

In his outstanding state of the Union message, the President set forth our goals in Vietnam when he said:

We seek neither territory nor bases, economic domination or military alliance in Vietnam. We fight for the principle of self-determination that the people of South Vietnam should be able to choose their own course, choose it in free elections without violence, without terror, and without fear. The people of all Vietnam should make a free decision on the great question of reunification.

We have also made it clear from Hanoi to New York that there are no arbitrary limits to our search for peace. We stand by the Geneva agreements of 1954 and 1962. We will meet at any conference table. We will discuss any proposals—4 points or 14 or 40—and we will consider the views of any group. We will work for a ceasefire now, or once discussions have begun.

I wholeheartedly agree with the goals set by our President. However, because in the past there have been conflicting statements by our officials on our support for the Geneva accords, on negotiations with the Vietcong, and on free elections, we must further clarify our war aims and negotiating position.

We should clearly announce our willingness to seek a settlement based on the 1954 Geneva accords providing neutrality, self-determination, and free elections for Vietnam. The Geneva accords which we agreed to but did not sign state that "the military demarcation line at the 17th parallel is provisional and should not in any way be considered as constituting a political or territorial boundary." Historically, there is no North and South Vietnam.

We should indicate explicitly our readiness to participate in negotiations with all parties involved—I mean with delegates of the Vietcong, or National Liberation Front, so-called. We should agree to abide by the results of a peaceful, free election by the people of Vietnam of their own Government, their own leaders, and their own destiny. I know our CIA officials in Vietnam and Prime Minister Ky, of the Saigon government oppose an armistice at this time. Our President should overrule their views along with those of the Curtis LeMays.

If our President moves decisively for such peace our people will support him. If instead, he approves steadily expanding military involvement, he will please our militarists, and warhawks in Congress. Then in the 1966 congressional elections and in 1968, as casualty lists mount, some Republican politicians, now urging acceleration of the war by bombing Hanoi and Haiphong and even Red China, will be the first to denounce this as "Lyndon's war."

Were we to bomb Hanoi and Haiphong, thousands of Vietnamese civilians including women and children would be killed and wounded. If we failed to destroy all the war planes of North Vietnam some might bomb Saigon, and elements of the North Vietnamese army, numbering some 400,000, would cross the demilitarized zone and invade South Vietnam.

Pentagon gossip reports plans to bomb Haiphong and Hanoi followed by an amphibious landing at Haiphong and then "bombing Red China back into the stone

age." That, to quote Gen. Curtis LeMay. Let us hope President Johnson rejects these proposals. Bombing Hanoi would be compared with the Nazi bombing of Guernica in the Spanish Civil War. Furthermore, no one can accurately forecast just how damaging the reaction would be. It would certainly at least outweigh any possible military gain.

From September 28 to last October 20 I was in southeast Asia most of the time. I went, looked, and listened. Very soon I learned we are involved in a civil war over there. In South Vietnam I was at every airbase except one—traveling through the entire area by helicopter, airplane, and jeep. It is my considered judgment that South Vietnam is of no strategic importance whatever to the defense of the United States. Furthermore, the fact is that the conflict raging in Vietnam is a civil war. General Westmoreland stated to me that the bulk of the Vietcong fighting in South Vietnam were born and reared in South Vietnam. General Stilwell, in Thailand, went further. He stated that 80 percent of the Vietcong fighting in the Mekong Delta area south of Saigon, were born and reared in that area. They were not infiltrators or Communists from the North.

No matter how often we profess our intention to defend freedom in Vietnam, the increasing escalation of the war is raising grave doubts throughout Asia and elsewhere in the world as to the wisdom of our policy. Attacks with sophisticated weapons on unsophisticated and illiterate Asians are building a vast reservoir of anti-Americanism and misunderstanding of our country among the masses of the people in Asia.

