Atlanta, Dillard Munford, Jackson-Atlantic Co. president, commented, “we hope like hell we don’t have any of those kind working for us. If we do, and they demonstrate, they won’t work here on Thursday.” According to *Business Week*, most companies took a neutral stance, allowing individual employees to decide whether to participate or not. A few firms, like Cleveland’s TRW, Inc, even allowed workers to wear black armbands.²³

Vietnam.

When the U.S. entered the war,
George Proctor had 2 sons.

Steve was 8. He's now 16.

Larry was 11. He's now dead.

Do you have sons?

What are you doing to keep them alive?

BEM BUSINESS EXECUTIVES MOVE FOR VIETNAM PEACE
An organization of hundreds of Chicago businessmen and thousands
throughout the U.S. who are opposed to the deaths and futility of purpose
of the Vietnam War. We urge you to add your voice to ours. Write or call
BEM, 116 S. Michigan, Chicago 60603. (312) 332-3282.

Figure 2
BEM Chicago Chapter Advertisement, June 1969
Business Executives Move Records, Swarthmore Peace Collection

As the war dragged on into 1970, many people in the antiwar movement—including BEM—grew dispirited. But in Los Angeles, A. R. Appleby, President of National Girls Services, Inc, and BEM chapter chairman, decided to increase the pressure on major corporations that were profiting from the war by introducing a new tactic—what he called “a kind of economic boycott.” On March 6, he sent a letter to Louis Lundborg, Chairman of the Board of Bank of America, the largest bank in the US. Noting that he was a stockholder, Appleby asked Lundborg eleven questions regarding the company’s involvement in Vietnam. If he did not receive specific answers to his questions, he promised to appear at the Bank of America’s annual meeting to raise these issues. Five days later, Lundborg responded with a detailed four-page letter addressing Appleby’s queries. The chairman prefaced his comments with a general statement of the bank’s policy toward the war. He set forth two key points. First, “We do not feel that we are qualified, nor do we feel it would be proper for us to recommend a political course to extricate ourselves from the war.” This was not an unexpected reply. His second point, however, declared, “Because the war distorts the economy and contributes substantially toward inflation, this bank has consistently pointed out that an end to the war in Vietnam would be good, not bad, for American business.”²⁴ If this was intended to satisfy Appleby, it would prove inadequate.

On March 17, 1970, Appleby stood up at the stockholders meeting and challenged the Bank of America’s position on the Vietnam War. This led to quite a lively meeting as stockholders on occasion booed Appleby and other times applauded Lundborg. The most salient points included Lundborg’s refusal to close the bank’s five branches in South Vietnam and his rebuff of Appleby’s proposal that the company publicly support ending the war. Lundborg, however, stated that the firm would “consider donating its future profits from the Vietnam operations to the International Red Cross.” Two days after the annual meeting, Appleby addressed another letter to Lundborg thanking him on behalf of BEM for his “courtesy and cooperation” at the meeting and noting that, “we are fully aware of the difficulties presented by my appearance.” On March 23, Appleby sent a memo to all BEM members describing his new idea, urging them to praise Lundborg for his position that the war was bad for business and “encourage him to go the next step.” Moreover, he recommended that other members follow his new plan and

appear at company stockholders meetings to raise the Vietnam War issue. He concluded by noting his next target was IBM.²⁵

Appleby's "Corporate Responsibility Program" soon bore fruit. Lundborg appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and repeated the statement he made to BEM that the Vietnam War was bad for business. In the interim, Appleby appeared at stockholders meetings of IBM, Chase Manhattan Bank, General Motors, among other corporations. At the IBM meeting, Appleby asked that the firm "stop the sale of computers that are helping to destroy human life and property in Vietnam" and to refuse to support another such military conflict unless Congress voted to declare war. This triggered another animated board meeting. Chairman Thomas Watson, Jr.'s defense of IBM's Vietnam commerce drew applause from many of the stockholders. Later, however, Watson appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and offered his own personal statement against the war. Hobart Rowan, the *Washington Post's* economic and business columnist, suggested in his April 12 article that "if Big Business is really sophisticated" it will address the concerns of "its stockholder-protestors" because if they do not the extreme left will garner more power due to the changing climate of opinion in America.²⁶

