FULBRIGHT AND VIETNAM: THE EMERGENCE OF AN ADVERSARY ROLE

Lee Riley Powell
Little Rock, Arkansas

B. A., Southwestern at Memphis, 1979

A Thesis Presented to the Graduate Faculty
of the University of Virginia
in Candidacy for the Degree of
Master of Arts

Corcoran Department of History

University of Virginia

May, 1984

Approved

Norman A. Graebner

Frank A. Warren

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

In 1964 Senator J. William Fulbright was one of the principal Congressional apologists for President Lyndon Johnson's foreign policy in southeast Asia. Fulbright delivered two important analyses of the Vietnam war during the first year of Johnson's Presidency: in a major Senate address on March 25, 1964, he endorsed the President's policy of supporting the non-communist regime in Saigon, and in August he praised the administration's Gulf of Tonkin Resolution. Yet Fulbright did not devote great attention to Vietnam in 1964, for he was primarily concerned with opposing the Presidential candidacy of Arizona Senator Barry Goldwater. Fulbright later asserted that until the early 1960s he had considered the American military and economic aid to South Vietnam as "a very small operation. I wasn't at all concerned. I was entirely preoccupied with Europe. I don't recall we ever had a hearing on Vietnam."[1] The Arkansas Senator tended to rely on the administration for information concerning southeast Asia, largely because he was not particularly knowledgeable about Vietnam in 1964.[2] Thus, in March he accepted the administration's contention that the United States should not seek an immediate negotiated settlement in Vietnam, and

five months later he did not challenge the President's allegations of flagrant North Vietnamese aggression in the Gulf of Tonkin.

Fulbright briefly analyzed American policy towards Vietnam in a passage of his March 25, 1964 Senate speech entitled "Old Myths and New Realities." The only "realistic options" in Vietnam, he declared, were "the expansion of the conflict" or a "renewed effort to bolster the capacity of the South Vietnamese to prosecute the war successfully on its present scale."[3] In Fulbright's view, "Whatever specific policy decisions are made, it should be clear to all concerned that the United States will continue to meet its obligations and fulfill its commitments with respect to Vietnam."[4]

Fulbright opposed an immediate negotiated settlement, arguing that it was exceedingly difficult for a party to a negotiation to achieve by diplomacy "what it has conspicuously failed to win by warfare."[5] He expressed the idea which later became the Johnson administration's private justification for expanding the American military involvement in southeast Asia: the United States would intervene in order to substantially alter the military "equation of advantages" in favor of the anti-communist forces, and thus establish the existence of an independent, non-communist South Vietnam as a precondition for any diplomatic conference.[6] The Senator did not speculate

about the future duration of the American military presence in South Vietnam. He did not indicate whether he recommended expanding the conflict, although he approved of the first air strike against North Vietnam a few months later.

Fulbright did not elaborate upon what would be required in a "renewed effort to bolster" the South Vietnamese military capacity, nor did he define America's obligations and commitments to South Vietnam. His ambiguity was typical of the perennial difficulties which Johnson's supporters experienced in presenting specific, cogent justifications for the American intervention in Vietnam.[7] When Fulbright expanded the March 25 Senate speech into his book entitled Old Myths and New Realities later in 1964, the only "evidence" he offered to demonstrate the alleged threat to American security in Vietnam was a vague and inaccurate charge of Chinese and North Vietnamese aggression.[8] In 1964 he believed that the Congress must rely upon the thousands of experts in the State Department and the Central Intelligence Agency for expertise in the realm of diplomacy, largely because the half-dozen staff members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee could not comprehensively analyze all the myriad controversies of America's foreign relations.[9] Fulbright's dependence on the administration for information was unnecessary, as he eventually realized; during the late 1960s he employed a larger number of Congressional investigators, sought

the ideas of journalists and scholars, conducted frequent Foreign Relations Committee investigations, and diligently attempted to acquire independent sources of information concerning American foreign policy in Vietnam and elsewhere. But it was only after the massive military interventions in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic that Fulbright would become wary of depending on the executive's evaluations in foreign affairs; in 1964 he accepted the administration's judgment on the southeast Asia crisis.

The lack of detail in Fulbright's passage on Vietnam in "Old Myths and New Realities" may be partially explained by the fact that the speech was a general review of American diplomacy, and the Vietnam policy was only one of many controversial issues which Fulbright discussed on March 25. His analysis of the Vietnam war constituted less than one-tenth of the material in the address. The brevity of the section on Vietnam was characteristic of his inattention to southeast Asia in the early 1960s.