A military surrender to the United States will never produce acceptance of American presence in Asia by most Asians. It would be a legacy of ill will which we should not leave to future generations of Americans. Until Asians show more interest in defending themselves, then unilateral American involvement in Asia is doomed to failure. The ugly reality is that for the most part it is American GI's who are fighting and dying in Vietnam for the alleged defense of freedom in Asia. Do we Americans have a mandate from Almighty God to police the entire world?

President John F. Kennedy said on September 3, 1963, shortly before his assassination:

I don't think that unless a greater effort is made by the Government to win popular support that the war can be won out there. In the final analysis, it is their war. They are the ones who have to win it or lose it. We can help them, we can give them equipment, we can send our men out there as advisers, but they have to win it—the people of Vietnam—against the Communists. We are prepared to continue to assist them, but I don't think that the war can be won unless the people support the effort, and, in my opinion, in the last 2 months the Government has gotten out of touch with the people.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Alaska.

THE VIETNAM CONFLICT

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the most pressing problem facing our Nation and the world today is the war in Vietnam. I hope our President will continue to strike out boldly for a peaceful settlement of this bitter conflict. Bonafide peace negotiations mean concessions by us, concessions by the Vietcong and a cease fire with no one an abject loser and no one an arrogant winner. Unless there is a negotiated settlement, American GI's are likely to be fighting and dying in Vietnam until 1980.

President Johnson is to be commended for directing a pause in the bombing of North Vietnam. But standing alone, this is not enough.

Mr. GRUENING. Is it not a fact that when President Kennedy made that statement in September of 1963, we had been in Vietnam for practically a decade?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GRUENING. Yet, at the end of 10 years of assistance of all kinds, including vast sums of money, we had a situation that was deteriorating; and it was clear then, was it not, that the government of South Vietnam, either the puppet government that we had installed there, or its successors after various coups were out of touch with the needs of the people, were uninterested in those needs, and were doing little or nothing to bring about the reforms which President Eisenhower had made conditional upon our giving them aid for 10 years previously? Is that not a fact?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. That is true, of course.

Mr. GRUENING. Is that not a demonstration of the folly of our policies there?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I agree with the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, on our initial commitment to South Vietnam made by President Eisenhower in 1954 in a letter to the President of South Vietnam stated:

I am instructing the American Ambassador to examine with you how an intelligent program of American aid can serve to assist Vietnam in its present hour of trial.

He added:

The purpose of this offer is to assist the Government of Vietnam in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means. The U.S. Government hopes that such aid, combined with your own continuing efforts, will contribute effectively toward an independent Vietnam endowed with a strong government.

That was a very "iffy" commitment made by President Eisenhower.

Can anyone claim that Prime Minister Ky, of South Vietnam, who himself was born and reared in Hanoi, heads a strong, viable state? He could not remain in power 1 week except for the operations of our Central Intelligence Agency and the support of our Armed Forces.

To justify sending a military advisory group to Vietnam and increasing its size from 327 in 1953 to 685 in 1961, President Eisenhower on April 7, 1954, said:

The loss of Indochina will cause the fall of southeast Asia like a set of dominoes.

That was in the Stalin era. Today, there is no bitter cold war between the Soviet Union and the United States as when Stalin was dictator. The Soviet Union is no longer a "have not" nation. It is veering toward capitalism. Its leaders and the Russian people seek coexistence instead of cannihilation. Moscow and Peking are now in bitter conflict. This domino theory has been completely discredited.

Red China is a paper dragon. It is overrated as a great power. It has crude nuclear capability, that is true. However, it will take at least 5 or 10 years

before it will have the know-how to deliver any nuclear warheads on targets. Its air force is inferior. It has no surface navy except a few torpedo boats and gunboats—no modern transports—nothing except thousands of junks. It is an agrarian nation, with 85-percent of its population engaged in agriculture. On the Pacific, under the Pacific, and in the air, we have a more powerful Navy, submarine fleet, and Air Force than all the nations of the world combined.

