

THE VIETNAM CONFLICT: THE SUBSTANCE AND THE SHADOW

REPORT OF

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD

Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN

Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE

Senator J. CALEB BOGGS

Senator DANIEL K. INOUE

TO THE

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS
UNITED STATES SENATE



JANUARY 6, 1966

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1966

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

J. W. FULBRIGHT, Arkansas, *Chairman*

JOHN SPARKMAN, Alabama
MIKE MANSFIELD, Montana
WAYNE MORSE, Oregon
RUSSELL B. LONG, Louisiana
ALBERT GORE, Tennessee
FRANK J. LAUSCHE, Ohio
FRANK CHURCH, Idaho
STUART SYMINGTON, Missouri
THOMAS J. DODD, Connecticut
JOSEPH S. CLARK, Pennsylvania
CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island
EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, Minnesota

BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, Iowa
GEORGE D. AIKEN, Vermont
FRANK CARLSON, Kansas
JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Delaware
KARL E. MUNDT, South Dakota
CLIFFORD P. CASE, New Jersey

CARL MARCY, *Chief of Staff*
ARTHUR M. KUHLMAN, *Chief Clerk*

II

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

UNITED STATES SENATE,
OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,
Washington, D.C., January 3, 1966.

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In accord with a letter from the President dated November 7, 1965,¹ Senators Aiken, Muskie, Boggs, and Inouye joined me in a study mission to Europe and to Asia. The group was drawn in part from the Senate at large, rather than exclusively from the committee, because it seemed to me that it would be useful to add to a joint effort of this kind, the views of Members who could bring other perspectives to the study. In this connection, the contributions of Senators Muskie, Boggs, and Inouye were exceptional. Insofar as Senator Aiken is concerned, he also provided not only a bipartisan strength to our purposes, but his great wisdom and judgment and his knowledge based on a long Senate and committee experience.

The mission took us to France, Poland, the Soviet Union, Rumania, Ceylon, Burma, Thailand, Laos, Cambodia, Vietnam, Hong Kong, the Philippines, and Japan. Consideration was given to the inclusion of both Pakistan and India in the itinerary. It was decided that it would be inadvisable to include these two great countries, because the immediate difficulties with which they are beset over Kashmir are currently under active consideration before the United Nations, and it is the policy of the United States to support fully the efforts of that international body to alleviate these difficulties. In the circumstances and in view of the nature of the group, we did not wish by our presence even to imply otherwise. To avoid any possible misunderstanding, therefore, we proceeded by a longer route from Bucharest to Aden and across the Indian Ocean to Ceylon, making courtesy calls en route in Riyadh and Taiz.

On this mission, which took us more than 30,000 miles in over 30 days, we met with many of our own officials abroad and with officials of other governments. We went not to propound but to ask, to listen, and to note. To the extent that we spoke, it was to stress the essential unity of the Nation, irrespective of party or personal view in matters which affect the Nation in its relations with other nations. We emphasized the deep concern of the President and the people for peace, and the profound preference which this Nation has for the works of construction over those of destruction. We reiterated the deep and firm commitment of the United States to a just resolution of the conflict in Vietnam.

¹ See app. I.

We were at all times correctly and courteously received and, on occasion, with very great warmth. Conversations with the officials of other governments were invariably frank, often animated, but never personally discourteous even where our points of view differed most markedly. Almost without exception, officials put their cards on the table. We did the same.

Reports covering the situation in Vietnam and on other aspects of the mission were submitted to the President on December 19, 1965, the day following my return to Washington. Subsequently, these were discussed when I met with Secretaries Rusk and McNamara. A report reflecting the joint observations and conclusions of the group as the situation appeared to us in November-December 1965 is now submitted herewith to you as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The situation in Vietnam and its worldwide ramifications constitute the gravest international problem which has confronted the United States in many years. In connection therewith, the forces of the United States in Vietnam (under Gen. William C. Westmoreland) are performing a profound service at great personal sacrifice on behalf of the Nation. It is essential that the full dimensions of the Vietnamese problem be explored and considered as thoroughly and as widely as practicable in present circumstances. It was in the hope that a constructive contribution will be made to this exploration and discussion, that this report was prepared for the use of the committee and the Senate. There has also been included, as an appendix to this report, a study made public by a similar Senate group on a previous presidential mission 3 years ago.² It may help to provide a useful perspective for the current situation in Vietnam.

I should like to note before closing a matter of special interest to the committee. The Ambassadors and the officers of the Department of State abroad were immensely helpful to the mission. Administrative arrangements for the group were exceptionally effective and efficient. The knowledge, understanding and diplomatic skills of the embassy staffs which were placed at our disposal were generally outstanding in character. And the cooperation of the Defense Department, not only in providing efficient transportation but in many other ways, was of the greatest value to us.

The group had as escort from the Department of State, Minister Francis E. Meloy, Jr., Mr. W. O. Trone, Director of the Office of Operations, Department of State, and Mr. Paul Kelly. The Department of Defense provided the services of Maj. Gen. Charles R. Roderick, Col. Frank Goss, and Lt. Col. George L. J. Dalferes. The assistance of these men was highly effective in every respect and of the greatest value to the group.

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

² See app. II.

CONTENTS

	Page
Letter of transmittal.....	III
A. Vietnam: The substance of war.....	1
B. Vietnam and the nations of Asia.....	8
C. The Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.....	10
D. Communist China.....	11
E. Concluding comments.....	11
Appendixes:	
Appendix I: Letter from President Lyndon B. Johnson to Senator Mike Mansfield, November 7, 1965.....	15
Appendix II: Vietnam and southeast Asia, report of Senator Mike Mansfield, Senator J. Caleb Boggs, Senator Claiborne Pell, and Senator Benjamin A. Smith, 1963.....	17

THE VIETNAM CONFLICT: THE SUBSTANCE AND THE SHADOW

A. VIETNAM: THE SUBSTANCE OF WAR

1. Introductory

The most important new factor in the war in Vietnam has been the introduction of large numbers of U.S. troops into South Vietnam and their direct entry into combat. This augmentation of the U.S. military role in Vietnam was a response to a near-desperate situation early in 1965. There is no question that the Government of Vietnam in Saigon was faced with a rapidly deteriorating position at that time.

After the assassination of Ngo Dinh Diem, repeated coups had weakened the cohesiveness of the central authority and acted to stimulate public disaffection and indifference to the war. At the same time, there was a greatly accelerated military drive by strengthened Vietcong forces. Their control expanded over large areas of the country, particularly in provinces adjacent to the western borders. Communications and transportation between population centers became increasingly hazardous, except by Vietcong sufferance. In short, a total collapse of the Saigon government's authority appeared imminent in the early months of 1965.

U.S. combat troops in strength arrived at that point in response to the appeal of the Saigon authorities. The Vietcong counter response was to increase their military activity with forces strengthened by intensified local recruitment and infiltration of regular North Vietnamese troops. With the change in the composition of opposing forces the character of the war also changed sharply.

2. Military forces of the Government of Vietnam

The Government of Vietnam now has approximately 635,000 men under arms. Of this number, however, only about 300,000 are regular troops of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines, with about 88 percent being Army troops. A general reserve of six airborne battalions and five marine battalions is equipped to fight anywhere in the country.

The Vietnamese Government has six fighter-bomber squadrons. It also has a small navy, composed of sea, river, and coastal forces.

In the total of 635,000 men there are also regional forces of about 120,000 men which act as a constabulary in the 43 Provinces. Each Province chief, who has a military as well as a civil capacity, has a number of regional force companies under his command. Popular forces number about 140,000. Lightly armed, this group is recruited as a rule from local youth to act as defenders of villages and hamlets. A civilian irregular defense group is recruited by the Vietnamese Special Forces. It numbers about 25,000 and is posted in border areas for patrol purposes. Finally, there is a national police of about 50,000 men.

The total of 635,000 men in all categories is expected to be expanded in the current year, although a substantial increase is not anticipated. The sources of expanded recruitment are not great and, in any event, are shared with the Vietcong. Moreover, a high desertion rate continues, despite determined efforts to reduce it.

3. *U.S. and international forces in Vietnam*

In 1962, U.S. military advisers and service forces in South Vietnam totaled approximately 10,000 men. This number had increased by May of 1965 to about 34,000. At that time the American force was still basically an advisory organization. Americans, in regular combat units, were not yet engaged on the ground. U.S. helicopter companies were in use but only to supply tactical transportation to regular Vietnamese units and the U.S. jet fighter-bombers in the country with the exception of two or three squadrons of aircraft were not yet engaged in support of the Vietnamese Armed Forces.

By December 1965, however, there were approximately 170,000 U.S. troops in South Vietnam. Additionally, there were about 21,000 soldiers and marines from the Republic of Korea an infantry battalion and a battery of artillery, comprising some 1,200 men, from Australia, and a New Zealand artillery battery of about 150 men.

The augmented U.S. ground forces were composed of two Army divisions, the 1st Infantry Division and the 1st Air Cavalry Division, and two separate brigades, the 1st Brigade, 101st Airborne Division, and the 173d Airborne Brigade. The Australian and New Zealand troops were attached to the latter group. A full U.S. Marine division reinforced by a separate regiment was in Vietnam with the support of six Marine fighter-bomber squadrons.

The small Vietnamese coastal force was augmented by a number of U.S. naval ships and Coast Guard vessels. The U.S. 7th Fleet was off the Vietnamese coast. Planes from its carriers were active in the air campaign against North Vietnam. They were also reinforcing the U.S. Air Force and Vietnamese fighter-bomber squadrons in operations in South Vietnam.

Ten U.S. Air Force and Marine fighter-bomber squadrons were operating from five jet airfields in Vietnam; a sixth field was under construction. B-52 bombers from Guam were providing additional air strength, concentrating on more remote Vietcong bases which had previously been immune to harassment or attack.

The magnitude of the expanded U.S. military effort has required a vastly enlarged support complex. Starting almost from scratch in May of 1965, a logistic system has been built. There are four major logistic support areas. One is in the Saigon region, including Bien Hoa and Vung Tau. The other three are located along the coast, at Cam Ranh Bay, at Qui Nhon in Binh Dinh Province, and at Da Nang. The rapid infusion of American forces has strained the facilities of the new logistic system to the utmost, with long delays in unloading and moving equipment not unusual. There have also been and still are shortages of important items of supply despite efforts to eliminate these shortages.