The climate was also changing in Indochina. On April 29, 1970, US forces invaded neutral Cambodia—what President Nixon termed an "incursion"—to destroy alleged North Vietnamese supply depots. Nixon's decision to expand the war when most Americans thought the war was winding down rekindled the antiwar movement. On May 1, BEM Chairman Henry Niles sent a memo to all members asking them to write their senators urging them to cut off funds for the Cambodian campaign. An analysis of sixteen letters sent during the first two weeks of May revealed that all authors opposed the attack on Cambodia, seven argued that Nixon's decision was an abuse of presidential power, three noted they were life-long Republicans who nevertheless strongly disagreed with their party's president, while several equated Nixon's actions with Hitler or Stalin. Nine of the BEM members who wrote after the tragedy at Kent State on May 4 expressed their shock and horror at what several characterized as criminal acts committed by the Ohio National Guard, when suddenly, without an immediate threat to their safety, they fired at students killing four and wounding nine. While some of the students shot had been protesting against President Nixon's decision to invade

Cambodia, others were just walking across campus when the shooting began. Two businessmen even called for impeachment proceedings to be initiated.²⁷ Concerns over abuse of presidential power and demands for impeachment indicated a growing fear among some BEM associates that the “imperial presidency” was undermining the balance of power in the federal government.

The “striped ties for peace”—as *Newsweek* dubbed them—appeared before the Senate’s Joint Economic Committee in May to discuss the negative economic consequences of the Vietnam War, and defense spending in general. The interest in the latter issue reflected their revised name—Business Executives Move for Vietnam Peace and New National Priorities—still known as BEM. Prior to the November Congressional elections, BEM instituted Operation Housecleaning, trying to unseat the fifteen “worst” hawks that “have shown by their vote their support for war over peace, for war over jobs, for war over housing.” They helped defeat three. During this period the organization worked to expand and diversify their membership, adding a new category—Associates—that included non-business executives—as well as courting women. In a *Wall Street Journal* advertisement, they stated, “when we organized in 1967 we purposely described ourselves as ‘business executives’ rather than ‘businessmen’ because we believed opposition to the war wasn’t limited only to men.” They had at least some success in this regard. For example, between 1968 and 1972, the number of women in BEM’s Delaware Valley chapter increased from fourteen to twenty-two. Overall membership reached more than 3,500 by 1971—an increase of approximately 1,000 since 1968.²⁸

At the same time, Appleby’s Corporate Responsibility campaign continued to raise issues. In “When Businessmen Turn Radical,” *Wall Street Journal* Los Angeles bureau chief William Blundell asserted that Appleby’s actions angered many stockholders and enraged management while dividing BEM over his tactics. Blundell, however, placed Appleby in the broader context of a rising number of young businessmen who “grow restless with the hardening belief that they are part of a system that places too much premium on the bottom line, and not enough on the public good.” According to Blundell, business could not ignore this development because most of those challenging corporate policies were not from the “radical fringes.” However, he regarded Appleby as a unique case. While a successful businessman who had worked for Bank of America, Atlantic Richfield, and IBM before starting

Business Executives for Vietnam Peace

his own company, he alienated most in the corporate world with his confrontational approach. For example, when attending the Bulova Watch Company's annual meeting, he asked Chairman and former General Omar Bradley, "Do you think you bring any honor to your company by making millions of dollars producing weapons systems used to kill women and children?" Ultimately, Blundell concluded, resistance in the business community and BEM forced Appleby to curtail his campaign.²⁹

By the early 1970s, BEM became more directly involved in the political process. They established a national headquarters in Washington, D.C. and hired an executive director to lobby Congress. BEM expanded its official policy statement to include a demand for the return of all prisoners-of-war, most likely reflecting their recognition of the political reality of this sensitive issue and their humanitarian concern. Repeating their earlier Operation Housecleaning campaign, in 1972 they targeted the most politically vulnerable pro-war House hawks. Dubbed the "Deadly Dozen," BEM's efforts helped remove three—one Republican and two Democrats. The larger goal for BEM was to elect enough pro-peace representatives who would vote to stop funding the war. Their efforts bore fruit in the next session as Congress voted to halt US "military operations in and over Indochina."³⁰ In addition, BEM abandoned its non-partisan stance during the 1972 presidential campaign by endorsing Democratic Senator George McGovern.³¹ Undoubtedly, Nixon's ongoing prosecution of the war and McGovern's unqualified call to end it led BEM and other antiwar organizations to support the South Dakota Senator. BEM's hard work did not prevent Nixon from winning the election in a landslide.