Red China does have a huge land army. The elephant can fight neither the eagle nor the whale. As General MacArthur in his "Reminiscences" stated:

Anyone in favor of sending American ground troops to fight on Chinese soil should have his head examined.

Can anyone claim that we would lose face and that our prestige in Asia would be damaged were we to withdraw from this conflict? France was bled white during the 8-year struggle to save her vast colonial empire in Indo-China. France became a greater and more powerful nation following her withdrawal from what is now North and South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos. Furthermore, did De Gaulle lose face or prestige when he surrendered Algeria, that vast domain larger than France? A great nation like ours does not lose face by withdrawing from a miserable war. We have lost face by messing around with it in the first place.

The winds of freedom are blowing across the China Sea and elsewhere throughout the world in a manner and to an extent almost beyond belief. Surely we should not respond with our Armed Forces whenever the winds of change strike a country in southeast Asia or in Africa or elsewhere outside our hemisphere and sphere of influence. In Vietnam the security of the United States is not the issue. Saigon is not and never will be an outpost defending Seattle. Vietnam very definitely is of no strategic importance to the defense of the United States.

We should have long since learned that the outcome of a guerrilla war in the swamps, jungles, and highlands of southeast Asia does not threaten the security of the United States. We should, if we wish, give money, food, or guns, giving this aid from afar. We should withdraw from implicating ourselves so deeply into this conflict converting it into an American war.

This steaming jungle where thousands of American GI's have already been afflicted with malaria and other jungle diseases is the worst place in the world for us to wage a ground war.

Americans should not blindly accept the propaganda coming from Washington. If mistakes are compounded on mistakes, then the conflict will be expanded and escalated.

In my judgment, our national interest requires a redirection of our policy in Asia. We should not be the sole defenders of freedom as we define freedom in Asia. The Joint Chiefs of Staff and our CIA should take a back seat when it comes to formulating foreign policy. I hope that President Johnson will reassert

that civilian authority must remain supreme over military authority. The men who wrote the Constitution of the United States provided that civilian authority in this Nation must always be supreme over the military. We should adhere to that.

Any forces we have in Vietnam should be only part of the forces of many nations under the United Nations and for peacekeeping and not warmaking purposes.

Vietnam is a land of breathtaking sea-coasts, green jungles, fertile rice paddies, picturesque mountains—a lovely Garden of Eden converted into a hell on earth by man's inhumanity to man.

I have just quoted the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster] who revisited the scene of his youth in the early part of World War II when he served as a marine in Vietnam.

Let it not be written by future historians that American boys died needlessly in far distant jungles because of weakness of diplomats and indifference of politicians. I wish I had as much confidence in the skill and intelligence of our diplomats in trying to settle this war as I do in the bravery and high competence of our soldiers fighting the war.

The primary reason for our being in Vietnam today is our stubborn refusal to admit a mistake in our attempt to make Vietnam a pro-American and an anti-Chinese state. More than anything else, we are fighting to avoid admitting failure. As Walter Lippmann bluntly put it, "We are fighting to save face."

The late President John F. Kennedy said, "Transforming Vietnam into a Western redoubt is ridiculous."

Sallust, the Roman historian, about 40 years before the birth of Our Savior wrote:

It is always easy to begin a war, but very difficult to stop one, since its beginning and end are not under the control of the same man.

That is true now as it was then. President Johnson deserves praise for ordering a holiday in bombing North Vietnam while his executive department officials are seeking to secure an armistice and cease-fire at the conference table with representatives of the Vietcong or National Liberation Front, so-called, and Hanoi.