4. *Relationship of United States and Vietnamese forces*

From the point of view of American policy and practice, the war itself remains a Vietnamese war. The American command empha-

sizes that U.S. forces in Vietnam are there to support the Vietnamese and their Armed Forces in the effort to resist aggression by infiltration from the north and terrorism and subversion from within. Vietnamese sovereignty and the paramount role of the Vietnamese are meticulously respected and the supporting nature of the U.S. role is stressed.

There is no combined or unified command of the international forces in Vietnam. United States and Vietnamese forces work together through coordination and cooperation. The commander of the U.S. forces maintains close liaison with the Vietnamese Minister of Defense and the Chief of the Joint General Staff. Strategy and plans are devised together. Parallel instructions are then issued to the respective commanders through corps and division to regimental level. In the execution of an operation a joint command post is set up or liaison officers are exchanged and terrain is apportioned for tactical areas of operation. According to American military commanders these arrangements have proved to be practical and workable.

5. *Vietcong-North Vietnamese forces*

In December 1965, the best available estimates placed Vietcong strength in South Vietnam at 230,000 men. This figure is double that of 3 years ago. Total Vietcong strength, apparently, is steadily increasing despite the serious casualties which these forces have suffered during the past few months.

Of the present total, approximately 73,000 are main force soldiers, including 14,000 regular PAVN (People's Army of North Vietnam) troops from North Vietnam. The Vietcong forces also include about 100,000 militia, some 17,000 support troops who operate along lines of communication, and approximately 40,000 political cadres. It is estimated that the Vietcong, through local recruitment in the south and infiltration from the north, have the capability of a substantial increase in their numbers within a short period of time.

Infiltration of men from North Vietnam through Laos has been going on for many years. It was confined primarily to political cadres and military leadership until about the end of 1964 when North Vietnam Regular Army troops began to enter South Vietnam by this route. It is anticipated that with the multiplication of routes through Laos the rate of infiltration is likely to increase threefold from the present estimated 1,500 per month. The monsoon, which earlier was considered to be of great significance in its effect on the reinforcement capabilities of the Vietcong as well as on the ability of both sides to prosecute the war, has proved in experience to be of minor consequence if, indeed, of any consequence at all.

6. *Current state of the war*

By November 1965, American troops were directly involved in battle to a much greater degree than at any other time in the history of the Vietnamese conflict. At the same time, the intensity of the war itself reached a new high. The Vietcong initiated 1,038 incidents during the last week of November and the total number of incidents which had increased steadily throughout 1965, reached 3,588 in that month. These incidents involved armed attacks up to regimental strength as well as terrorism and sabotage of various kinds and antiaircraft fire against U.S. aircraft. In the later months of 1965 the trend was toward larger attacks, except in the Mekong Delta where there were numerous small-scale actions.

With the increase in the intensity of the conflict, there were increased numbers of casualties among all participants. In the month of November 1965, alone, 469 Americans were killed in action, a figure representing about 35 percent of all Americans killed in action in the war until that date. In addition 1,470 Americans were listed as wounded and 33 as missing. During the same month the South Vietnamese Army reported 956 soldiers killed in action, 2,030 wounded, and 355 missing. The Vietcong, for their part, are estimated to have lost 5,300 men killed in the month and, in addition, 595 were taken prisoner. Many of these casualties were regulars of the North Vietnamese Army.

7. *The security situation in South Vietnam*

The presence of U.S. combat forces has acted to arrest the deterioration in general security in Government-controlled parts of South Vietnam. It has also improved the ability of the Vietnamese Government to hold Saigon, the strategic heart of the country, the coastal bases, and certain other key areas in the country. In the latter connection, it should be noted that a strategic route (19) from the coast to the western highlands has been reopened for convoyed ground traffic to Pleiku, a major military strong point in the western highlands. On certain other roads, an improvement in security is also reported.

8. *Vietcong reactions*

Faced by a blunting of their military efforts, the Vietcong have reacted strongly to the new situation. Beginning in June an estimated 1,500 North Vietnamese troops per month have entered South Vietnam through Laos and this number is rapidly increasing. The estimates are that at least seven regiments of regular troops from North Vietnam are now in the country with more on the way. At the same time the Vietcong have in recent months greatly stepped up the recruiting, induction, and training of South Vietnamese in the densely populated delta region. They have increased their small-scale attacks in that area, aiming apparently at isolated outposts and at demoralizing the regional and popular forces as well as harassing lines of supply and communication.

The stepped-up activity of the Vietcong in the countryside has been paralleled by an effort on the part of the Government forces to strengthen their control over the population in the base areas and their immediate environs. These base areas themselves are held in some force. At the U.S. Marine base at Da Nang, for example, the perimeter of security has been pushed out about 10 miles. The bulk of the U.S. Marine forces, however, is now preoccupied in defense within that perimeter. Nevertheless, it is still possible for the Vietcong to bypass the defenders and penetrate the area in sporadic hit-and-run raids. Communications between the base areas along the coast are still subject to Vietcong ambush and attack.

In Saigon, heavily defended as it is, the rattle of automatic weapons fire or the explosion of mortar shells in the outskirts of the city are not uncommon sounds by day or by night. Vietcong ability to carry out terroristic attacks within the city itself is from time to time made evident. Indeed, it is considered by some that Saigon with its many vulnerabilities to sabotage and terrorism and Hanoi with its exposure to air attack are mutual hostages, one for the other.

9. *Impact of increased American forces on the Vietnamese*

The arrival in Vietnam of American combat troops in large numbers has had an immediate positive psychological effect on Government-held areas. Not only has there been an improvement of morale in the Government and the Armed Forces, there has also been a return of confidence among Vietnamese civilians. This is especially true in Saigon where the increased American presence is taken as insurance against an imminent collapse of the existing structure.¹ Politically and commercially minded Vietnamese, seeing that the United States had so far committed itself, have found renewed courage and confidence.

Of great significance is the fact that there has been a period of Government stability in Vietnam following the arrival of additional U.S. troops. This stability is more essential than ever for the maintenance of public confidence after the debilitating consequences of the repeated coups which followed the assassination of President Diem. It is also vital for the effective prosecution of the war and the formulation and carrying out of social, economic, and political reform programs.

10. *The government of Gen. Nguyen Cao Ky*

The new leadership in Government which is drawn largely from military circles, is young and hopeful, but with little knowledge of politics. Gen. Nguyen Cao Ky, the Prime Minister, recognizes that a purely military solution to the problems of Vietnam is not possible. Security and social and economic reform, in his view, must proceed hand in hand in order to gain the support of the people.

The new leaders express the intention of moving toward some form of representative civilian government, taking into account the history and needs of the Vietnamese people. They speak of a consultative assembly to prepare the way for a constitution and hearings throughout the country on the constitution with a view to a referendum at the end of 1966. The referendum, according to their concepts, would be followed by elections to a legislative body by the end of 1967, if by that time elections can be held without intimidation in as much as two-thirds of the country. Some observers believe that, perhaps, not more than 25 percent of the villages under Government control in South Vietnam would be free from intimidation at an election at the present time.

In addition to prosecuting the war, the Government of Vietnam is seeking to initiate measures to protect and improve the welfare of the population. With the indispensable assistance of U.S. aid, food and other commodities are being imported into the country to meet current needs and to insure that the price of staples such as rice, fish, and canned milk remain within the reach of the people.

11. *The pacification or civic action program*

A new effort is also being made to bring the people of the villages into closer and firmer rapport with the Government. In the period following the fall of the government of Ngo Dinh Diem, the so-called pacification or civic action program which brought government, police, economic, and social organization into the hamlets, was allowed in large

¹ The illustrative story is told of the Vietnamese professional man who sold his house in Saigon in January of 1965 in despair over the deteriorating situation, only to buy back the same house later in the year, following the arrival of American troops, for twice the price at which he had sold it.

measure to lapse. Due to subsequent changes of government, there were eventually only a very few people left to carry on this work. Military necessity required the Government to concentrate on attempting to stop Vietcong military advances.

The present Government is once again seeking to create an organization to carry out a program of pacification or civic action. Screening the cadres left from the programs of previous governments, a basic group has been selected. Together with additional groups to be trained it is expected that a total number adequate to meet the needs for pacification teams in the priority areas chosen by the Government of Vietnam will be available by the end of 1966.

The present plan for pacification work is regarded by observers as more thorough and more realistic than previous efforts. It contemplates teams remaining in each village for an initial period of several months with subsequent followups over a period of at least 1 year. The belief is that the inhabitants can generally be sufficiently won over to the side of the Government in that period and conditions established where elections for local officials can be held. It is realized, however, that even then the work cannot be considered as completed.

12. Other programs

In addition to giving strong support to the pacification program, the new Government has numerous other plans to better the lot of the people. There are, for example, projects to improve the pay of the troops, construct low-cost housing, and redistribute land. In this connection a program has been inaugurated to give 700,000 acres of land to 180,000 farmers. It is generally recognized that Government programs of this kind, many of which have been attempted in various forms before, will require years before any substantial political effect upon the population can be anticipated.

13. Economic aspects of the conflict

The Government of Vietnam has also instituted a resources control program in an effort to restrict the Vietcong's ability to get the things they need to carry on the war. In most parts of Vietnam, which is a naturally rich and productive country, it is not difficult to obtain enough food to support life. This is particularly true in the fertile and densely populated delta of the south with its great rice fields and network of interconnecting canals. The Vietcong obtain money by many means, including taxation and extortion, and they can and do use these funds to purchase food in the countryside and medicines in district and provincial towns. The Vietcong can and do attack trucks and convoys on the roads and seize the weapons, ammunition, and the other goods which they may carry.

By a system of rationing, identity cards, and resource control, including checkpoints and mobile control teams, however, the Government hopes to stop the Vietcong from obtaining key commodities such as food and medicines in key areas such as the highlands, which is a deficit region. In other areas it is hoped that the system will make goods less available for the Vietcong and more difficult for them to obtain.

It must be said that there is also a reverse side to this picture. The Vietcong, operating in the countryside, have the ability to restrict the flow of food to cities and population centers such as Saigon. Vegetables, for example, come to Saigon from Dalat in the central highlands.

Sugar also comes to Saigon along the same road which is controlled in part by the Vietcong. It is common knowledge that commodities reaching Saigon's markets by road from the Dalat area have paid a tax to the Vietcong before reaching the city and that unless the tax is paid they will not reach the city. The fact is plain: Much of Saigon's indigenous food and commodity supply depends on the sufferance of the Vietcong and on payments to them.