As it turned out, the war would end with the signing of the Paris Peace Accords on January 27, 1973. With its original purpose fulfilled, BEM now grappled with the challenge of defining its future program.³² The rest of 1973 saw a significant reduction in its operations. In 1974, its members changed the organization's name to Business Executives Move for New National Priorities, and re-focused their efforts on reducing the militarization of American society. Four years later, Henry Niles, the indefatigable leader of BEM, moved to a Friends retirement community with his wife. BEM disbanded in 1982.³³

The Historical Significance of BEM

Between 1967 and 1973, Business Executives Move for Vietnam Peace played an important role in the antiwar movement. It stands as a notable example of the diverse and broad-based nature of the movement. The membership consciously positioned BEM as a respectable opposition using open lawful methods to affect change—in sharp contrast to several of the more radical antiwar groups. Furthermore, as it challenged popular perceptions about the antiwar movement, it challenged conventional wisdom about the relationship between business and US policy.³⁴ As the war dragged on, thousands of business executives began to see America's war in Vietnam as counterproductive to the economic well-being and moral standing of the country, and took an active role in trying to end the conflict. In so doing, they challenged the widely held belief among business people that they should not speak out publicly on divisive issues. In this context, while BEM can be classified as part of the moderate liberal opposition to the Vietnam War, its members were “radical.” Moreover, as established business executives, they had more to lose, and thus risked more by their opposition to the war than did many radicals in the larger movement. This risk had a telling effect on the membership; typically, BEM did not attract conventional “organization men,” but executives from small and mid-size firms who felt more at liberty to speak out. That said, there remained a prevailing desire amongst the membership to remain respectable. In some instances, there were those who wished to employ less “respectable” means, which caused divisions in the ranks. Yet ultimately, the members were unified in the belief that to preserve American democratic capitalism they must stop the war. The Vietnam War, they argued, was definitely not good for business.

As with the larger antiwar movement, it is difficult to quantify BEM's effect on US policy in Indochina. That said, it clearly made a significant contribution to the movement. One revelation would stand as a testament to BEM's effectiveness in the effort to pressure the Johnson and Nixon administrations to end to the conflict. In June, 1974, a *New York Times* article revealed that the Nixon White House had placed BEM, Henry Niles, and more than twenty other members on a “political enemies” list. This illegal monitoring of BEM strongly suggested that the administration was indeed worried about the organization's influence. Reflecting the change in the

Business Executives for Vietnam Peace

American mood since 1967, a number of people sent Niles congratulatory letters for making the list.³⁵

In 1996, a group of American business executives established Business Leaders for Sensible Priorities (BLSP) to pressure the government to substantially reduce defense expenditures. They asserted that since the Cold War had ended, the US no longer needed costly weapons systems designed to fight a conflict between nuclear superpowers. By 2002, the focus of the BLSP would shift to the Bush administration's impending war against Iraq. The BLSP argued against such a course of action because it would hurt the economy and actually foster more terrorism in the Middle East. After the war was launched, it ran newspaper advertisements opposing the war. Like their BEM predecessors, the BLSP members emphasized that they were not a peace group, and stressed their non-partisan character. To strengthen their arguments against the war and bloated defense budgets, they added military advisors to their ranks. These tactics clearly mirrored those introduced in the 1960s by BEM. The similarities did not end there. In a 2007 letter to an editor that bore an uncanny resemblance to BEM statements made in 1967, Warren Langley, chairman of BLSP, wrote that "in the business world, chief executives must know when their strategies aren't working and react, or they go out of business," so he encouraged President Bush to "develop a different business plan for Iraq."³⁶ In addition to similar thinking, the two organizations had explicit links. For example, Alan Kligerman, founder of SugarLo Company, Lactaid, Inc, and AkPharma Inc, was an early supporter of BEM who later played an active role in BLSP. In a *New York Times* article, he observed that it was "easier for him to speak his mind because his company is small and privately owned. Leaders of large, publicly traded companies, on the other hand, generally find it too risky to take a stand on the war—for or against it."³⁷ Kligerman's comments revealed that the members of the two organizations had a common pedigree. Perhaps more importantly, they had a common legacy. In both periods, business leaders confronted issues of war and peace and whether or not to risk their reputations by taking a public stance against what they considered to be an economically and morally bankrupt government policy. They believed that their opposition represented the best interests of both their businesses and nation—the real bottom line.

