

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, many Members, by reason of the holiday occasion following George Washington's Birthday, will be leaving tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order so that we can hear the Senator from Michigan.

The Senator from Michigan may proceed.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, what I have to say, I think, must be on the minds of each of us. The institutions of a free society, history tells us, sometimes have failed because of their inability to respond to national needs.

The people of this country in the last several years, have asked themselves the question more frequently than ever before: "Has in our evolution time and events begun somehow to run faster than our institutions can react?"

I do not pretend that all who voted a moment ago against tabling will turn up on Monday and vote for the Mondale-Brooke amendment, but I think an obvious, fair analysis of several votes we have had; the tabling vote on the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN]; the vote on cloture yesterday, and the vote refusing to table the Housing amendment of today, demonstrates that a majority of the Senate of the United States, in February 1968, seek to put on the Federal statute books the proposition in form reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, the so-called Hart bill, as a means of responding to an identified need, and, second, that a majority of the Senate seek to put on the Federal statute books the proposition that one's religion and race and place of origin, is not to be a test when a man goes out to seek or to buy a home for his family. Nothing could be more clear than these votes.

If history records that this institution thereafter failed to do those two things because of something called rule XXII, it will be a pretty severe verdict on all of us. I would hope that history would not record our failure. All the learned parliamentarians would never be able to explain to the people of this country why, after 5 weeks of debate and these votes, the majority was prevented from acting.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. On behalf of the minority leader and myself, we can confirm for the Senate the fact that the vote under the unanimous-consent agreement will take place 1 hour after the Senate convenes at 12 o'clock on Monday next. So all Senators should be on notice and should be in attendance.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). The Senator from Idaho has the floor.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I recognize the importance of this subject. I desire to accommodate Senators, but I

have a speech to deliver, and the Committee on Foreign Relations will meet at 2:30 p.m. for a very important executive session, some part of which I hope to attend. I hope Senators will keep that in mind and foreshorten their remarks.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for 30 seconds?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to adopt the views of Senator HART as my own, and to add that it is not history, but that the verdict will be recorded this year in the major American cities of the United States, exactly as he has said.

I thank my colleague for yielding.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I yield to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on tomorrow we will celebrate the anniversary of a great American hero, George Washington, who fought for 7 years to make Americans free. The Mondale amendment proposes to rob all Americans of the substance of their right of private property and to centralize the control of that private property in one Cabinet member in Washington.

I, for one, will continue the fight George Washington made to keep Americans free and to prevent the passage of an amendment which would convert all Americans from the status of free men into helpless puppets on a string to be pulled by one bureaucrat in Washington.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be appended to the motion for cloture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I associate myself with the statement made by the Senator from Michigan. I agree with what he has said, and I underscore the seriousness of the problem.

I believe that what we have failed to do here will sound resoundingly throughout the cities of America this summer, and our task has been made the more difficult by reason of the difficulties we have experienced in this body. I am sorry that the functioning of our system has prevented the will of the majority from prevailing.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

#### THE TORMENT IN THE LAND

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the war in Vietnam enters its fourth year since we commenced the bombing of the north, its fury intensified, and no end in sight. As though fascinated by the baited trap, we are poised to plunge still deeper into

Asia, where vast populations wait to engulf us and legions of young Americans are being beckoned to their graves.

Confounding our construction of the Vietnamese war as an aggression from the north, the Vietcong remains primarily an indigenous force of the south, honeycombed through every city and village, capable of striking from nowhere, moving with relative impunity among the people. Without a single area immune from enemy penetration, where he cannot obtain local cover, it should be obvious that we can find no magical answer to our dilemma in South Vietnam by striking out elsewhere. I listen, dismayed, to the reckless talk of "hot pursuit" into North Vietnam, Cambodia, or Laos, where, presumably, we shall deny the Communists their "sanctuary," when all of Asia behind them is their sanctuary.

The involvement of the United States in Vietnamese affairs, we should remember, began as just another foreign aid program. Our purpose was to help certain anti-Communist elements in South Vietnam strengthen themselves. But when we commenced to take over their fight in their country, converting their political struggle into an American war, I could no longer support the policy. As early as September 1964, I began to speak out against it.

In the intervening years, I have seen my worst fears confirmed. Step by step, we have been caught fast in a precarious Asian bog. Into its quicksands, we can readily stray farther and sink deeper, but out of it there is no quick or easy path of extrication.

Can unheeded warnings over many years now be used to unmake a war? Clearly, they cannot; the questions must be reframed. The victims of events, we must now ask if the premises of 1958, which have brought us to the realities of 1968, will be relevant in the world of 1978.