The ravages of war and terrorism, however, are taking a toll of the country's productive capacity. Rice fields and rubber plantations in areas that are being bombed and fought over no longer produce their contribution to feed the people and to nourish the economy. Fledgling enterprises in outlying areas, cut off from supplies and from markets by interrupted communications, wither and fail.

Along with increased Vietcong activity in the delta in recent months, there has been growing Vietcong restriction on the flow of rice from that region to the Saigon market. The result is that Vietnam, a rice surplus region, in 1966, will have to import at least 300,000 tons of rice from abroad under U.S. aid programs to feed the population of the cities and towns under the Government's control.

Although, as has been said, the arrival of large numbers of American troops has gone far to restore business confidence in the cities of Vietnam, there have been adverse effects as well. One of these is the creation of a labor shortage, particularly among skilled workers, as men have been drained away from normal areas of employment to the base complexes and other regions where construction projects are being pushed to create the logistic structure and other facilities required by the American forces.

Inflationary pressures resulting from the war and the changed U.S. role have thus far been kept within bounds. Saigon itself, however, has an overstimulated atmosphere of almost hectic prosperity, in some respects, as the impact of spending by American servicemen and the effect of U.S. defense expenditure make themselves felt. There are also the beginnings of the rumblings of personal discontent and antagonism which generally characterize the reaction in any nation to the sudden infusion of a large body of foreign forces.

14. Summation

In sum, the overall control of the country remains about the same as it was at the beginning of 1965. It is estimated that about 22 percent of the population is under Vietcong control and that about 18 percent inhabits contested areas. About 60 percent of the population in the country is, at present, under some form of government control, largely because of its hold on Saigon and other cities and large towns.

The population of the cities has been augmented by a great number of refugees. Hundreds of thousands in number, they are for the greater part composed of people who have fled to the cities in an effort to escape the spreading intensity of the war. In this sense, they are unlike the refugees who came from North Vietnam in 1954. These earlier refugees consciously chose to leave their ancestral homes and come south permanently, rather than accept a Communist regime. The new refugees, for the most part, are believed merely to be waiting for an end to the fighting in order to return to their homes and land.

The Vietcong have stepped up sabotage, terrorism, and hit and run attacks in the Government-held areas which are, principally, cities

and major towns and indeterminate, but limited, extensions outward from them. Harassment by United States and Vietnamese air attack and airborne forces has increased in the firmly held Vietcong areas of South Vietnam which are almost entirely rural. And, of course, North Vietnam has been brought under air attack.

In general, however, what the Saigon government held in the way of terrain in the early months of 1965 (and it was already considerably less than was held at the time of the assassination of Ngo Dinh Diem), is still held. What was controlled then by the Vietcong is still controlled by the Vietcong. What lay between was contested at the outset of 1965 and is still contested.

B. VIETNAM AND THE NATIONS OF ASIA

Other nations of Asia generally view the conflict in Vietnam with great concern. Those countries nearest to Vietnam see in the spread and increasing intensity of the warfare a heightened danger of a spillover into their territory. They sense that the longer the conflict continues and the more it escalates the greater becomes this danger to themselves. Furthermore, they fear the effect upon their own future should all of Vietnam become a Communist state.

Laos already finds itself deeply although unwillingly involved on the fringes of the war in Vietnam. The fighting within Laos, which continues despite the 1962 Geneva Agreement, is now a closely interwoven part of the Vietnamese struggle. The connection is most pronounced in the eastern part of Laos which lies within the control of the Communist Pathet Lao forces. This region, the so-called Laotian panhandle, is a natural infiltration route for men and supplies from North Vietnam into South Vietnam. A long border abutting on South Vietnam makes it possible for troops and equipment from Hanoi to reach far south through Communist-controlled territory in Laos with a minimum of risk before being diverted across the border into South Vietnam by any number of lateral communications routes. New roads have been constructed through this mountainous terrain along which men and supplies can pass, for the most part undetected, protected as they are in some regions by double canopies of jungle foliage. These roads are not easily susceptible to aerial interdiction.

Cambodia, in a different manner and to a much lesser extent than Laos, is already directly touched by the fighting in Vietnam. There are repeated charges that Cambodian territory is being used as a base for Vietcong operations. That is possible in view of the remoteness and obscurity of the border but there is no firm evidence of any such organized usage and no evidence whatsoever that any alleged usage of Cambodian soil is with the sanction much less the assistance of the Cambodian Government. Prince Sihanouk responded immediately to a recent allegation that the Cambodian port of Sihanoukville is being used to transship supplies to the Vietcong by calling for an investigation by the International Control Commission which was set up under the Geneva Accords of 1954.

Cambodia's overwhelming concern is the preservation of its national integrity which, in times past, has been repeatedly violated by more powerful neighbors and is still subject to occasional forays from a minor dissident movement (the Khmer Serai) which has

been allowed to base itself in the neighboring nations. Cambodia seeks recognition and respect of its borders by all parties to the conflict. It asks to be left to live in peace so that it may concentrate on its own problems and internal development. The Cambodians have made great internal progress, largely through their own efforts supplemented by a judicious use of aid from the United States in the past and from other nations both in the past and at the present time. They have a peaceful and productive nation with an intense sense of national unity and loyalty to Prince Sihanouk.

The fact that fighting in South Vietnam has raged close to the border and there have, as a result, been occasional border incursions and bombing of Cambodian territory has caused the deepest concern to the Cambodian Government. Cambodia can be expected to make the most vigorous efforts to resist becoming directly involved in the struggle surging through South Vietnam and to repel to the best of its capability direct and organized invasions of its territory which may stem from the mounting tempo of the war.

Thailand, the only country on the southeast Asian mainland directly allied with the United States, seeks to cooperate with the United States as an ally while avoiding a spillover of the war into Thai territory. That course is becoming increasingly difficult to maintain. Thailand has a large number of North Vietnamese living in its northeast region bordering on Laos. This element retains an affinity for Hanoi and is susceptible to its influence. Moreover, in the recent past Peiping has brought to the forefront a Thai leader in exile and has increased the intensity of its propaganda attacks against Thailand. Reports of terrorism and sabotage in the northeast of Thailand are increasing.

The Vietnamese war was brought very close to Thai territory in November 1965. A Pathet Lao military thrust toward the Laotian town of Thakkek on the Mekong, which was supported by North Vietnamese troops, was fortuitously driven back by Government forces. Had it not been repelled, the war, in effect, would have reached the point where it made direct contact with Thailand's frontier.

Nations in Asia more geographically remote from the war in South Vietnam are nonetheless conscious of the dangers to the entire area as the struggle in South Vietnam becomes more prolonged and ever more intense. These countries range from neutral and nonaligned Burma through such allies of the United States as the Philippines and Japan.

Each of the countries of Asia has its own internal problems. Each has varying degrees of internal stability. Each has as a principal concern, the avoidance of direct involvement in the Vietnamese conflict. With the exception of Korea, there is little likelihood of substantial material help from these sources in providing military assistance in South Vietnam. Others are either unwilling or reluctant to become involved in a military sense or are unable to do so because of inner difficulties or the broader strategic requirements of the Asian situation. Even with respect to Korea, it is obvious that any withdrawal of forces for use in Vietnam creates new problems of military balance as between North and South Korea. It should not be overlooked that peace in the Korean peninsula is still held together only by a tenuous truce.

The Asian nations generally are aware of their own relative powerlessness to influence the main course of events, or, in the final analysis, to control their own destinies should the conflict in Vietnam ultimately

develop into a confrontation between the United States and Communist China with all that such an eventuality might imply for the peace of Asia and the world. In Japan, for example, there is a deep anxiety over the possible consequences to that nation of such a confrontation if it should materialize. The memory of the escalation of the limited Manchurian incident of 30 years ago into a seemingly interminable war on the mainland of China is not yet dead in Japan.

To sum up, then, the nations of Asia recognize the immense importance to themselves of what is transpiring in Vietnam. But they also recognize their own limitations in the face of it. Their immediate preoccupation, in any event, is with their own internal problems and development. Throughout the area there is a continuing interest in activities involving peaceful cooperation for economic development. The Peace Corps is generally welcomed wherever it operates and, notably, in the Philippines. The new Asian Development Bank is being launched with considerable enthusiasm. The Mekong project has warm support throughout the region and considerable interest in Cambodia, which is central to the concept.

It is clear that none of the nations of the area desires the domination of either China or the United States. Given a choice, it is doubtful that any nation would like to see the influence of the United States withdrawn completely from southeast Asia. Generally speaking, the nations of the area welcome peaceful ties with the United States and our participation in the development of the region if that participation does not become overwhelming.

C. THE SOVIET UNION AND EASTERN EUROPE

Without exception the Soviet Union, Poland, and Rumania give full and firm support to the position of Hanoi and the Vietcong. They are quick in their denunciation of the U.S. role in South Vietnam and vehement against U.S. bombing in North Vietnam.

Part of this solidarity is undoubtedly derived from ideological affinities. Whatever attitudes they may manifest toward Communist China, and they vary, it is clear that responsibility for the continuation of the conflict in Vietnam is assigned to the United States and this is regarded as an impediment to improvement in political relations with this country.

There is no reason to believe that the Soviet Union, in present circumstances, sees its way clear or, in fact, is anxious to play a significant role to assist in bringing an end to hostilities in Vietnam. The Soviet Union has steadfastly refused to join with the United Kingdom, the other Cochairman of the 1954 Geneva Conference, in calling for a reconvening of that Conference. They have emphasized repeatedly in public statements as well as in other ways that they have no intention of taking an initiative for peace in Vietnam at this time.

The countries of Eastern Europe have reason for concern over the continuation of the conflict in Vietnam and its escalation. Some of these reasons have to do with their own national preoccupations and the situation in Europe. Both Poland and Rumania, for example, have a very substantial trade with the Western World and remain interested in increased trade with the United States should conditions permit. Both might well be disposed to make a contribution to a settlement of the Vietnam problem to the extent their capabilities permit but only should they see some possibility of success.

D. COMMUNIST CHINA

Behind the war in Vietnam, behind the fears and preoccupations of other Asian nations and through the attitudes of the Eastern European countries and the Soviet Union runs the shadow of Communist China.

Until now the Chinese Communists have not introduced their manpower directly into the conflict although they clearly recognize that the war may reach that point. They recognize, too, that the war may impinge upon China herself at some point and have begun to make preliminary preparations for that eventuality.