We Americans should not be so much interested in saving face as in saving lives.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Ohio on his forthright, penetrating speech. I think it is one of the most important statements that have been made in Congress on the war in Vietnam. It deserves the widest attention. I am happy to welcome the Senator from Ohio to the ranks of those of us who feel and for nearly 2 years have stated that our military involvement there is folly and represents a tragic mistake, perhaps the most tragic ever made by this country. As pointed out in the report of our distinguished majority leader, an expert on southeast Asia, and our colleagues who went to South Vietnam and other parts of the world, that unless we can bring the war

to an end at the conference table there appears no prospect except more and more destruction and killing. I think we should get out in the best way possible and admit that we made a mistake. Individuals who do this are honored. Great nations find it harder to do.

I applaud President Johnson for the efforts he is making for peace, but I feel he is handicapped by some needlessly unqualified verbal commitments he has made.

Three Presidents did not, as President Johnson has indicated—I think he is mistaken in this—promise military aid and establish thereby a national pledge. President Eisenhower offered only economic aid, provided certain reforms were made. As the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young] pointed out, it was a very "iffy" offer, and was contingent upon improvement and reforms in the then Diem government—reforms which never took place.

During the 6 years of President Eisenhower in the White House, there was no military involvement, that is, no Americans were sent into combat, only a military mission with an advisory role. Under President Kennedy, we sent military advisers, and President Kennedy continued to maintain that it was South Vietnam's war—and that they had to win it. It has been only in the past year that we have become involved with our troops in combat—a tragic mistake.

I hope the speech that the Senator from Ohio has delivered will have wide circulation.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President I thank the distinguished junior Senator from Alaska. Contrary to what we sometimes read in the press, the Vietnam issue was debated in the Senate during the past year; and as we settle down to the final session of the 89th Congress the debate is renewed. There is a great difference of opinion among Senators.

It is going to be a good thing that all Senators debate this pressing problem, the greatest problem before the country at this time, and express their views.

Mr. President, supplementary to what I have said, I have a letter from a constituent of mine, Thomas A. Gianfagna, of 841 Alhambra Road, Cleveland, a valiant young constituent of mine. I do not know him personally, but he wrote me as follows:

DEAR SENATOR YOUNG: I have followed with great interest your views on the situation in Vietnam. As an ex-GI just recently granted the blessing of rebirth into civilian life and as a veteran of 2 months service in the central highlands of Vietnam with the 1st Cavalry Division, I want you to know that I agree with you 89 percent.

As you say, we are not the policeman of the world. As you say, the situation in Vietnam is more a civil war than a war of aggression or subversion. Thank you for saying it so loudly.

Thank you again.

Yours truly,

THOMAS A. GIANFAGNA.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

—Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I believe I heard the distinguished Senator from Ohio state that the senior Senator from Mary-

land had visited Vietnam during World War II.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I did so—inadvertently. I meant Okinawa.

Mr. BREWSTER. I thank the Senator, because I was in Vietnam only with the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], where the three of us spent some time. My world war service took me to Espiritu Santos, Guadalcanal, Ulithi, Eniwetok, Guam, and Okinawa, but not until recently was I in Vietnam.

My own observations are somewhat different from those of the Senator from Ohio, but I appreciate the deep sincerity with which the Senator from Ohio has expressed his point of view.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I greatly respect the Senator from Maryland who is a great Senator. He is one of the heroes of World War II, and he has a fine record in the Senate. It was a slip of the tongue when I used the word "Vietnam" for "Okinawa," because I knew he was with the Marines who conquered Okinawa in World War II.

I had two sons, both of whom served in the Pacific, and I know something about the hardships of those fine young men who, some 22 and 23 years ago, fought for their country in the Pacific.

Whenever I see a marine like DAN BREWSTER, of Maryland, who fought there, I feel like taking off my hat to him. Of course, I readily accept the fact that both he and Senator CANNON have views and conclusions somewhat different from mine. I know both of them and many other Senators will express those views later this year.

It was not a correct statement for anyone to assert that the Vietnam situation and the conflict there had not been debated in the last Congress; and it is fair to assume that it will be fully debated in the final session of this Congress. It deserves to receive more attention and no doubt will receive more attention, than any other issue.

I yield the floor.