As America now ponders the price of its policy in Asia—

Writes Emmet John Hughes—

the quest for any healing wisdom must begin with the facing of one truth: the reckoning has been inevitable, for the policy was forever fatally flawed. Such a truth is almost too bitter to bear. For many, it will be so much easier to explain away the Vietnam tragedy in terms of cruel misfortunes or chance misjudgments. But this kind of history has not been decreed by blunders—but by premises. It has not been ruled by anguishing circumstance but by avowed purpose. And its full warning is not to be read as a matter of what America failed to do but what America tried to do.

It is with what we have tried to do, not only in Asia but in the world at large, that I would speak today. I am deeply concerned about our concept of the world around us and the proper role that we should play in it. It is my belief that the time has come to search our souls—to ask what, indeed, is the true condition of our country, and how that condition relates to the course we are embarked upon abroad.

There is a story making the rounds of an airline pilot who announced to his passengers that he had two pieces of news for them, one bad and the other

good. The bad news, he said, "is that we are lost. The good news is that we are traveling at a recordbreaking rate of speed."

The United States, without doubt, is traveling at a recordbreaking rate of speed. Our gross national product now exceeds an annual rate of \$800 billion; for an unprecedented 84 months we have enjoyed a steady, upward trend of growth. More Americans are living better than ever before.

Yet, something is seriously wrong. Many of our thoughtful citizens sense that we are somehow off course, that we may have even lost our way.

For the first time, in my memory, a sizable segment of our young people have actually repudiated the country. The "hippies" have simply withdrawn from our society, seeking psychedelic escape by drug-induced hallucinations. We can deplore them but we cannot dismiss them—for they are there.

The activists among the angry rebels vent their contempt in public displays of brazen insolence. They defiantly tear up their draft cards; they shout, as the President passes by, "Hey, hey, L. B. J., how many kids did you kill today." They have gone so far as to mutilate the flag.

I recognize, of course, that these extremists do not typify American youth as a whole. Still, we deceive ourselves if we fail to acknowledge that a multitude of bright and sensitive college students— young men and women who refuse to participate in the abusive conduct I have just described—nonetheless feel profoundly disturbed about their country.

They question our course abroad. They resent the spreading mantle of militarism at home. They have, I must say quite frankly, greater sympathy for Dr. Spock and the ministers now under indictment, than for the Government prosecuting them. And they are skeptical about the condition of freedom in our land.

These students, though numerous, are probably not yet in the majority. But they do not care. Nor do they believe they can convince a country which will not listen. So their method is not to persuade but to obstruct, not to debate but to demonstrate. A kind of organized coercion seems to be their evolving technique, picket lines, massive sit-ins, rude resistance to established authority.

These anguished young people, in my opinion, are mistaken in the way they have chosen to conduct themselves. Disrespect for authority is disapproved by most Americans. No argument can be won by bad manners. The more shrill the shouting, the less inclined the country will be to listen.

Still, we are left confronted with the indisputable fact that a substantial proportion of our college students are estranged: they portray a poignant, visceral sense of alienation toward the "establishment," by which they mean all authority that stands for, or somehow represents, the government.

And this is a serious symptom of the torment in the land.

Another symptom, even more alarming, is the relentless growth of crime and violence in the streets. Our cities have

become time bombs. We ask ourselves, in muted voices, which will be the next to explode. What horror does the coming summer hold?

For reassurance, we repeat truisms to one another. We earnestly agree that this country cannot tolerate mob rule; that riots, arson, and looting are the tools of anarchy and revolution; that the maintenance of liberty depends, first of all, upon the maintenance of order; that in a free country, anyone has the right to try and change the law, but no one has the right to break the law.

On all this we concur. More money will be given the municipal police for better instruction in riot control. Federal funds will be made available to finance special training programs for the National Guard. When the time comes, we know that many arrests will be made, and even now we demand swift punishment for the guilty.

Yet, deep down we also know that, though the police and guardsmen may suppress the violence, they cannot prevent it from occurring. And so we wait for the hot summer.

And this is another symptom of the torment in the land.

What has gone wrong? What is the reason for the dissension on our college campuses? Why, with rising affluence, are we faced with a rising tide of violence in America?

Finding the answers to these questions is the most urgent item on our national agenda. President Johnson, in his recent state of the Union message, took note of "a certain restlessness" in the country, explaining that—

When a great ship cuts through the sea, the waters are always stirred and troubled.

But, with all deference to the President, our troubles are not stirring in the wake of the ship; our troubles are aboard. The ferment works amidst the crew, and the anxiety relates to the course charted for the ship itself.

Many aspects of that course may have contributed to the deterioration of public morality, to the spreading disregard for law and order, but none, I submit, has had a greater impact than this country's marathon dance with war.

We bear the imprint of war prolonged and unending. The draft has become a permanent fixture in our national life. Our youngsters grow up with war, listening to their fathers' stories of excitement and adventure on a hundred battlefronts. Where is the little boy whose favorite toys are not miniature replicas of our country's vaunted weaponry?