For the present, however, the Chinese appear to take the view that their direct intervention in Vietnam is not required since: (1) the war in South Vietnam is a people's war which the Vietcong are winning; (2) North Vietnam is successfully defending itself; (3) the more the United States escalates the war the higher our casualties will be and the more discouraged we will become; and (4) the United States cannot win, in any event, according to Chinese theories.

It is from Communist China that Hanoi and the Vietcong derive the bulk of their outside material support. It is from Communist China that there has also flowed encouragement of resistance to negotiation or compromise. As the war escalates and Hanoi becomes ever more dependent upon Chinese support, a dependence which Soviet aid at best only tempers, the likelihood also increases that North Vietnam will not be able to negotiate a settlement without at least the tacit consent of China. In fact, that point may already have been reached.

E. CONCLUDING COMMENTS

A rapid solution to the conflict in Vietnam is not in immediate prospect. This would appear to be the case whether military victory is pursued or negotiations do, in fact, materialize.

Insofar as the military situation is concerned, the large-scale introduction of U.S. forces and their entry into combat has blunted but not turned back the drive of the Vietcong. The latter have responded to the increased American role with a further strengthening of their forces by local recruitment in the south and reinforcements from the north and a general stepping up of military activity. As a result the lines remain drawn in South Vietnam in substantially the same pattern as they were at the outset of the increased U.S. commitment. What has changed basically is the scope and intensity of the struggle and the part which is being played by the forces of the United States and those of North Vietnam.

Despite the great increase in American military commitment, it is doubtful in view of the acceleration of Vietcong efforts that the constricted position now held in Vietnam by the Saigon government can continue to be held for the indefinite future, let alone extended, without a further augmentation of American forces on the ground. Indeed, if present trends continue, there is no assurance as to what ultimate increase in American military commitment will be required before the conflict is terminated. For the fact is that under present terms of reference and as the war has evolved, the question is not one of applying increased U.S. pressure to a defined military situation but rather of pressing against a military situation which is, in effect, open

ended. How open is dependent on the extent to which North Vietnam and its supporters are willing and able to meet increased force by increased force. All of mainland southeast Asia, at least, cannot be ruled out as a potential battlefield. As noted, the war has already expanded significantly into Laos and is beginning to lap over the Cambodian border while pressures increase in the northeast of Thailand.

Even if the war remains substantially within its present limits, there is little foundation for the expectation that the government of Vietnam in Saigon will be able, in the near future, to carry a much greater burden than it is now carrying. This is in no sense a reflection on the caliber of the current leaders of Vietnam. But the fact is that they are, as other Vietnamese Governments have been over the past decade, at the beginning of a beginning in dealing with the problems of popular mobilization in support of the Government. They are starting, moreover, from a point considerably behind that which prevailed at the time of President Diem's assassination. Under present concepts and plans, then, what lies ahead is, literally, a vast and continuing undertaking in social engineering in the wake of such military progress as may be registered. And for many years to come this task will be very heavily dependent on U.S. foreign aid.

The basic concept of present American policy with respect to Vietnam casts the United States in the role of support of the Vietnamese Government and people. This concept becomes more difficult to maintain as the military participation of the United States undergoes rapid increase. Yet a change in the basic concept could have a most unfortunate impact upon the Vietnamese people and the world at large. What is involved here is the necessity for the greatest restraint in word and action, lest the concept be eroded and the war drained of a purpose with meaning to the people of Vietnam.

This danger is great, not only because of the military realities of the situation but also because, with a few exceptions, assistance has not been and is not likely to be forthcoming for the war effort in South Vietnam from nations other than the United States. On the contrary, as it now appears, the longer the war continues in its present pattern and the more it expands in scope, the greater will become the strain placed upon the relations of the United States with allies both in the Far East and in Europe.

Many nations are deeply desirous of an end to this conflict as quickly as possible. Few are specific as to the manner in which this end can be brought about or the shape it is likely to take. In any event, even though other nations, in certain circumstances, may be willing to play a third-party role in bringing about negotiations, any prospects for effective negotiations at this time (and they are slim) are likely to be largely dependent on the initiatives and efforts of the combatants.

Negotiations at this time, moreover, if they do come about, and if they are accompanied by a cease-fire and standfast, would serve to stabilize a situation in which the majority of the population remains under nominal government control but in which dominance of the countryside rests largely in the hands of the Vietcong. What might eventually materialize through negotiations from this situation cannot be foreseen at this time with any degree of certainty.

That is not, to say the least, a very satisfactory prospect. What needs also to be borne in mind, however, is that the visible alternative at this time and under present terms of reference is the indefinite expansion and intensification of the war which will require the continuous introduction of additional U.S. forces. The end of that course cannot be foreseen, either, and there are no grounds for optimism that the end is likely to be reached within the confines of South Vietnam or within the very near future.

In short, such choices as may be open are not simple choices. They are difficult and painful choices and they are beset with many imponderables. The situation, as it now appears, offers only the very slim prospect of a just settlement by negotiations or the alternative prospect of a continuance of the conflict in the direction of a general war on the Asian mainland.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, November 7, 1965.

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MIKE: It would be helpful to have the firsthand observations of yourself and some of your Senate colleagues on the situation in various areas abroad. I have in mind, in particular, the state of our relations with nations in Eastern Europe, southeast Asia, and Vietnam, and such other areas as in your discretion you might see fit to include.

I anticipate that this mission would result in reports by yourself and your colleagues which would provide useful supplements to the flow of information which comes through the regular channels of the executive branch. Moreover, the mission would provide an excellent opportunity to emphasize abroad the unity of the U.S. Government in the pursuit of an equitable peace in Vietnam and stable and mutually satisfying relations with all nations similarly inclined.

I know your burdens have been heavy during the 1st session of the 89th Congress. Nevertheless, I do hope you will see your way clear to undertake this mission and I assure you of the full cooperation and assistance of the executive branch in carrying out its purpose.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

APPENDIX II

FEBRUARY 26, 1963.

VIETNAM AND SOUTHEAST ASIA

Report of Senator Mike Mansfield, Senator J. Caleb Boggs, Senator Claiborne Pell, and Senator Benjamin A. Smith to the Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Transmitted herewith is a report pursuant to a study mission abroad undertaken by Senators Boggs and Pell, former Senator Smith, and myself last fall in compliance with a request of the President.¹ The enclosed report which follows deals with the situation in Vietnam and southeast Asia. I should note that the group was in India at the height of the Sino-Indian military crisis and in the southeast Asian region when the revolt in Brunei erupted. We were afforded, thereby, an unusual opportunity to familiarize ourselves with both situations.

This is the fifth report growing out of the mission. As I wrote you in forwarding the group's first report to the committee,² I communicated directly to the President on December 26 our findings on the Berlin-European situation, the Sino-Indian dispute, and Vietnamese-southeast Asian developments. Additional observations pertaining largely to the administration of policies overseas were transmitted to the Secretary of State on January 7. With reference to the Peace Corps, the Director, Mr. Sargent Shriver, was apprised orally of certain findings on January 17.

The focus of the enclosed report is South Vietnam. In that nation the commitment of the United States is the most direct and deepest in southeast Asia, involving as it does about 12,000 Americans on dangerous assignment and public expenditures at an annual level of hundreds of millions of dollars. What transpires in Vietnam inevitably colors the course of U.S. policy throughout southeast Asia.

Writing in an individual vein, I should note that my recent visit to Vietnam was the fourth in a decade. I had previously traveled to that country in 1953, 1954, and 1955 and have watched, with interest, developments in that country in subsequent years.

I have a great admiration for President Ngo Dinh Diem which dates from his exceptional achievements in the transition to independence (1954-55). In that period his personal courage, integrity, determination, and authentic nationalism were essential factors in forestalling a total collapse in South Vietnam and in bringing a measure of order and hope out of the chaos, intrigue, and widespread corruption.

Nevertheless, it would be a disservice to my country not to voice a deep concern over the trend of events in Vietnam in the 7 years which have elapsed since my last visit. What is most disturbing is that Vietnam now appears to be, as it was then, only at the beginning of a beginning in coping with its grave inner problems. All of the current difficulties existed in 1955, along with hope and energy to meet them. But it is 7 years later and \$2 billion of U.S. aid later. Yet, substantially the same difficulties remain if, indeed, they have not been compounded.

¹ See appended copy of a letter from the President, dated Oct. 22, 1962.

² "Berlin in a Changing Europe," report to the Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, January 1963.

I wish to note in closing the exceptional contribution of the other members of the group to the work of the mission. Although not of the Committee on Foreign Relations, their participation was full, energetic, and indispensable. The report which follows is the product of our joint observations and effort.

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

VIETNAM AND SOUTHEAST ASIA

1. INTRODUCTORY

In the fall of 1962, Chinese forces moved out of Tibet in an assault on the Indian Army in the North East Frontier Agency (NEFA). The Chinese action was unexpected, militant, and relentless, and it carried deep into Indian territory, almost to the banks of the Brahmaputra River. Then the advance halted as suddenly as it had begun and the Chinese staged a unilateral withdrawal.

Ostensibly the action arose from a border dispute which for some time had been the subject of negotiations between Delhi and Peiping. But it also constituted the first unabashed use of Chinese military power in strength against an independent southern Asian neighbor in modern times.¹ The power was employed, moreover, in a most humiliating fashion against India, with which Peiping had assiduously cultivated friendly relations for some years. These unusual factors suggested that, beyond border considerations, there were other implications in the affair. It might well have been designed, as many observers believed, to discredit Indian leadership and to demonstrate to nations of southeast Asia that the new China could be ruthless or magnanimous but, either way, it was the power to be reckoned with in Asia.

A short time after the Sino-Indian clash, a second outbreak of violence occurred 2,000 miles to the south in Brunei. By contrast, this incident was associated not with a projection of outside power toward southeast Asia but with its recession from the region. To be sure, the Brunei revolt contained obscure inner regional implications, involving Malaya, Indonesia, and perhaps even the Philippines. The violence, however, came only after it was clear that the British intended to withdraw from remaining political responsibilities in southeast Asia by fostering a Malaysian federation of Malaya, Singapore, Brunei, Sarawak, and North Borneo.