NOTES

¹ While the literature on the Vietnam antiwar movement is immense, this author could find no major studies of BEM. For significant works in this field that do briefly discuss BEM see Charles DeBenedetti and Charles Chatfield, 1990, and Melvin Small, 2002.

² On business and foreign policy see Joan Hoff Wilson, 1971; Bruce Russett and Elizabeth Hanson, 1975; Stephen Schlesinger and Stephen Kinzer, 1999; Douglas Karsner, 2007.

³ “Testimonial cites Henry E. Niles,” *Baltimore Afro-American*, October 19, 1968, p. 8; “Seeker of the Peace,” *Baltimore Magazine* (January 1965), Box 1, Folder “Niles, Henry E. ‘Seeker of the Peace’ reprint,” in the Business Executives Move Records (DG 116) Swarthmore College Peace Collection [hereafter cited as BEM]; “Henry E. Niles Chairman of BEM,” *Baltimore Magazine* (September 1971), Box 1, Folder “Niles, Henry E. Speech,” BEM.

⁴ The Americans for Democratic Action was a liberal organization that supported progressive social and economic policies. They also advocated an internationalist, interventionist foreign policy from the late 1940s until the Vietnam War undermined that consensus.

⁵ “Seeker of the Peace,” *Baltimore Magazine*, BEM; “Henry E. Niles Chairman of BEM,” *Baltimore Magazine*, BEM; Henry E. Niles to Congressman Charles O. Porter published in the *Congressional Record*, December 30, 1959, Box 1, Folder “Background material on Henry E. Niles,” BEM; Henry E. Niles to Honorable J. William Fulbright, May 4, 1965, Box 1, Folder “Niles, Henry E. Testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee regarding Senate Concurrent Resolution 32, May 11, 1965,” BEM; Statement of Henry E. Niles, Chairman, Baltimore Life Insurance Co, Baltimore, MD, *Hearings Before the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, Eighty-Ninth Congress, First Session on S. Con. Res. 32 For Planning for Peace*, May 11 and 12, 1965, pp. 26-27; Moss, “Testimonial,” *Afro-American*; Brochure, Americans for Democratic Action, “FDR/ADA 23rd Annual Roosevelt Day Dinner, March 9, 1970, New York City,” Box 1, Folder “Niles, Henry E. ADA New Leadership Award, March 1970.” In 1920, Niles earned an A.B. in Economics from Johns Hopkins University.

⁶ Fred Baker, Director, Industrial Public Relations, to Henry E. Niles, December 19, 1966, Box 41, Folder "Disagree," BEM; Barry Bingham, *Louisville Courier-Journal*, Louisville, Kentucky, to Henry E. Niles, December 9, 1966, Box 41, Folder "Negative Reactions to BEM, 1966-1969," BEM; John Nureen, Chairman, John Nureen Company, Chicago, to Henry E. Niles, October 17, 1966, Box 41, Folder "Negative Reactions to BEM, 1966-1969," BEM; Robert Dineen, President, Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Company, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, to Henry E. Niles, November 16, 1966, Box 41, Folder "Disagree," BEM.

⁷ "81 Business Executives Protest War to Johnson," *New York Times*, February 9, 1967, p. 26; "Stop the war, Mr. President," display ad *Washington Post*, February 8, 1967, p. A17; "Stop the War, Mr. President," display ad, *New York Times*, May 28, 1967, p. E5.

⁸ "Vietnam War Hurts Business, LBJ Is Told," *Washington Post*, May 27, 1967, p. B3; "Businessman Warns War May Be an 'Edsel'," *The Evening Star*, Washington, DC, May 26, 1967; "Vietnam and the Edsel," *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, September 28, 1967.

⁹ "Insurance Executive Forms Anti-War Business Group," *The Sun*, Baltimore, September 22, 1967; Business Executives Move For Vietnam Peace, Text of Remarks, First National Meeting, Statler Hilton Hotel, Washington, DC, September 27, 1967, Chicago Committee, Box 56, Folder "Business Executives Move, Chicago Chapter 1967," BEM; "Johnson 'Brainwashed' on War, Morton Charges," *New York Times*, September 28, 1967, p. 1.