Violence begets violence; incessant warfare becomes, at last, the accepted companion of normalcy. Every night we watch on television the gory spectacle of the jungle war in Vietnam, the latest film, in color, flown to us directly from the battlefield. Year in, year out, the brutal drama penetrates every home, until burning villages, screaming children, and flowing blood become a routine part of the typical family scene.

Each morning our newspapers carry the latest body count of enemy dead, together with pictures of our own fighting men, bandaged and mangled. The brand

of war pervades and brutalizes our culture. Funny strips give way to fury strips. Violence not only dominates the entertainment we are offered on the ubiquitous tube; it is exalted there. Our video spies kill with a ruthlessness indistinguishable from that of their adversaries. One cannot really separate, on any ethical basis, the good from the bad. Nor does it seem to matter. For it is the "action" itself which is glorified, and apparently all that matters is that our side wins by the end of the program.

So it has happened that the American people, long gathered about the arena, have been steeped in violence. The President expresses the hope that hardened veterans, returning from the fighting in Vietnam, will join the police forces in our cities to help keep order. But even as he issues his appeal, he knows that other veterans, equally seasoned in the black arts of guerrilla warfare, are returning each day to the slums and ghettos. As whole blocks were burning in Detroit last summer, one such veteran turned to his buddy and said: "It's here, man, that the real war is."

To deal with that "real war," the bipartisan foreign policy of the United States has left us ill equipped. Since the end of World War II, our attention has been largely diverted away from the problems at home and riveted instead on distant shores. So, too, have our resources. Today, we are much more a warfare, than a welfare state. Of the \$157 billion voted by Congress in 1967, an astonishing 74.7 percent went for war or war-related programs, while only 12.2 percent went for health, education, and welfare. The breakdown of last year's budget follows:

	Percent
Military forces (includes present war)	55.7
Veterans (includes past wars)	4.4
National debt (over 80 percent war incurred)	9.1
Foreign relations (mainly foreign aid)	2.6
Space race	2.9
Post Office and roads	5.7
Agriculture and natural resources	3.9
Commerce and Labor	1.6
Health, Education, and Welfare	12.2
General Government	1.9
Total	100.0

The most perfunctory examination of this budget reveals the staggering cost of war, past and present, but even these percentages fail to describe the mammoth extent of our involvement abroad.

Since the end of the Second World War, we have wrapped our arms around the world as if it were our oyster. American fleets patrol not only our home waters, but the oceans of the earth, from the Mediterranean to the China Sea. Over 2 million of our military personnel, including their dependents, are stationed abroad. We maintain no less than 132 major military bases overseas.

The cost of this unprecedented military array defies comprehension, approaching a trillion dollars since the end of World War II. Our nuclear arsenal has grown to such awesome proportions that if it were ever detonated in anger, its

destructive power would be the equivalent of a thousand pounds of TNT against the head of every living inhabitant on earth.

However, even this is not the whole story. From the beginning of World War II onward, virtually every country in the world has received some form of loan or subsidy from the United States. In the postwar period alone, we have distributed more than \$90 billion in economic aid to no less than 124 foreign governments, plus \$38 billion in weapons, ammunition, and military equipment. Our arsenal diplomacy encompasses the globe. We are the world's largest munitions supplier, having disbursed over six times as much armament as our nearest rival, the Soviet Union.

But even this lavish gift of arms is not intended as a substitute for the use of our own. The United States has formally pledged itself, in advance, to the defense of 42 foreign countries, a commitment without example in history.

All of this we have solemnly done in the name of living up to our responsibilities as a great power. State Department strategists patiently explain that no other Western nation retains the capability of filling the vacuum created by the sudden collapse of the European empires. The good order they once maintained throughout the colonial world, we are told, it is now up to the United States to furnish—by subsidy wherever possible, through direct military intervention where lesser measures fail. Thus do we inherit the burden of the broken empires, assured that we shall be welcome since our motives are pure.

As a blueprint for American foreign policy, this doctrine of universal intervention is nothing less than a prescription for disaster. It rests, in the first instance, on a presumptuous misconception of modern history.

Let China sleep—

Napoleon warned—  
for when she awakes the world will tremble.

Nineteenth century colonialism awakened Africa and Asia from ancient slumbers, sowed indignation thick and deep, and reaped a bitter harvest of virulent nationalism. The resulting ferment can never be stilled by new intervention from without, least of all by another rich and powerful Western nation. The notion that we can restore stability to that half of the world which has just thrown off colonial rule, or, worse still, that it has fallen to us to act as a rearguard for the shrinking empires of a bygone day, is not even worthy of being called a policy. It is a grandiose dream of men who suffer from the dangerous delusion of American omnipotence.