These two contrasting incidents underscore the basic problem which southeast Asia has posed for U.S. policies for more than a decade. On the one hand, the Brunei incident foreshadows the completion of Western European political and military withdrawal from the region. On the other hand, the Sino-Indian clash points clearly to the possibility of a deeper projection of Chinese power into southeast Asia.

This latter possibility has existed, of course, for some time. Considerable Chinese Communist influence already is present, quite in addition to the large Chinese commercial communities which have long been established in southeast Asia. Heretofore, however, Peiping's influence has been diplomatic, ideological, economic, and only indirectly military, as in the case of aid to North Vietnam. But the Sino-Indian clash makes clear that it is now necessary for the southeast Asian nations to reckon with the enlargement of the Chinese role at any time to include the direct use of military power in a full modern revival of the classic pattern of Chinese imperial techniques in southeast Asia.

That such is the possibility serves to emphasize the hiatus of power and responsibility which has been left in southeast Asia by the Western European withdrawal. The small independent states, mostly successors to colonial regimes, have been unable to fill the breach out of their present capabilities. While these states have immense potential, they are still weak and much of their social structure is inadequate to the demands of stable and independent survival in the world of the 2d half of the 20th century.

It has been largely in compensation for this weakness that U.S. policies for southeast Asia have formed over the past decade. From the most limited and casual interest scarcely a dozen years ago, we have plunged heavily into the affairs of that region. It would be more accurate to say, perhaps, that we have

backed into the involvement. For it was the bitter conflict with the Chinese in Korea at the other end of Asia which directed our attention sharply to the southern flank of the continent. And it was largely out of the estimates of the military necessities of that conflict that we became immersed in southeast Asia.

Whatever the impetus, the commitment has already been very costly. In terms of aid, military and other, to southeast Asia since 1950, the volume has been in the neighborhood of \$5 billion through 1962.² The commitment has also involved the building of large aid and information structures and other administrative machinery in virtually every nation in the region. There was, for example, a total of about 180 U.S. military and civilian personnel in all of southeast Asia in 1950. Today the figure is in the neighborhood of 18,000.³

Further, the involvement led to our assuming the initiative in devising the Southeast Asia Treaty of 1954, which, in effect, pitted U.S. prestige against a Chinese advance into the region. This treaty, in turn, has led to our underwriting much of the cost of building and maintaining the SEATO defense structure.

The deepening involvement in southeast Asia carried us to the brink of war in North Vietnam in 1954 and again in Laos in 1961. More recently, it has included the assignment of substantial U.S. military forces to Thailand as well as to South Vietnam.

These facts are cited to stress the key position which the United States has come to occupy in the present situation in southeast Asia. For it is well to note the obvious at the outset: Any sudden withdrawal from this position—as, for example, by the sudden termination of aid programs—would open the region to upheaval and chaos. What would eventually emerge is uncertain but there is little doubt that, in present circumstances, the Chinese shadow on the northern periphery would lengthen over southeast Asia.

2. VIETNAM

Introductory

The deepening involvement of the United States has brought with it an accumulation of problems of foreign policy throughout southeast Asia. The critical focus, however, is Vietnam. It was in that country, while it was still under the control of France, that the first major U.S. commitment, largely of military aid, was made on the south Asian mainland.

Estimates of U.S. aid of all kinds to French Indochina through 1954 place the figure at about \$1.2 billion. In that year there occurred the French military disaster at Dienbienphu. The French then undertook a drastic reduction of their commitment in Vietnam, and the United States stepped into the breach. We entered, not as a replacement for France, but in support of indigenous Vietnamese nationalists who came to the fore in South Vietnam in the wake of the French withdrawal. From that time on, our policies became an indispensable factor in preventing the southern half of the country from falling to the Communist-led and Chinese-supported Vietminh revolutionary movement under Ho Chi Minh.

When Ngo Dinh Diem became President in 1955, the United States assumed the preponderant burden of outside support for the new Republic in South Vietnam. That relationship has continued to the present day. French influence is now largely confined to the spheres of commerce, investment, and culture. Other nations and international organizations make contributions of various kinds to Vietnamese development. But in matters of defense, internal stability, and economic support, the Vietnamese Government has come to depend almost wholly on the United States for outside assistance.

In terms of aid, the assumption of this preponderant responsibility has meant U.S. outlays of \$1.4 billion for economic assistance during the period of 1955-62. This economic aid has had some effect on Vietnamese development, but its primary purpose has been to sustain the Vietnamese economy so that it, in turn, could maintain the burden of a military establishment which has been upward of 150,000 men for the past half decade. On top of economic aid, there has also been provided large amounts of military equipment and supplies and training for the Vietnamese Army, Navy, and Air Force and for other defense purposes. For the period 1955-62 the total of aid of all kinds to Vietnam stands at more than \$2 billion.

¹ The figures include Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Burma, Thailand, Malaya, and Indonesia. They exclude the Philippines for which the total is \$525 million.

² Figures exclude the Philippines where, of course, there has long been a special and close relationship.

³ Although it caused deep concern, it is doubtful that the Chinese suppression of the Tibetan revolt was generally regarded in this fashion in India and in most of Asia.

Concluding comments

Those who bear responsibility for directing operations under the new strategy are optimistic over the prospects for success. Indeed, success was predicted to the group almost without exception by responsible Americans and Vietnamese, in terms of a year or two hence.⁶ The word "success" is not easy to define in a situation such as exists in South Vietnam.⁷ It would mean, at the least, a reduction of the guerrillas to the point where they would no longer be a serious threat to the stability of the Republic. If that point is reached, road and rail communications would once again become reasonably safe. Local officials would no longer live in constant fear of assassination. Rice and other major commodities would again move in volume to the cities. Development throughout the nation would be feasible. In short, the situation in South Vietnam would become roughly similar to that which eventually emerged in Malaya, and it is significant that a good deal of the present planning in South Vietnam is based upon the Malayan experience.

While such a situation would fall far short of the development of a "bastion" in South Vietnam, as the objective has been described on occasion, it would, nevertheless, be adequate to the survival of free Vietnam. It would not necessarily permit any great reduction in U.S. aid to the Vietnamese Government for some years but it would, at least, allow for a substantial reduction in the direct support which American forces are now providing to Vietnamese defense.

Great weight must be given to the views of those who have direct responsibility in the conduct of the new strategy. But even if success is envisioned in the limited sense described above, experience in Vietnam going back at least a decade recommends caution in predicting its rapid achievement. The new strategy is not entirely new. Elements of it have appeared over the past decade or more in various unsuccessful plans for resolving the guerrilla problem in Vietnam. What makes it new, perhaps, is that these elements have been interwoven, along with certain Malayan counterinsurgency tactics into a cohesive pattern which is supported more heavily than ever by the United States.

At this time, experience under the plan does not appear adequate for drawing the kind of optimistic conclusions with respect to it which have been drawn. The reported number of Vietcong casualties has gone up but, so too, has the estimated total of active Vietcong guerrillas. There are indications of improvements in the security of travel and in the movement of rice and other commodities through the countryside, but they are not yet conclusive. The newly strengthened armed services of the Republic, supported by U.S. forces, have scored some striking victories, but the Vietcong have recently shown a capacity to devise new tactics to counter the increased mobility and firepower of the Government's forces. Most frequently pointed to, has been the success in winning over the Montagnards to the Government. This could be an achievement of great importance in terms of its effect on Vietcong supply lines from north to south through the western mountains, but there are other supply lines by land and by sea. Moreover, the winning over of these scattered and quite primitive tribal peoples who, incidentally, were also won over in Laos, is not to be confused with the winning over of the Vietnamese peasants. The attitudes of the 15 million of Vietnamese in city and countryside, not those of the relatively small group of Montagnards, will ultimately determine the future of the Republic and its Government.

It is with the Vietnamese peasant, of course, that the "strategic hamlet" concept is primarily concerned. The concept is based on the assumptions that the Vietcong are sustained by the rural populace primarily out of fear, and in part, because the peasants are not aware of the superior social, economic, and political advantages which are offered by support of the Government and participation in its processes. Assuming the accuracy of the assumptions successful military action within the dimensions of the present effort is conceivable within the foreseeable future. But even to give an initial military victory meaning will require a massive job of social engineering. In the best of circumstances, outside aid in very substantial size will be necessary for many years. However, large such aid may be, it will not suffice without a great mobilization of selfless Vietnamese leadership in all parts of the country and at all levels.

⁶ More recent estimates as, for example, that of Adm. Harry Felt on Jan. 30, 1963, speak in terms of 3 years.

⁷ Admiral Felt defines victory as Government control of at least 90 percent of the rural population.

It is in this area that criticism and doubt of the new strategy finds most persistent expression. And it is not a service to the people of Vietnam or to this Nation to ignore or to make light of the existence of this criticism and doubt. The fact must be faced that the practices of political organization which have been relied upon most heavily to date in South Vietnam are, in many respects, authoritarian. While the plans for the strategic hamlets are cast in a democratic mold, it is by no means certain at this point how they shall evolve in practice. The evolution of the practices of the Central Government, to date, are not reassuring in this connection.

There are, to be sure, extenuating circumstances in Vietnam which counsel great patience. The situation which was inherited by the Republic in 1955 was one of great corruption, repression, and divisiveness. Apart from the relatively peaceful period 1955-58, moreover, there have been continuous guerrilla pressures designed to weaken the Government and bring about its collapse. In spite of the difficulties some significant political, economic, and social reforms have been essayed over the years. Indeed, the basic political form of the Central Government is democratic.

When that has been said, however, it is also necessary to note that present political practices in Vietnam do not appear to be mobilizing the potential capacities for able and self-sacrificing leadership on a substantial scale. Yet, such a mobilization is essential for the success of the new strategy and, hence, the survival of South Vietnam and of freedom within Vietnam.

It is most disturbing to find that after 7 years of the Republic, South Vietnam appears less, not more, stable than it was at the outset, that it appears more removed from, rather than closer to, the achievement of popularly responsible and responsive government. The pressures of the Vietcong guerrillas do not entirely explain this situation. In retrospect, the Government of Vietnam and our policies, particularly in the design and administration of aid, must bear a substantial, a very substantial, share of the responsibility.

We are now reshaping the aid programs in a fashion which those responsible believe will make them of maximum utility. We have intensified our support of the Vietnamese armed forces in ways which those responsible believe will produce greater effectiveness in military operations. This intensification, however, inevitably has carried us to the start of the road which leads to the point at which the conflict in Vietnam could become of greater concern and greater responsibility to the United States than it is to the Government and people of South Vietnam. In present circumstances, pursuit of that course could involve an expenditure of American lives and resources on a scale which would bear little relationship to the interests of the United States or, indeed, to the interests of the people of Vietnam.