¹⁰ "Johnson 'Brainwashed'," *New York Times*; "The Story Behind Businessmen's Viet Peace Drive," *Chicago Sun-Times*, October 15, 1967, pp. 10, 72.

¹¹ "J. William Fulbright," *Los Angeles Times*, February 22, 1995; "Harold Willens, 88; Political Activist Wrote California Nuclear Freeze Initiative," *Los Angeles Times*, March 20, 2003. On the impact of the media, see Small, 2002. For a more detailed study see Small, 1994.

¹² Edward J. Green to Senator Hugh Scott, January 19, 1968, Box 43, Folder "Letters to President Johnson from BEM Members, January 1968," BEM; Harold G. King, President, David Pike Associates—Wantaugh, Inc,

Wantaugh, NY, to President Johnson, January 16, 1968, Box 43, Folder "Letters to President Johnson from BEM Member, January 1968," BEM. [Caps in original.]

¹³ Tet has drawn much scholarly attention. For different interpretations see Robert Buzzanco, 1996; William Hammond, 1998; and Don Oberdorfer, 2001.

¹⁴ Business Executives Move for Vietnam Peace, Program Guide, "Conference on Economic and Social Consequences of the War and Our National Goals," May 22, 1968, Box 43, Folder "BEM National Conference May 22, 1968," BEM; "We Prepare for War Like Giants—For Peace Like Pygmies," Excerpts from Speeches and Discussions at the Conference on Economic and Social Consequences of the War and Our National Goals, Second National Meeting of Business Executives Move for Vietnam Peace, May 22, 1968, Box 43, Folder "BEM National Conference May 22, 1968," BEM; Report to Mr. Henry Niles from E. J. Flynn; Subject: May 22 conference advance activities, May 21, 1968, Box 43, Folder "BEM National Conference May 22, 1968," BEM; Draft Press Release Concerning Washington Conference on the Economic and Social Consequences of the War in Vietnam," May 22, 1968, Box 43, Folder "BEM National Conference May 22, 1968," BEM; "Entirely New Breed: Executives Do Something About Social Ills," *The Cincinnati Enquirer*, May 26, 1968; Erwin Salk, 1968, pp. 66-67; Honorable Benjamin Rosenthal of New York in the House of Representatives, "Business Executives for Peace," *Congressional Record*, May 27, 1968, E4696-E4697; Chairman Henry Niles, "A Letter to Mayors of Large Cities," July 15, 1969, Box 56, Folder "BEM Chicago Chapter 1969," BEM.

¹⁵ "Generals Ask Bombing End," *The Sun*, Baltimore, January 12, 1968; "Retired military men join group for Viet peace," *The Christian Science Monitor*, January 13, 1968, p. 3; "1,600 Executives Form Group For a National Antiwar Drive," *New York Times*, February 27, 1968, p. 9.

¹⁶ "Business Taking a Stand on Vietnam," *New York Times*, March 17, 1968, pp. F1, 9; "Executives Organize to Attack War," *Washington Post*, April 1, 1968, p. D9; "Executives step up war on war," *Business Week* (March 16, 1968); Harold Willens to Walter Hardy, Hardy Salt Co, St. Louis, January 23,

1968, Box 43, Folder "Letters to President Johnson from BEM Members January 1968," BEM; "Reischauer: Army Can't Defeat NLF; Joins Anti-War Execs, Along With Galbraith," *The Harvard Crimson*, December 6, 1968; "Mr. Niles Revisited," *Baltimore Magazine* (January 1969), p. 9.

¹⁷ "BEMVP--Voice of Businessmen Opposed to War in Vietnam," *Boston Sunday Globe*, January 14, 1968, p. B-49; "Why Does Dow Chemical Make Napalm?," *Wall Street Journal*, December 8, 1967, p. 18; "Dow Chemical Meeting Backs Production of Napalm; Antiwar Protestors Rebuffed," *Wall Street Journal*, May 9, 1968, p. 4.

¹⁸ "Business Men Signing Up As Vietnam Protesters," *Dayton Daily News*, March 21, 1968, p. 36; Tristram Coffin to "Harry," August 20, 1968, Box 43, Folder "BEM Executive Committee Summer 1968," BEM; Strout, "Retired military men," *Monitor*; "Executives step up," *Business Week*; "Executives Organize to Attack War," *Washington Post*, April 1, 1968, p. D9.