Today that dream lies shattered before our present agony in Vietnam. Whatever the eventual terms of settlement there, we have learned the chastening lesson others learned before us, that there are limits to what outsiders can accomplish by force of arms. The presence of a huge American expeditionary force in this small Asian country has reduced to puppetry, in the eyes of its own people,

the very government we sought to bolster. Predictably, the banner of nationalism has passed to the Vietcong.

Moreover, as the *Pueblo* seizure demonstrates, we lack the manpower to extend to the rest of Asia the policy we pursue in Vietnam. For if Americans must fight Asians on a spreading Asian front, we shall soon run out of both men and money.

A general reassessment of American foreign policy is urgently needed. If we could only overcome our obsessive preoccupation with other people's ideologies, we could start asking some practical questions. What, for instance, have we bought with armaments unlimited and foreign aid dished out on a global platter?

We have not bought security.

After 20 years of the nuclear arms race, the Russian and American people are not the most secure, but the most imperiled people in the world. If the funeral pyre each government has set for the other is ever ignited, both peoples will be laid out upon it. A hundred million will die, it is estimated, in the initial blast, while untold millions more—wretched victims of the insidious fallout—will vomit their lives away in the hideous aftermath.

"The survivors would envy the dead,"

said Nikita Khrushchev.

"The last insanity," said Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Whatever could be salvaged, the mainstream of civilization would shift, for centuries to come, to the nonnuclear lands beyond the outer limits of the holocaust.

No, we have not bought security.

If not security, have we bought peace? Again, the answer is "No." Our policy of global intervention has meant war, not peace. During the past 25 years, the United States has engaged in more warfare than any other major power.

Then, at least, have we not bought favor? Once more the honest answer is "No." Our insistent involvement in the internal affairs of so many foreign countries meets with rising resentment and suspicion. As a delegate to the 21st General Assembly of the United Nations, I was a reluctant witness to the growing cynicism.

If I draw a bleak picture of the American predicament abroad, it is to underscore my conviction that the time is ripe for what John Foster Dulles once called an agonizing reappraisal of our foreign policy. I say this after 9 years of service on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, a lengthy and intensive course. I say it after extended travel into many parts of the world, where I have met and questioned hundreds of prominent foreigners, journalists, businessmen, educators, and political leaders, from Harold Wilson to Nikita Khrushchev, from Chiang Kai-shek to Charles de Gaulle. Finally, I say it as one who firmly believes that the United States must continue to play a very prominent role in world affairs.

I do not propose swinging the pendulum back to ostrich-like isolationism. One extreme need not call for the other.

I propose, rather, that we seek out the rational middle ground, where the limits of our intervention are drawn to correspond with the limits of our resources, and where we reserve direct military measures for those occasions that actually pose a clear and present threat to the security of the American people.

If we were to do this, I think our perspective would return again. No great calamity would occur. Instead, we would begin to see the folly of intercession without restraint. We would lift a dread burden from our shoulders and stand taller before the world.

Indeed, we would soon discover that, even as the United States cannot cap or control the endemic eruptions in the emerging world, neither can any other nation. Five thousand years of human history bear witness: it is a stubborn world, much too large and tough to be subjugated by any one country, or any one ideology or political or economic system.

What we once conceived to be monolithic communism is already cracking up under the hammer blows of national rivalry. The systems differ, one from another. Russia and China engage in bitter controversy, while the "satellite" countries assert a growing measure of independence. Slowly we have come to acknowledge, then to applaud, the disintegration of Communist solidarity in Eastern Europe. Yet we refuse to either recognize or respond to the same phenomenon in Asia.

Fear blinds us; fear of communism which transcends faith in freedom; fear of a future that we cannot shape with our own hands; fear of sudden devastation hurling down from the skies. The nuclear monster we ourselves unleashed returns, like Frankenstein's, to haunt our lives. Psychologists testify that a frightened man strikes out in all directions, a characteristic conspicuous in our foreign policy of recent years.

In the face of all this, I wish I could express some confidence that, by an act of our own volition, we might soon commence to alter this country's foreign policy from one of general, to one of selective, involvement. But I have no such confidence. Like other nations before us that drank deeply from the cup of foreign adventure, we are too enamored with the nobility of our mission to disenfranchise ourselves. Besides, powerful vested interests now encrust and sanctify the policy. Were we to wait for the hierarchy of either political party to advocate a change of course, I fear we would wait indefinitely.

But events are transpiring that may force a change of course upon us. If a widening war in Asia is averted, 1968 may well prove a year of reckoning for the United States. Our lengthy binge of extravagant spending abroad is catching up with us, for the laws of economics are immune to national ambition. Half the gold has been drained from our Treasury. Less than \$2 billion in unfettered bullion remains to meet some \$30 billion in foreign obligations, all of which are redeemable in gold.