If we are to avoid that course it must be clear to ourselves as well as to the Vietnamese where the primary responsibility lies in this situation. It must rest, as it has rested, with the Vietnamese Government and people. What further effort may be needed for the survival of the Republic of Vietnam in present circumstances must come from that source. If it is not forthcoming, the United States can reduce its commitment or abandon it entirely, but there is no interest of the United States in Vietnam which would justify, in present circumstances, the conversion of the war in that country primarily into an American war, to be fought primarily with American lives. It is the frequent contention of Communist propaganda that such is already the case. It should remain the fact that the war in Vietnam is not an American war in present circumstances. The words, "in present circumstances," are reiterated lest they be overlooked by those who may assume that there are no circumstances in which American interests might require even greater efforts in southeast Asia than those which we are now making.

S. LAOS

Background

In contrast to Vietnam, policies since 1961 have involved a lightening of commitment in Laos. As in Vietnam, the United States began to supply aid to Laos about a decade ago. In the early years, this burden was shared with the French. The aid went to a government headed by the then Prime Minister Souvanna Phouma whose internal policy succeeded in bringing about partial integration of the dissident Pathet Lao political faction headed by his half brother Prince Souphanouvong. Various U.S. aid and other activities increased in the kingdom. At the same time the French role declined. Once again, an internal political divisiveness appeared. Souvanna Phouma was compelled to withdraw from the

Government. There followed the coups and countercoups of 1959-60 which ended with an anti-Communist military government in control in the administrative capital of Vientiane. Its position, however, was challenged by two other factions, the Pathet Lao looking to the Vietminh of North Vietnam for support and by a group under a U.S. trained military officer, Kong Le, which advocated the return of Souvanna Phouma to the Government. By that time, U.S. agencies had assumed almost total responsibility for outside assistance to the military government in power in Vientiane.

The U.S. involvement

The growth in U.S. personnel in Laos and the overall cost of military and other aid to that country is indicative of the rapid engrossment of the United States in internal Laotian affairs. From a total of 2 American officials permanently stationed in all of Laos in 1953,⁸ the number of U.S. personnel rose to 850 at its height in 1961, a total which has now declined to 250. Through the years 1955-62, the United States provided over \$450 million in aid of all kinds to Laos.

In relation to the size and nature of the country this aid effort has been more intense than anywhere else in the world. Laos has only 2.5 million inhabitants, most of whom live in scattered and primitive villages. The land is located in one of the most remote regions of Asia and is largely covered with inaccessible jungle. A decade ago, political leadership on a national scale was nonexistent. Politics centered on the small group of intellectuals in the administrative capital of Vientiane, with ramifications reaching to the Royal Court in Luang Prabang. In 1953, the Laotian Army had two battalions in process of formation, less than a thousand men in all. There were also several hundred Pathet Lao dissidents under arms in the northeast. Outside its immediate neighbors and France, the existence of the Kingdom of Laos as a political entity was almost totally unknown abroad.

Yet scarcely a decade later, 100,000 Laotians were bearing arms. There were three major military factions engaged in conflict. The peaceful little Buddhist kingdom had become both a mirror reflecting the principal ideological stresses of our times and a bloody setting for international competition and intrigue on a massive scale. The transition had gone so far by the spring of 1961 that this Nation was compelled to consider seriously the possibility of a major and direct military involvement of U.S. forces in Laos, with overtones not unlike those of the Korean conflict.

There were, however, different characteristics in the Laotian situation which held some promise that a satisfactory solution to the problem could be achieved through negotiations. An international conference of 14 nations was convened in Geneva on the Laotian question in an effort to find a peaceful solution along lines which had long been advocated by Cambodia. Fourteen months later on July 23, 1962, an agreement was signed by the participating nations and a measure of peace returned to the embattled kingdom.

The current situation

The signatories of the Geneva accord of 1962 pledged themselves to respect the neutrality of Laos and not to interfere in its internal affairs. In addition, they promised to withdraw such military forces as they had in Laos and not to use the territory of Laos for interference in the internal affairs of other countries.

Concomitant with the Geneva agreement, the leaders of the three principal Laotian factions agreed to establish a unified government and administration under the King. The key figures in the latter settlement were Prince Souvanna Phouma, who, having served as the first Prime Minister of an independent Laos, became Prime Minister once again in the provisional government. He was joined in the new government by Prince Souphanouvong, his half-brother and the leader of the northern dissidents, and by Gen. Phoumi Nosavan, leader of a southern faction, who had had close ties with Thailand and United States executive agencies.

It is too soon to judge the efficacy of the international and Laotian accords which have been introduced into the situation. Insofar as the larger powers are concerned, U.S. forces have been withdrawn in keeping with the agreement. On the basis of available information, there are neither Soviet Russian nor Chinese forces in Laos in violation of the agreement. But there is every likelihood that Vietminh forces are still present among the Pathet Lao, and there are allegations that foreign elements are also active in other military factions.

⁸ In that year, the U.S. mission in Saigon was accredited for all three Indochinese states—Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos—and the U.S. Minister in Saigon paid only occasional visits to what was then a small legation in Vientiane.

Responsibility for determining that all foreign forces have been withdrawn from Laos rests with an International Control Commission. But this group of Indians, Canadians, and Poles has yet to carry out the responsibility, largely because of disagreement among the factions within the provisional government.

This is but one example of the difficulties besetting the government of Prime Minister Souvanna Phouma, which operates on the principle of unanimity of the three factions on matters of significance. There are many others. In particular, there is the problem of military demobilization. An agreement in principle has been reached to reduce the total of more than 100,000 men under arms in Laos to a national force of 30,000 and a police force of 6,000 drawn equally from the 3 major factions. As of the time of our visit, however, the agreement was still awaiting action. There have also been sporadic violations of the cease fire directed especially at Meo tribespeople in Pathet Lao controlled territory. And American planes have even been shot down while carrying relief supplies to isolated troops at the request of the Prime Minister.

Present U.S. policies

It is the policy of the United States, as expressed by the President, to support fully both the Geneva Agreement of 1962 and the efforts of Prime Minister Souvanna to establish a unified government in Laos. In keeping with the Geneva accords, the United States has already withdrawn its military aid mission personnel of 650 as well as 400 Filipino contract technicians.

At the same time, and at the request of the Prime Minister, the United States is supplying maintenance material to the armed forces under the control of General Phoumi and those responsive to Souvanna Phouma and has offered to assist in the orderly demobilization of the military when it becomes feasible. The United States is also continuing economic help to the Laotian Government, but the program is shifting from aid designed to permit the economy to sustain large military burdens to aid designed essentially to help in reconstruction and development, its stress on education.

In effect, U.S. Laotian policy is now acting to extricate this nation in an orderly fashion from the position of virtually sole outside support of the Government of Laos. A substantial reduction in the cost of Laotian policy has already been achieved by the withdrawal of the military aid mission. Aid going to Laos, moreover, has been reduced from a peak annual level of \$73 million in 1962 to the present level of about \$40 million.

While this reduction has been taking place, both France and Britain have agreed to share in new programs of economic reconstruction and development. So far, however, the French have been reluctant to assume any increase in responsibilities for military aid although France is the only power permitted by the Geneva accords to maintain military personnel in Laos.

The Soviet Union is also providing economic assistance to the provisional government, largely through a new commercial payments agreement. The Russians have also given Laos 10 aircraft for transport purposes. They have offered to build a hospital and a radio station and to provide credit for the construction of a large hydroelectric station.⁹

Concluding comments

Solution to the Laotian problem along the lines of international neutralization and national unification would be immensely difficult to achieve in the best of circumstances. Geographic and cultural factors in the situation are such as to encourage internal political fragmentation, and the sense of Laotian nationality is not widely developed among the populace. At the same time, ideological and predatory forces from without have historically tended to press in, as wedges, upon the region in which the little kingdom is located. To these obvious difficulties must be added lingering personal suspicions among the principal Laotian leaders, growing out of the experiences of the past.

What the outcome of the attempted solution will be is still very uncertain. Much hinges on the perseverance of Prince Souvanna Phouma, who as Prime Minister, has undertaken the principal responsibility. Alone among the present leaders he enjoys a stature which is larger than any faction. Much depends, too, on the willingness of France to play a significant part in providing disinterested assistance along with other outside nations. The tenuous peace, moreover, can be jeopardized if there is continued use of the facility which Laos

⁹ Other bloc countries and Communist China have also indicated interest in supplying aid. Gen. Phoumi Nosavan has visited Moscow and Peking on an economic aid mission, and a state visit by the King to the Soviet Union, the United States, and other Geneva participants is in progress.

offers for the transshipment of supplies from North Vietnam to the guerrillas in the south.

At this point, half year after the conclusion of the agreement, it must be counted an achievement that the military conflict remains substantially in abeyance. There have been, as noted, sporadic and isolated outbreaks of hostility. In general, however, the cease-fire has held. Moreover, major outside powers—notably the United States and the Soviet Union—have been giving substantial constructive aid to the provisional government of Prime Minister Souvanna Phouma.

On the other hand until the removal of all foreign forces from Laos is ascertained, until the authority of the unified government is generally accepted throughout the country, until the military forces are reduced and unified, the situation is bound to continue to hang in precarious balance. Attempts by either an outside nation or a faction within Laos to take advantage of the delicate transition could readily upset the situation, and might well bring about the abandonment of the effort at unification by Souvanna Phouma.

From the point of view of the United States, the situation is improved over that which prevailed when the Geneva Conference convened in 1961. At that time it was evident that only military intervention by SEATO, and primarily by U.S. military forces in considerable strength, in a war of uncertain depth and duration, offered the hope of preventing further deterioration in the position of the Vientiane Government.¹⁰ The Geneva Conference interposed a cease fire at that point, and the accords to which it led helped to forestall a deepening of U.S. involvement. At least the prospect now exists for a peaceful solution and that alone has already permitted a reduction in both aid costs and numbers of U.S. personnel in Laos.