¹⁹ Edward Flynn to William Fischer, Fischer Machine Co, Philadelphia, July 8, 1968, Box 43, Folder "Flynn, Edward 1968," BEM; Edward Flynn to Henry Niles, July 12, 1968, Box 43, Folder "Flynn, Edward 1968," BEM; "Business, Ex-Military Chiefs Press for Peace," *The Miami News*, July 31, 1968, p. 6-A; Statement of Samuel B. Griffith, The II, Brigadier General, US Marine Corps (Ret) Before the Foreign Policy and National Security Committee of the Platform Committee, Republican National Convention, Miami Beach, Florida, July 31, 1968, Box 43, Folder "Military Views July 1968," BEM.

²⁰ Flynn to Niles, July 12, 1968, BEM; Edward Flynn, The Democratic Convention Program Activities, September 5, 1968, Box 43, Folder "Flynn, Edward 1968," BEM; Business Executives Move for Vietnam Peace, "For Press Release," August 25, 1968, Box 43, Folder "Flynn, Edward 1968," BEM.

²¹ "The War Issue Emerges," *Wall Street Journal*, November 4, 1966; "Proposed GOP Platform Is Moderate to Liberal; Cut in U.S. Role in War Urged," *Wall Street Journal*, August 5, 1968, 2; Andrew Johns, 2006, p. 586; "Czech Crisis Called a Blow to McCarthy, Democratic Doves in Efforts on Platform," *Wall Street Journal*, August 22, 1968, p. 4; "Humphrey Easily

Wins the Nomination on First Ballot With Aid of Traditional Big City and Dixie Leaders,” *Wall Street Journal*, August 29, 1968, p. 3.

²² “Mr. President: Start right—Stop the war NOW. You can do it!” display ad, *Washington Post*, January 20, 1969, p. A22; “Businessmen Ask Troops’ Return in 18 Months,” *Washington Post*, April 11, 1969, p. A9; “Chicago Businessman Lobby For End Of War,” *Chicago Daily Defender*, July 5, 1969, p. 27; Ed Small to All Members, Chicago BEM, Newsletter, July 9, 1969, Box 56, Folder “BEM Chicago Chapter 1969,” BEM; “Gordon Sherman, Exec and Activist,” *Chicago Tribune*, May 15, 1987; “Gordon Sherman of Midas Muffler,” *New York Times*, May 16, 1987.

²³ “What businessmen did on protest day,” *Business Week*, October 18, 1969. For a detailed analysis of the Moratorium, see Small, 2002, pp. 106-112.

²⁴ Ben Perkin, President, to the General Membership, October 5, 1970, Box 56, Folder “Chicago Chapter 1970,” BEM; A. R. Appleby, Chairman, Los Angeles Chapter BEM, to Louis Lundborg, Chairman of the Board, Bank of America, Los Angeles, March 6, 1970, Box 58, Folder “LA Chapter 1967-1972,” BEM; Louis Lundborg, Chairman of the Board, Bank of America, to A. R. Appleby, Chairman, Los Angeles Chapter, BEM, Los Angeles, March 11, 1970, Box 58, Folder “LA Chapter 1967-1972,” BEM.

²⁵ “Bank Chief Talks Back to Critics,” *San Francisco Chronicle*, March 18, 1970; “Protesters Disrupt BankAmerica Meeting, Fail in Bid to Get Vote on Vietnam Policy,” *Wall Street Journal*, March 18, 1970; A. R. Appleby to Louis Lundborg, March 19, 1970, Box 58, Folder “LA Chapter 1967-1972,” BEM; A. R. Appleby to Fellow BEM Members and Supporters, March 23, 1970; Box 58, Folder “LA Chapter 1967-1972,” BEM.

²⁶ Business Executives Move for Vietnam Peace, Southern California Chapter, “BEM Backgrounder—Los Angeles Chapter—1970,” Box 58, Folder “LA Chapter 1967-1972,” BEM; “Business Can’t Ignore Protests,” *Washington Post*, April 12, 1970, p. 11; “IBM Sees 1970 Earnings Growth Difficult To Maintain; Vietnam Stance Is Defended,” *Wall Street Journal*, April 28, 1970, p. 6; William Blundell, 1971, p. 14.