The emergency measures proposed by

President Johnson are palliatives, at most. He asks for the removal of the gold cover, which contributes nothing to the correction of our adverse balance of payments, but merely throws open to foreign creditors those remaining vaults to which their access is now denied. The gold drain, constant and unrelenting, is much too large to be checked by a dubious tourist tax or by limited restrictions on the investment of private capital abroad. Retrenchment of Government spending abroad is inescapable, if the calamity of the dollar's devaluation is to be avoided. But the solution will not be found in further manipulation of our foreign aid program, salutary as that may be; the solution lies where the gold toll is heaviest, in the redeployment homeward from Europe of large numbers of American troops.

Mounting pressure on the dollar, deaf to the trumpet call, will thus force a pullback. The question is not whether, but when. Congress could face up to a reckoning this year, if it had the fortitude to retain the gold cover, the removal of which merely buys a little extra time.

The stern, unavoidable requirement, made all the more urgent by the necessity of meeting the heavy gold drain costs in Vietnam, is to drastically cut back our foreign spending elsewhere. Would it not be wiser to do so now, while we still retain the last half of our gold as insurance for the dollar, than to wait until no gold remains? Why should Senators, long since convinced that the United States is overextended and overcommitted abroad, who have seen their repeated warnings repeatedly ignored, vote now to relieve the one pressure within our control that could compel a retrenchment?

I, for one, will not do it. I refuse to vote for the removal of the gold cover. I cannot support a measure designed to give globalism, our current foreign policy, an extended lease on life. All that Congress has left, with which to influence our course abroad, is the power of the purse. If we shrink from using it, we abdicate our role, and obtain nothing in return but temporary postponement of the inevitable day when the ledger must be balanced on our international payments.

So I shall vote to keep the pressure on, knowing full well that this is the only feasible means by which Congress can force a change in American foreign policy. The advice that Congress offers will continue to go unheeded, as long as Congress keeps giving its consent.

For the same reason, and other considerations as well, I have decided to vote against the proposed tourist tax. Apart from its impact on our adverse balance of payments, this tax strikes me as being grossly unfair. It will be borne by students, teachers, and other citizens of modest means, who have skipped and saved for a trip abroad, while our cosmopolites, the rich and well positioned with foreign bank accounts, will easily escape its reach. Moreover, the tax represents still another harassment of our citizenry by a Government increasingly immersed in a foolhardy endeavor to bestow liberty abroad instead of insuring its blessings here at home.

Nothing in the Constitution suggests that the Federal Government was established for the purpose of restructuring the world.

Again, however, I confess to no optimism that the Congress will hold fast. Our habit is to yield and I expect that the gold cover will be removed. The day of reckoning for the dollar will be deferred for a few more years, while the rest of our gold is transferred into foreign hands.

But what of the human pressures, the pressures which cannot be postponed. The pressures surging up from the slums, the pressures that cannot be postponed? The hot summer looms ahead, taunting us with the paradox of squandering, on the opposite side of the world, huge sums to suppress an insurrection in Vietnam, when insurrection smolders in every major city in America.

Must it come to guerrilla warfare on our own streets before we begin to put first things first? How long do we wait before the men who occupy the seats of power finally see, that though the responsibilities of the United States Government are far reaching, there are none so important as those owed the American people?

Out of such an awakening, a new age would dawn. We would begin to find spiritual satisfaction again. We would regain our composure. Turning our primary attention to the problems afflicting our own society, confident our strength is such that no other nation can ever overcome us, we might even rediscover the guidance bequeathed to us by our earliest statesmen, men who understood, from the first, that our capacity to influence other lands depends upon our moral leadership, not our military might; upon the force of our example, not the force of our arms.

Listen to the wise words of John Quincy Adams, spoken on July 4, 1821:

Wherever the standard of freedom and independence has been or shall be unfurled, there will be America's heart, her benedictions, and her prayers. But she goes not abroad in search of monsters to destroy. She is the well-wisher to the freedom and independence of all. She is the champion and vindicator only of her own. She will recommend the general cause by the countenance of her voice, and by the benignant sympathy of her example. She well knows that by once enlisting under other banners than her own, were they even the banners of foreign independence, she would involve herself beyond the power of extrication, in all wars of interest and intrigue, of individual avarice, envy, and ambition, which assume the colors and usurp the standards of freedom. The fundamental maxims of her policy would insensibly change from liberty to force . . . She might become the dictatrix of the world. She would no longer be the ruler of her own spirit.

These words were uttered in the days of our infancy. Now, in the days of our maturity and in the fullness of our power, we see the dire prophecy of John Quincy Adams fulfilled.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I have sat here and listened with great interest to the speech of the distinguished Senator from Idaho. I commend him for his very thoughtful and very perceptive evaluation of our situation, both on the domestic scene and in the field of foreign affairs; and without necessarily agreeing with every detail of his speech, I certainly agree with it in general.