4. OTHER SOUTHEAST ASIAN NATIONS

Outside Laos and Vietnam, the United States has commitments of varying depth with respect to the other countries of southeast Asia. The ties range from those of intimate alliance with the Philippines and to a lesser extent with Thailand to what might be termed friendly but essentially routine relations with Malaya and Burma. Relations with Cambodia are in an intermediate stage, in which U.S. aid is still a factor but one of declining significance.¹¹

Cambodia

Cambodia has developed into one of the most stable and progressive nations in southeast Asia. Apart from difficulties on its borders with Thailand and Vietnam, the kingdom enjoys complete peace and has registered a remarkable degree of economic and social progress in a decade. The leadership of Prince Sihanouk has been a key factor in this achievement. Abdicating the throne in order to participate actively in political affairs, the Prince has led the kingdom with an understanding of his people, with personal dedication, and with immense energy. He has maintained cooperative relations with France on the new basis of full national independence and equality and the French, today, continue to play a major part in the development of the country. Cambodia's contacts with the rest of the world have been greatly expanded and now encompass all of the major powers, Communist and non-Communist. In international circles, Cambodia has come to occupy an influential role among the smaller nations and was a prime mover in the convening of the Geneva Conference on Laos.

Outside assistance has been supplied to Cambodia by many countries, including Soviet Russia and Communist China. The United States has provided over \$300 million in assistance from 1955 to 1962. But the level has been declining, with Cambodian encouragement and concurrence.¹²

In spite of this assistance, however, Cambodian-United States relationships have encountered repeated difficulties from the outset. In retrospect, many of these difficulties appear superficial and avoidable. Whatever the difficulties, there is not and can hardly be any legitimate basis for a direct conflict with this remote Asian kingdom. There are, on the other hand, possibilities for deepening

¹⁰ Indications, at the time, were that only Thailand was prepared to use troops in significant numbers. The Philippines and other non-Asian members also offered small contingents. The forces of both Thailand and the Philippines, in any event, are heavily dependent on U.S. aid.

¹¹ Indonesia was not visited during the course of the mission.

¹² Several months ago, Prince Sihanouk stated that he was prepared for the complete termination of military aid.

cultural and economic contacts of mutual benefit. Indeed, Cambodia's inner progress and declining dependence on U.S.-grant aid point to a foreseeable termination of these programs, not in chaos but in a transition to an enduring relationship of mutual respect and mutual advantage. Finally, Cambodia's existence as an independent nation at peace with all of the great powers is of exemplary value if there is ever to be a durable and peaceful solution to the basic problems of southeast Asia.

It would appear very much in order for the United States to make every effort to understand the position of the Cambodians and to use its good offices in every practicable way to encourage settlement of the border difficulties with Thailand and Vietnam. Our military aid to these countries is undoubtedly a factor in exacerbating Cambodian fears and, hence, has intensified the difficulties which have characterized United States-Cambodian relations. However they may appear to us, these fears are very real to the Cambodians and exert a powerful influence on the course of its policies which of late have tended toward an extreme neutralism.

As noted, there has already been a decline in the level of one-sided U.S. aid to Cambodia and apparently, the Government of that country desires a continuance of this process. We should seek to meet this desire in an orderly fashion. At the same time, far greater emphasis should be placed on expanding more mutual relationships. Educational and other exchanges and the promotion of tourism, for example, can be of great value in this connection. The possibilities of stimulating investment and enlarged trade should also be fully explored. It would appear greatly in our interest to make every reasonable effort to encourage a transition from what has been a stormy and one-sided aid relationship to a new relationship of greater understanding and mutuality.

Thailand

In Thailand, as in Cambodia, there also exists the possibility for an effective evolution of relationships toward a more mutual basis. The setting for this evolution, however, differs considerably. Thailand is an ally in SEATO and less than a year ago, the United States landed combat forces of 5,000 men in that country when the conflict in neighboring Laos threatened to spill over.

The United States is presently committed to the defense of Thailand against outside aggression and is involved indirectly through various aid and other activities in supporting the present Government against internal subversion. U.S. aid has borne the principal cost of equipping modern forces of over 130,000 men in the Thai armed services and 30,000 militarized police. U.S. economic aid has been a major factor in the very considerable economic development which has ensued in recent years.

At the present time, Thailand is stable. Its economy is beginning to grow beyond the elementary stages into more advanced forms of modern development. Private foreign investment is coming into the country from Japan and Western Europe as well as from the United States.

Economic development is uneven and its effects are still only slightly felt by the 80 percent of the population which lives on the land. Nevertheless, it is an expanding process which is fanning out from Bangkok, with encouragement from the Government.

There are no immediate discernible threats to this progress. However, it should be noted that institutions of political change in Thailand have not been firmly established.¹³ Moreover, the northeast area of the country which contains about one-third of the population is vulnerable to infiltration by militant political opposition inasmuch as its populace is extremely poor and has traditionally been isolated from the Central Government.

As noted, the United States has borne the bulk of the cost of equipping the Thai armed forces. In the period 1961-62, a total of almost \$450 million in military aid was provided. We have also supplied economic aid to Thailand of almost \$300 million during the same period. At first much of this economic assistance was on a grant basis. More recently, however, increasing emphasis has been given to loans. Furthermore, there has been growing international participation. The International Bank has made loans for major undertakings and Germany has made significant loans. In the near future, a coordinated aid effort is

¹³ The present Government and predecessors have come to power by coups d'etat. These coups have been, on the whole, quick, and bloodless, but they do result in temporary and depressing confusion and can lead to new orientation of policy.

expected to be undertaken by the Development Assistance Committee which includes the United States, Western European countries, and Japan.

These trends toward diversification of the sources of assistance to Thailand, of course, are to be encouraged, inasmuch as they reduce what has heretofore been almost a complete dependence on U.S. aid. It should be noted, however, that these new efforts are for the most part those which promise tangible returns to the participants. The bulk of U.S. aid to Thailand over the years has been grant assistance for defense or defense-related purposes and continues in that form.

In view of the increasing availability of outside finance and Thailand's stable economic situation, it would appear that efforts to reduce and to phase out one-sided assistance from the United States would be in order. Here, too, as in Cambodia, possibilities may exist for a concurrent expansion of the relationships of greater mutuality; that is, in trade, investment, and cultural exchange. Certainly, such expansion should be encouraged vigorously by our Government. It should be noted in this connection that the Peace Corps is now operating, apparently, with wide acceptance and approval in Thailand. This is essentially a mutual undertaking in the sense that a substantial group of Americans—mostly young people—are helping to teach English and to impart other skills to Thais at the people-to-people level. At the same time they are afforded a unique opportunity to study closely another culture. The knowledge which the members of the Peace Corps gain in Thailand should contribute, on their return, to the pool of our national skills and to the enrichment of our own national life.

Burma

U.S. relations with Burma and Malaya are unique in southeast Asia in that an aid mission does not function in either country. Some years ago there was a regular aid program and administrative structure in Burma but it was withdrawn at the request of the Burmese Government. From time to time there have been reports of a revival of this mission. However, such aid as has since gone to Burma has been on an irregular basis for specific finite undertakings and has not involved the stationing of a large permanent U.S. aid group in Burma. Indeed, Burma's anxiety of late to adhere to a position of nonalignment with respect to the great powers has been so intense that it has even terminated the private assistance programs of the Asia and Ford Foundations and has curtailed educational exchanges under the Fulbright program.

Burma's position in southeast Asia is a precarious one. It sits astride remote communications routes between two giant neighbors—India and China. With both countries, it has had difficulties over the years largely because of Indian and Chinese minority communities in Burma. With Communist China it has also had the problem of a poorly demarcated common boundary of 1,200 miles although this problem apparently has now been resolved to the satisfaction of Burma.¹⁴

Relations with the United States while correct are subject to periodic strains. At the root of the difficulties, apparently, are the deep-seated Burmese fears of excessive foreign influence. These fears have a historic basis as well as a contemporary rationale in view of the effort which the nation is making to remain on a course of nonalignment.

The United States has not been alone in evoking these fears. The Soviet Union and other nations, from time to time, have stimulated them. It is significant that Burma is apparently more inclined to turn to a small country such as Israel for technical personnel to assist in modernization than to the larger powers.

Certainly, there is nothing in U.S. policies, and there ought not to be anything in their administration, to stimulate Burmese fears of excessive foreign influence. In view of the existence of this attitude, it is fortunate that the United States does not have an aid program in operation in Burma. It is obvious that a large group of Americans actively involved in many aspects of Burma's inner situation would probably intensify the almost obsessive concern with foreign influence. Indeed, there is even a serious question as to the advisability of stationing a U.S. aid representative in Burma as in now the case. His presence would appear to be superfluous and may actually contribute to an erroneous impression that this Nation is eager to resume a regular aid program in that country. Such residual or occasional aid matters as may require attention should arise only at Burmese initiative and surely they can be handled either

¹⁴ Oddly enough, the solution is along the demarcation of the historic McCarthy line, an extension eastward of the concept of the McMahon line, which China rejects for its border with India.

by the economics counselor of the U.S. Embassy in Rangoon or in Washington through the Burmese Embassy.

There is much to be said for encouraging the expansion of relationships of mutual advantage with Burma, as with other nations. Possibilities for enlarged commerce and cultural contacts on a mutual basis should be thoroughly explored, provided, of course, the Burmese are so inclined. The stress, however, ought to be on the concept of mutuality, in which aid in a one-sided pattern has no applicability.

The immediate problems which Burma faces are essentially internal. The country is one of immense natural wealth and great economic potential. If the Burmese people are to derive increasing benefit from this wealth what is needed, beyond economic modernization, is an end to the tendencies toward regional fragmentation and the development of institutions of orderly political change. Certainly it is in order for the United States to be sympathetic to efforts to solve these problems which have been in the forefront of Burmese affairs ever since the British withdrawal a decade and a half ago. But it is hardly in order for the U.S. Government or its agents to become deeply enmeshed through aid programs or other such activities in what is wholly a Burmese problem.

Malaya

The same general principle of strict noninvolvement which is indicated as a sound basis for U.S. policies on Burma would appear, also, to apply to the emerging Malaysian Federation of Malaya, Singapore, Brunei, Sarawak, and North Borneo. There has been, as noted, a serious outbreak of violence in Brunei in connection with this transition. Moreover, since a number of groups, conscious of racial or tribal separativeness, will have to be joined in the Federation, other inner resistances may well develop. There are also international repercussions with respect to the proposed Federation. Already a serious strain has developed in Malayan-Indonesian relations and there have been disagreements between the United Kingdom and the Philippines.