²⁷ Henry Niles to BEM Members and Supporters, May 1, 1970; Henry Eisner to Senator Mathias, May 8, 1970; Norman Beecher to Senator Brooks, May 6, 1970; Jack Alton, Law Offices of Caren, Lane, Huggard, Alton & Horst, to

President Nixon, May 8, 1970; Nolan Kerschner, President, Kerschner Construction Company to Senator Dodd, May 7, 1970; E. J. Haynes to Senator Jordan, May 1, 1970; Rose & Ralph Levin to Senator Scott, May 6, 1970; Rose & Ralph Levin to President Nixon, May 6, 1970; Irving Schactman, Carlisle Manufacturing Company to Senator Case, May 12, 1970; David Sauberman, Realtor, Rand Realty, to Senator Mansfield, May 5, 1970; Lt. Col. Franklin Littleton, Jr. to Editor, *The Sun* (and Senators Mathias, Tydings, and President Nixon), May 2, 1970; Carl Schmidt, Senior Vice President, Systems Analysis and Research Corporation, May 4, 1970; Frederick Kaufmann to President Nixon, May 5, 1970; Morton Zieve to Senator Griffin, May 11, 1970; Ernest Farmer, President, Shawnee Press, Inc, to Mr. Niles (and telegram to Senator Scott and call to White House), May 5, 1970; All letters in Box 45, Folder "Letters from BEM Members to Senate and Congress," BEM.

²⁸ Chairman to BEM Members and Supporters, March 31, 1970, Box 46, Folder "Proposals for Expanded BEM Program Spring 1970," BEM; Chairman Niles to Joe McDowell, "Appearance before the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress," May 28, 1970, Box 46, Folder "Henry Niles Testimony before Subcommittee on Economy in Government," BEM; "Operation Housecleaning Begins Today," *Washington Post* advertisement, September 10, 1970, p. A28; "Niles," *Baltimore Magazine*, Box 1, "Niles, Henry E. Speech," BEM; "If you're a woman in an executive or leadership capacity," *Wall Street Journal* advertisement, December 1, 1971, p. 28; BEM Membership List, Delaware Valley Chapter, June 30, 1968, Box 57, Folder "BEM Delaware Valley Chapter, 1967-1969," BEM; Delaware Valley BEM, Members as of January 1, 1972, Box 57, Folder "Delaware Valley Chapter, 1970-1972," BEM. Women comprised 14 of 371 members in 1968 and 22 of 417 in 1972. One man of Japanese ancestry was a member on both dates. The question of how actively BEM courted women and minorities and how many joined BEM is an issue that needs further exploration.

²⁹ Blundell, 1971, p. 14.

³⁰ George Herring, 2002, p. 328.

³¹ "Representatives Listed as Foes By Antiwar and Ecology Groups," *New York Times*, June 12, 1972, p. 32; "It Isn't Who's for You That Matters in '72;

It's Who Hates You," *Wall Street Journal*, September 28, 1972, p. 1; "Niles," *Baltimore Magazine*; "Historical Background," Online Descriptive Summary (1979), BEM, <http://www.swarthmore.edu/library/peace/DG100-150/dg116BusinessExecsMove.htm>. Other antiwar organizations that joined BEM in supporting McGovern included Women's International League for Peace and Freedom and the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy. See Small, 2002, p.155, and DeBenedetti, 1990, p. 335.

³² Sydney Jacobs to Henry Niles, February 16, 1973; Henry Niles to Sydney Jacobs, February 21, 1973; Walter Spiro, President, Spiro & Associates, Philadelphia, to Henry Niles, February 27, 1973; Letters in Box 50, Folder "Future Program for BEM Proposed by Sydney Jacobs and related correspondence, February-March 1973," BEM.

³³ "Historical Background," Business Executives Move Records, 1965-1983, Collection DG 116, Swarthmore College Peace Collection, 1979.

³⁴ Key groups that also joined the anti-Vietnam War movement in 1967 included Another Mother for Peace in March and Vietnam Veterans Against the War in June. Influential individuals who helped diversify the movement included the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. See chapter 4 in Small, 2002.