The Senator consistently offers to Congress and to the country very penetrating analyses of the problems that confront us, and I believe this is one of the most thoughtful speeches I have heard in a good long time. I thank the Senator from Idaho for his contribution.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin very much for his kind words.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Once again, it is my privilege to associate myself with a great foreign policy speech, made by the Senator from Idaho. As he knows, I share the views that he has expressed on the folly of our war in Vietnam, as I have ever since we started slaughtering American boys in an unconstitutional, illegal, and immoral war in that country.

I shall continue to protest that war as long as we fight it on the basis that we are now fighting it, for I am satisfied that history will record that it did not produce peace, and could not produce peace—only more war for future generations of Americans to inherit as the legacy from our generation.

I think that is a very sad thing, and I want the Senator to know that I know that he knows how difficult it is, and how unpleasant, to stand up against the mistaken foreign policy of the United States; but I rise to commend him for his courage and his foresight, because he, too, will be sustained by history for the position that he has taken. I wish to associate myself with the objectives and the general tenor of his speech.

Mr. CHURCH. I appreciate very much the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

There are two Senators present who were the first Members of this body to object to the tragic course of our policy in Southeast Asia. It was the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] who were the first to sound the warning, when no one else was listening.

As I have mentioned, in my address, my own protest goes back to September of 1964. A few months later, in February of 1965, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN] and I joined, one afternoon here in the Senate Chamber, to urge a negotiated settlement in Vietnam, at a time when "negotiation" was an ugly word here in Washington.

Others have since joined in the growing dissent. But I simply want the record to be clear that the first to speak up against the present policy were two men who sit here this afternoon, the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr.

MORSE] and the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], to whom I am now happy to yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Let me say first to my able colleague from Idaho that this was one of the great speeches of all time. I believe it ranks with the classics, with the addresses of Daniel Webster and other distinguished orators of the past. I cannot conceive of a more eloquent, searching, and comprehensive analysis of our foreign policy.

It is a tragic thing for those of us who love the United States, who revere its great past, who want to see its noblest professions adhered to, to see our Nation violating those professions and engaging in practices which nullify our noble traditions and our great past.

The tragedy about all this is that we do not know what we can do about it?

As Senator CHURCH has pointed out, there is a great rising tide of discontent, frustration, bewilderment, sorrow, and indignation in this country. The American people are deeply confused. They wish they knew some way out. Their protests seem to have fallen upon deaf ears.

It is not merely the commitment in Southeast Asia which is so tragic but its effects at home. The question is, How do we get out of this morass? The administration has taken the position that unless you have a solution, you should not criticize. Solutions have been proposed, with which not all are in agreement, but I would give my own view that while it is generally accepted that we must have an honorable way out, we have first to define that word "honorable."

An honorable way out would require a good face-saving formula. If we could go to the negotiating table and end the killing that way, that would be fine. But I think there is very little chance of negotiation for the reason that our U.S. approaches have not been realistic.

My able colleague from Idaho may not agree, but I feel that unless we view this issue as not—as presented by the administration—an effort to stop aggression and help a friendly country which allegedly asked us to come in and save it from aggression, or as a method of stopping communism—all of which premises I consider are completely unwarranted—we shall not get very far.

After careful study of the record, it seemed to me—and as I have stated many times—that we barged into Vietnam unilaterally, unasked, into a country where only Vietnamese then were; that our entry was accompanied by the installation of a puppet whom we brought from the United States; that our refusal, with him, to abide by the agreement reached through the Geneva Accords precipitated a civil war; and that in that civil war we took the part of a succession of unpopular, coup-imposed corrupt generals, whose tenure recently have been reaffirmed in a rigged election, who have no popular support, and who would not last 24 hours without our military and financial aid.

I believe that until we face that situa-

tion realistically, and confess error, there will be no settlement.

This is a hard revelation for the American people to take; namely, that we are the aggressors there. That is difficult for the American people to believe, when they have been told from on high for so many years that we are fighting aggression. The facts, as I see them, are quite otherwise. I have tried to demonstrate that objectively in a book just published, entitled "Vietnam Folly."

Until we face the situation realistically, the opposition will never come to the conference table. That is our dilemma. I wonder if my colleague from Idaho does agree that if negotiation is not attainable it would be better to withdraw on almost any basis, than to stay and continue what we are doing. I know that is difficult to face. Such a policy has been stigmatized with the words "scuttle and run."

But actually, if we continue to do what we are now doing, we will merely aggravate the disaster. To date, we have lost in action some 16,000 fine young Americans and suffered more than 100,000 wounded—some of them crippled for life.

I have seen some of those poor 18- and 19-year-old kids. I saw one of them who is blinded for life and armless. When a man loses his sight, we try to train him to develop his tactile sense through his fingers. This poor kid has no fingers, hands, or arms. Others, through brain injury, have lost their minds. Another 19-year-old is paralyzed from the neck down.