Regardless of what may develop, it would seem to be desirable for the United States to make every effort to continue to maintain the position of noninvolved cordiality which has characterized our relations with Malaya since that nation achieved independence in 1957. There are United States-Malayan commercial ties, mainly involving raw materials which are of great value to both countries. A U.S. Peace Corps unit is now functioning in Malaya. But there is no aid mission in the usual form. Nor does there exist any rationale for such a mission from the United States to the emergent Malaysian Federation. There are already substantial supplies of modern skills and capital available in Malaya, in Singapore, and elsewhere in the proposed Federation. What might be needed in addition can surely be drawn from other nations of the British Commonwealth, notably from the United Kingdom which retains an immensely important economic position in all parts of the proposed Federation. To be sure, there may be developmental undertakings in the region of tangible and mutual benefit to participants and the United States might find advantage in joining in such undertakings. But in Malaya or in an emergent of Malaysia there can be no justification for the kind of one-sided aid involvement which has appeared elsewhere in southeast Asia. Nor can there be any point in direct involvement in the political complications which are developing in connection with the formation of the Federation. To the extent that these complications may involve non-regional nations, they would appear to involve, in the first instance, the Commonwealth nations and beyond it, the United Nations. If there is any responsibility at all developing on the United States in this situation, it is a derivative responsibility arising from our membership in the United Nations and it should be discharged solely in our capacity as one nation among many in that body.

The Philippines

Our relationship with the Philippines has been and remains of key importance to the United States in the southeast Asian region. It is a relationship of more than half a century. It is a relationship which has evolved through deep and manifold experiences. The preservation of this relationship is of fundamental importance in terms of the security of both countries, in terms of mutual economic advantages and in terms of the cultural bridge which it provides in the western Pacific.

The United States has a treaty of mutual defense with the Philippines which includes provision for the basing of U.S. forces in the Philippines. Our economic relationships, as they are encompassed in the United States-Philippine trade

agreement, provide preferences to nationals of both countries, with the result that U.S. investments are very heavy in the Philippines and a large share of the trade of that country is with the United States. Culturally, there has long been a considerable interchange of nationals, with each group making a contribution in the other country. Moreover, there is presently functioning throughout the islands, the largest unit of the Peace Corps. It is concerned primarily with keeping up the standards of English teaching. In the process, however, the tradition of United States-Philippines friendship is being reaffirmed in many helpful ways and the indications are that the Corps is gaining enthusiastic acceptance throughout the islands.

The democratic process is firmly established in the Philippines. Change via the ballot box on the basis of a two-party system is the prevailing political pattern. While there is still considerable resort to armed attack on law and order, particularly on the island of Luzon, this violence has apparently lost much of the political overtones of the postwar Huk revolutionary peasant movement.

The economic situation in the Philippines is encouraging. Standards of living are among the highest in the Far East, and the prospects are for continued improvement. The peso is stable. Foreign exchange reserves have recovered from the record low of 1961. The economy has been freed of many restrictions, and its growth has been stimulated by the Government through internal measures and the encouragement of foreign investment. Industrial production, in particular, is rising steadily. As has long been the case, the principal economic and social problems are to be found in rural areas.

Our relations with the Philippines are most satisfactory at this time. But even as the Philippine Republic is not a static nation it is to be anticipated that these relationships will not remain static. National consciousness and cohesiveness are growing in the islands along with the economic and social advance. This growth will inevitably lead to changing concepts of national interest, and there may well be repercussions on Philippine foreign policies.

There ought to be no grounds for concern to this Nation in this growth and change. It is, in fact, implicit in the enlightened pattern of our relationship with the Philippines which, after the acquisition from Spain at the end of the 19th century, evolved through the progressive extension of self-government and, after the tests of World War II, reached the full political equality of separate national entities. What is of fundamental concern in the United States-Philippine relationship is not change but that in the process of change there should be a preservation and extension of what is of mutual and of equal benefit. Even if the relationship is seen in this long view, there will undoubtedly be occasional difficulties and disagreements, but these will be faced frankly and can be resolved successfully against the background of the enduring value of the special tie which has long linked the two nations.

5. CONCLUDING COMMENTS

This report does not deal with United States-Communist Chinese relations. Yet these relations are the basic factor in our present deep involvement in southeast Asia. It was the hostility of China in Korea which first projected the United States in depth—via aid programs—into Indochina. It is Chinese hostility which evokes the continued flow of the bulk of U.S. aid and other activity into southeast Asia. It is Chinese hostility which underlies the U.S. treaty commitment to SEATO. In short, we are involved in southeast Asia preponderantly because of the implications of a Chinese hostility to the whole structure of our own security in the Pacific—a hostility which at this time is of unfathomable depth and uncertain duration.

To be sure, there are other factors which contribute, perhaps unduly, to the U.S. involvement in southeast Asia. It should be noted, for example, that there is the reluctance of friendly nations to assume a fair share of the more burdensome forms of aid to the small and weak states of the region in order that they may make the transition to a stable independence. It should also be noted, in all frankness, that our own bureaucratic tendencies to act in uniform and enlarging patterns have resulted in an expansion of the U.S. commitment in some places to an extent which would appear to bear only the remotest relationship to what is essential or even desirable in terms of U.S. interests.

There would appear to be little that can be done about Chinese hostility at this time. But in connection with the other factors in the U.S. involvement in southeast Asia, some changes may be practicable, changes which could result in savings in cost without doing violence to U.S. interests in the region.

Certainly the United States should make every effort to encourage a wider participation of other free nations in aid to the region, and not merely aid in the newer patterns such as consortium-type loans which promise tangible returns to the donors. More important would be a wider participation in those programs such as military assistance or economic grants which, however much they may involve an intangible long-range return to world freedom, are presently burdens carried preponderantly by the United States. There are, in all frankness, few indications that exhortatory efforts by the United States to produce a greater aid effort on the part of others are likely to prove fruitful. For in the last analysis if the United States is willing to bear the preponderant burdens of freedom in southeast Asia, out of concern with Chinese hostility, communism, or whatever, the likelihood is that other free nations will not be overly inclined to deny us the privilege. If we are to bargain effectively in this matter, therefore, there must be, first, a thorough reassessment of our own overall security requirements on the southeast Asian mainland, a realistic reassessment of what is essential, what may be desirable, and what may be superfluous. The group is inclined to believe that it is not impossible that such an assessment will show that national security needs may be met adequately without the further tension of the U.S. commitment, notably aid programs and missions in the usual pattern, into any country in southeast Asia where they do not now function. Further, the group is of the belief that an *orderly* curtailment of such programs and missions in other countries where they now function need not pose a significant increase in the threat to our national security. Extreme caution, however, is indicated in this connection and the discretion of what to do and when to do it must rest with the President. For, if the attempt is made to alter these programs via a congressional meat-ax cut of foreign aid to southeast Asia it runs the risk of not merely removing the fat but of cleaving a gap which will lay open the region to massive chaos and, hence, jeopardize the present Pacific structure of our national security.

As noted at the outset, the basic stimulant to U.S. commitment in southeast Asia is not to be found in the region at all. Rather, it is to be found in the hostility which characterizes the relation with the Chinese mainland government and the dangerous implications of that continuing hostility to our long-range security. So long as the hostility persists, any adjustment of policy involving a significant lowering of U.S. commitment or aid costs, if it is attempted at all as it has been attempted in Laos, is bound to carry a high degree of uncertainty. Indeed, the pattern of pressure on U.S. policy for the past decade has been to increase rather than decrease the commitment and the aid costs.

It does not follow, however, that it is in the interests of the United States or that it enhances our national security to respond to this pressure in all circumstances and in every specific situation in southeast Asia. Nor does it automatically follow that an ever-deepening total involvement of the United States on the southeast Asian mainland is the only way or, in all circumstances, the best way to deal with the implications of the Chinese hostility.

Indeed, it is doubtful that it is the best way if our concern for the multilateral stake of free nations in southeast Asia results in an indefinite continuance of the vast inequities which fall upon us in bearing the burdens of outside aid. It is doubtful that it is the best way in any southeast Asian nation, if the responsibility for its independent survival were to come to rest more heavily with the United States than with indigenous leadership because of the failure or inadequacies of that leadership in meeting its own responsibilities to its people.

To sum up, it would appear to us that in present circumstances the interests of the United States in southeast Asia are best served by a policy which—

1. Foregoes the extension of aid-programs in the usual pattern into any country of southeast Asia in which they do not now operate;
2. Seeks the orderly reduction of grant-aid of all kinds in countries where such programs operate; and assigns the functions of aid-mission directors (except in South Vietnam) to the economic counselors of the embassies wherever this practice does not now prevail;
3. Induces a more equitable contribution from other free nations to the costs of aiding freedom in southeast Asia;
4. Encourages vigorously everywhere throughout the region relationships of mutual advantage, particularly in commerce and in cultural and educational exchange;
5. Provides vigorous support to the Geneva accord of 1962 and the effort of the present provisional government to bring about a satisfactory solution

in Laos, a solution establishing a firm peace and permitting the continued reduction of our deep and costly commitment in that region ;

6. Helps to bring about internal peace in Vietnam but maintains, scrupulously, our advisory capacity, recognizing that the primary responsibility in all areas is Vietnamese ;

7. Measures effectiveness not only in terms of the policy's general impact in stopping Communist aggression in southeast Asia but also—

(a) In terms of the social, economic, and political benefits which the policy helps bring to the ordinary people of the nations concerned, and

(b) In terms of the cost and depth of the U.S. commitment in men and money to maintain that policy.

LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT

OCTOBER 16, 1962.

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MIKE: As you know, the administration keeps our foreign relations under continuous review in an effort to insure the highest degree of effectiveness of our foreign policies and the efficiency of expenditures related to their administration. While we have a constant flow of information through executive branch channels, it is useful to have a review of these matters through congressional eyes from time to time.

Might I prevail upon you, therefore, to undertake to visit selected areas of major significance to U.S. policy, prior to the next Congress. I had in mind, particularly, Berlin and Vietnam and other nations in the southeast Asian region. It would be most helpful if you were to travel in the company of several Members of the Senate from both parties and provide me with such observations on these situations and our policies and overseas administration as you and your colleagues would care to make.

I know that it has been a taxing session for you and other Members of the Senate. Nevertheless, if you see your way clear to comply with this request, please feel free to proceed at your leisure during the coming weeks. I should be happy to have the Departments of State and Defense assist in every appropriate way in facilitating a Senate study of this kind.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

○