³⁵ Henry Niles to Editor, *New York Times*, June 29, 1973; Henry Niles to Editor, *Washington Post*, June 29, 1973; Albert Ornstein to Henry Niles, June 30, 1973; Lawrence Chait, Chairman, Multi Media Direct Marketing, New York, to Henry Niles, July 11, 1973; Sinclair Armstrong to Henry Niles, July 12, 1973; Henry Niles to Sinclair Armstrong, July 16, 1973; Letters in Box 50, Folder "White House Enemies List June 28, 1973," BEM; "Lists of White House 'Enemies' and Memorandums Relating to Those Names," *New York Times*, June 28, 1973, p. 38.

³⁶ Compare this January 16, 2007, letter to the editor of the *New York Times* by Warren Langley to the discussion on page 7 based on 1967 sources found in citation #8.

³⁷ Ben Cohen of Ben & Jerry's Homemade, Arnold Hiatt of Stride Rite Foundation, Bruce Klatsky of Philips-Van Heusen Corporation, Alan Hassenfeld of Hasbro, and Theodore Williams of Bell Industries founded Business Leaders for Sensible Priorities. By 2007, the organization was comprised of 700 business executives and military authorities. See

“Pressuring the Pentagon,” *Los Angeles Times*, April 20, 1998; “Attacking Military Excess, From the Executive Office,” *New York Times*, June 13, 1999, p. 4; Tom Roberts, 1999, pp. 14-15; “Business, Civic Leaders Speak Out Against War,” *Philadelphia Inquirer*, December 11, 2002, p. A14; Patricia Panchak, 2003, p. 21; “US Business Group Slams Bush ‘Deception’ Over Iraq War,” Agence France Presse, March 24, 2004; “The Military We Need,” *Chicago Sun-Times*, March 3, 2007; Business Leaders for Sensible Priorities, “Common Sense Budget Act Charts New Course for US Economy,” March 29, 2007, <http://www.commondreams.org/>. Alan Kligerman is listed as one of the sponsors to BEM’s full-page advertisement “Stop the war, Mr. President,” *Washington Post*, February 8, 1967, p. A17.

WORKS CITED

Blundell, William. “When Businessmen Turn Radical.” *Wall Street Journal* (February 10, 1971): 14.

Buzzanco, Robert. *Masters of War: Military Dissent and Politics in the Vietnam Era*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

DeBenedetti, Charles, and Charles Chatfield. *An American Ordeal: The Antiwar Movement of the Vietnam Era*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1990.

Hammond, William. *Reporting Vietnam: Media and Military at War*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1998.

Herring, George. *America’s Longest War: The United States and Vietnam, 1950-1975*. New York: McGraw Hill, 2002, 4th ed.

Hoff Wilson, Joan. *American Business and Foreign Policy, 1920-1933*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1971.

Johns, Andrew. “Doves Among Hawks: Republican Opposition to the Vietnam War, 1964-1968.” *Peace & Change* 31 (October 2006): 585-628.

Karsner, Douglas. "Unfair Competition? American and Japanese Airlines Transpacific Route Rivalries, 1946-1971." *Essays in Economic and Business History* XXV (2007): 55-66.

Oberdorfer, Don. *Tet! The Turning Point in the Vietnam War*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001.

Panchak, Patricia. "Executives Say 'No' To Iraq War." *Industry Week* (April 2003): 21.

Roberts, Tom. "New Battles Brew Over Defense, Spending, Arms Sales." *National Catholic Reporter* (August 13, 1999): 14-15.

Russett, Bruce and Elizabeth Hanson. *Interest and Ideology: The Foreign Policy Beliefs of American Businessmen*. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman & Co, 1975.

Salk, Erwin. "If the Vietnam War Ends This Year." *The National Real Estate Investor* (September 1968): 66-67.

Schlesinger, Stephen and Stephen Kinzer. *Bitter Fruit: The Story of the American Coup in Guatemala*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999, expanded edition.

Small, Melvin. *Antiwarriors: The Vietnam War and the Battle for America's Hearts and Minds*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2002.

Small, Melvin. *Covering Dissent: The Media and the Antiwar Movement*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1994.

Spector, Bert. "'Business Responsibilities in a Divided World': The Cold War Roots of the Corporate Social Responsibility Movement." *Enterprise & Society* (June 2008): 314-336.

U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. *Hearings Before the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, Eighty-Ninth Congress, First Session on S. Con. Res. 32 For Planning for Peace, May 11 and 12, 1965*.