Those kids who have been killed have been giving their lives not for the safety of our country. They will have died in vain.

We like to believe in the word of Lincoln, that these men will not have died in vain. However, we are fighting a war that we cannot win. We are defending a crooked bunch of grafters. Every knowledgeable observer who goes there reports on the flagrant corruption. David Halberstam, the Pulitzer Prize winner, reporting in Harpers gave a horrifying picture of every official being corrupt.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has confirmed this. Yet, we are sacrificing our young men in a cause for which that country's own young men ought to fight. We were not attacked. No vital interest of the United States was in jeopardy.

I fear there is only one way out—although I do not see it coming at the present time—and that is to confess our error and make plans to phase out our occupation, leaving the Vietnamese to settle their problems. If we can find a face-saving means of doing this, fine.

I think that our ever-deepening Asian involvement is the most tragic thing that has happened to our Nation in its history. We have forfeited the good will of much of mankind. We cannot attain our declared objectives. Not only are we not stopping communism but actually aiding communism. While we are sending our young men there to fight a primitive peasant people, neither the Chinese nor Russian Communists have committed a single soldier to combat in that struggle.

I am hopeful that my colleague, the Senator from Idaho, has a solution for our dilemma. He has discussed the problem most vividly and eloquently, but what is his way out? How will he lend his efforts as a U.S. Senator in helping us to bring to an end this terrible mess?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, first let me say that no one has discussed the war in Vietnam with greater vehemence than has the distinguished Senator from Alaska.

He knows of the efforts that we have made together, over the years, to avoid the escalation of the war which has nonetheless occurred.

He knows of the plea that we have made from time to time against the further enlargement of the bombing, after it had become apparent that the bombing had failed.

He knows of the attempts we continue to make to keep the perimeters of the war from being enlarged still further.

As I said at the commencement of my address, we are caught fast in an Asian bog. Into it, we can readily stray farther and sink deeper, but out of it, there is no easy path of extrication.

I have no magical solution for the present dilemma. If there were one, I am sure the President would long since have found it. The reason I originally objected to the policy was because I felt it would lead us to the very dilemma with which we are now, in truth, confronted.

The purpose of my address today is to draw the lessons from this nightmare in Vietnam which should shape American foreign policy from now on. If we do not learn these lessons, the same premises that led us into Vietnam are going to lead us further into other Asian lands. The front is going to be extended indefinitely, and young Americans are going to die by the millions in unmarked Asian graves.

Mr. GRUENING. And for what? Mr. CHURCH. For nothing, because the history of this period should make it clear that the days of effective Western intervention in Asia are over.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CHURCH. All the other Western nations have fled. Only we remain.

The lesson is that virulent nationalism, the product of the colonial period, giving birth to 50 new nations in Asia and Africa, has created a state of mind in these lands that covets independence.

We are talking about a region of the world where most people do not regard communism as an ugly word. They are more inclined to regard capitalism as an ugly word.

Mr. GRUENING. Or what they term "Western imperialism."

Mr. CHURCH. They relate capitalism to the old colonial period.

We make a grave mistake if we continue to believe that the successful way for resisting Communist expansion in Asia is through massive interjection of American expeditionary forces.

The lesson we need to draw from Vietnam is that the presence of an enormous American Army there, half a million strong, so conspicuously foreign to Viet-

nam, plus the tremendous input of billions of American dollars into a country in which the per capita income was only about \$80 a year cannot help but corrupt the fragile economy and traditional life of the people. Inevitably, the government we sustain by force of our own arms, soon takes on the appearance of a puppet government, in the eyes of its own people. And then what happens? Then the banner of nationalism falls to the insurgents, and with the banner goes the sympathy and secret allegiance of most of the people.

Why is it, in Vietnam today, that the insurgents fight so fiercely, while those on whom we have lavished such tremendous aid are so inclined to leave the hardest battles to us?

Mr. GRUENING. The answer is that the other people are fighting for their independence, and we ought to be sympathetic to that objective.

Mr. CHURCH. No, I do not think we should be on their side; I do not think we should have sent an American Army to fight on either side, thus converting a Vietnamese political struggle into an American war.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CHURCH. This was a Vietnamese war to start with. We are the foreigners there today, and as a result the indigenous effort, the cause of nationalism, the continuing struggle by the Vietnamese to drive out the foreigners has simply been transferred from the French to us. And though our motives may differ, we sleep in the same bed today in Vietnam that the French occupied in years past.

And that is the lesson that has to be drawn from this agony in Vietnam. If we were resisting the expansion of communism in Asia intelligently and effectively, then we would deal with these newly independent governments at arm's length, remaining ever sensitive to their national pride; and the thing we would avoid is occupying one of these small Asian countries in such a way as to condemn its government in the eyes of its own people. That is the surest way to throw the banner of nationalism to the Communists, giving them a momentum they otherwise lack.

Mr. President, I lived in Asia for nearly 2 years during the Second World War, principally in India and China. I came away firmly convinced that the old era of Western intervention in Asia had run its course, and that Western nations would have to adjust to that new reality and accept it. There is no reason why the United States should not accept it. We are not in Vietnam today because we were attacked.

Mr. GRUENING. Of course not.

Mr. CHURCH. It does not matter whether the war in Vietnam is construed as an aggression from the North or as a civil war. Either way, it is a political struggle among the Vietnamese. The two halves of Vietnam were not separate and independent entities in any traditional or historic sense. The division was made temporarily by the Geneva accords of 1954, and it was expressly provided in those agreements that the division was

not to be regarded as a permanent political boundary and further, that the people of Vietnam were to be given a chance to vote on the reunification of the country.

So it is only a myth that aggression occurred in Vietnam which can be compared with aggressions elsewhere. It is a myth that we have developed for our own convenience in order to rationalize our own policy.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator is correct. It is a myth that we must maintain in order to justify our being there.

Mr. CHURCH. I agree with the Senator.

So the plea I make today is that the time has come to reassess American foreign policy, in Asia in particular, and in the world at large. We must recognize that, in this period of ferment, revolution cannot be bought off and stability can not be imposed from without.

If we keep trying, we will exhaust ourselves—exhaust ourselves against the current of history. That is being demonstrated painfully day after day in Vietnam.

So let us learn these lessons. Let us begin a reevaluation of the policy that both parties have supported, a policy, as I have described in my address, of unlimited intervention without restraint. Let us begin to establish goals that are practical, within our means, and commensurate with our resources. We can do this and preserve our security.

We must bring an end to this period of incessant foreign warfare, because it is brutalizing the land. That is the appeal I make today.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, does not the Senator agree that the role of the United States should be to show, by example, what a free society, a self-governing society, can do for its people: get rid of poverty, get rid of crime, get rid of hunger, get rid of disease; and show to the rest of the world that such a free, self-governing society is more productive of human happiness and, therefore, more enduring than any totalitarian system?

Mr. CHURCH. The Senator is eminently correct—he states a proposition so simple that most of the country is blind to its truth. All we need do is go

back to the period of our own national birth, when we established the first republican form of government in modern times, asserting that its purpose was to assure life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for our own people. That is why the Federal Government was established. Out of that set of ideas we ignited a flame that spread throughout the world. Within the century that followed, not by the force of our armadas or the might of our arms, these ideas brought down or modified all the great reigning monarchies of Europe.

What better example is there of the truth of what the Senator from Alaska has said? Build a free society that the world can honor and respect and admire; then you will influence the shape of events in other lands.

But now that we possess great wealth and power, I must say to the Senator from Alaska, we are taking the course

of other powerful countries of the past which drank deeply from the cup of foreign adventure, and that course has always led, in the end, to disaster. Why we think there is going to be some sort of historic exception for the United States escapes me.

So I say to the Senator from Alaska that I honor the courageous service he has rendered his country over the years, sometimes as a very lonely voice, and I appreciate the contribution he has made this afternoon.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

#### PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE ON SECRETARY OF DEFENSE McNAMARA'S APPEARANCE BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to a point of personal privilege.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to respond to the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, and to set the record straight in regard to some of his misrepresentations.

In a statement that he released yesterday to the public, which is published in this morning's New York Times, he states:

Senator [Wayne] Morse, at the hearing on Aug. 6, specifically raised the question of a connection between our patrol and the South Vietnamese islands which had occurred some 2½ days prior to the attack on Maddox, and I responded that there was no connection. The two operations were separate and distinct. I informed you that our destroyers took no part whatsoever in the South Vietnamese operations. They did not convoy, support or back up the South Vietnamese boats in any way. As I stated during the hearing:

"As I reported to you earlier this week, we understand that the South Vietnamese sea force carried out patrol action around these islands and actually shelled the points they felt were associated with this infiltration."

"Our ships had absolutely no knowledge of it, were not connected with it; in no sense of the word can be considered to have backstopped the effort."

That statement remains entirely accurate. I can confirm today that neither the ship commanders nor the embarked task group commander had any knowledge of the South Vietnamese action against the two islands or of any other specific South Vietnamese operations against the North.

Since his testimony on August 6, 1964, he apparently has come to realize that some of the facts were known as to what did happen. So, yesterday, we heard a coverup statement, or an attempted coverup statement, on the part of the Secretary of Defense, when he said in his statement:

Higher naval commands were made aware of the operations by Commander, U.S. Military Assistance Command, Vietnam. In order to avoid mutual interference or confusion between our patrols and those operations.

I want to say in general comment first, Mr. President, that the Secretary of Defense's testimony before the committee on October 6, 1964, was inaccurate in