"Old Myths and New Realities" was one of Fulbright's most famous critiques of the cold war mentality. He urged the United States to renounce "the master myth of the cold war that the communist bloc is a monolith composed of governments all equally resolute and implacable in their determination to destroy the free world."[10] According to Fulbright, some communist states, such as Yugoslavia and Poland, posed no threat to the West, while

China posed an immediate threat.[11] Nikita Khrushchev's diplomacy was much more prudent than the aggressive Stalinist foreign policy of the early postwar period.[12] Communist imperialism and not communism as a doctrine represented a danger to the West, Fulbright asserted.[13] He concluded that as long as any nation was content to practice its doctrines within its own frontiers, regardless of how repugnant its ideology appeared to be to Americans, the United States should have no quarrel with that nation.[14]

The most controversial passage of "Old Myths and New Realities" dealt with Cuba. Fulbright stated that American policies designed to overthrow Fidel Castro had been failures. Neither military invasion nor an American trade ban had succeeded in the past, and such aggressive policies would not succeed in the future.[15] The United States should accept the reality that the Castro regime was a "distasteful nuisance but not an intolerable danger" and stop flattering "a noisy but minor demagogue by treating him as if he were a Napoleonic menace."[16]

Many liberal politicians and journalists praised Fulbright's March 25 address before the Senate.[17] Walter Lippmann eulogized the Senator in an article written for Newsweek in early April: "He says what he believes is true rather than what is supposed at the moment to be popular. He is not listened to on the floor of Congress

until he has been heard around the world. He has become the leading witness to the present truth, but it is not a fatal mistake to be right too soon."[18] The Johnson administration, however, reacted negatively to the speech.[19] Secretary of State Dean Rusk carefully disassociated the administration from Fulbright's foreign policy positions. In two successive press conferences after March 25, President Johnson denied any agreement or connection with the ideas expressed in "Old Myths and New Realities."[20]

The President's hostile response to Fulbright's address was a significant indication of Johnson's intolerance of even mild dissent. Fulbright's views concerning American diplomacy in the Far East were actually quite similar to that of the administration; the March speech may have been influenced by Dean Rusk's conception of the relationship between North Vietnam and China. Senator Fulbright wrote in 1972 that Rusk adhered to a modified version of the communist conspiracy thesis.[21] In the late 1940s and 1950s, many foreign policy analysts had imagined international communism to be a global conspiracy, with the head of the "octopus" in Moscow and its tentacles reaching out to the farthest corners of the earth.[22] Fulbright contended that after the Sino-Soviet break became obvious in the 1960s, Rusk professed to be scornful of the conspiracy thesis. Yet Rusk defended the Vietnam war with references to a "world cut in two by Asian

communism," the only difference between the earlier and later perspectives being, in Fulbright's opinion, that Rusk had discovered a second "octupus" in Peking.[23] When Fulbright was writing in 1972, Rusk's specter of "Asian communism" seemed farcical. But in 1964 Fulbright may not have clearly understood that North Vietnam was not a Chinese puppet. He spoke of preventing South Vietnam from being dominated by "Peking and Hanoi" as if North Vietnam and China were practically indistinguishable.[24]

Fulbright probably thought his treatment of China in "Old Myths and New Realities" was moderate, since he clearly hoped for an eventual amelioration of Sino-American relations at some unspecified date in the future.[25] A reduction of tensions in the Far East, he hypothesized, might "make it possible to strengthen world peace by drawing mainland China into existing East-West agreements in such fields as disarmament, trade, and educational exchange."[26] He commended the recent French recognition of China, which might "serve a constructive long-term purpose, by unfreezing a situation in which many countries, none more than the United States, are committed to inflexible policies by long-established commitments and the pressures of domestic public opinion."[27] The French initiative, he speculated, might facilitate a re-evaluation of American foreign policy towards China.[28]

Despite the Senator's favorable response to the French recognition of China, there were no specific differences between Fulbright and the administration with respect to America's China policy. He contended that the United States should not recognize China or acquiesce in Chinese admission to the United Nations, for "there is nothing to be gained by it so long as the Peiping regime maintains its attitude of implacable hostility toward the United States."[29] China represented an "immediate threat" to the West, according to Fulbright, yet he did not explain what the threat was. Fulbright's rhetoric concerning China in 1964 was sometimes conciliatory and never as abrasive as the administration officials' statements; but the fact that his views were influenced by the belligerent anti-Chinese position of the executive branch was revealed in August, 1964, when he described the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution as a device to "deter aggression on the part of the North Vietnamese and Chinese."[30]

In 1966 Fulbright would characterize the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution as a blank check signed by the Congress in an atmosphere of urgency which seemed to preclude debate.[31] On August 5, 1964, Johnson summoned Fulbright and other Congressional leaders to an emergency meeting at the White House and advised them that North Vietnamese naval vessels had flagrantly violated the principle of freedom of the seas by attacking American

destroyers in the Gulf of Tonkin.[32] Without questioning Johnson's version of the Tonkin incidents, Fulbright cooperated closely with the administration in guiding the resolution through the Congress.[33] The Senate Foreign Relations Committee (Fulbright had been chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee since 1959) and the Senate Armed Services Committee held a joint executive session hearing which lasted an hour and a half on August 6.[34] Fulbright was the floor manager for the resolution, which was introduced on August 6 and adopted on August 7 by a vote of 416 to 0 in the House of Representatives and 88 to 2 in the Senate, with Senator Wayne Morse of Oregon and Senator Ernest Gruening of Alaska casting the only dissenting votes.[35]

During the August 6 joint hearing Rusk, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Earle G. Wheeler defended the resolution and an August 5 air strike against North Vietnam. Rusk emphasized the President's desire to continue closely consulting with Congress.[36] The Secretary of State did not employ John Foster Dulles' domino theory to justify the resolution or the bombings. This theory had been explained by President Eisenhower in 1954, when he averred that if the non-communists in Vietnam were overthrown, communist expansion into Burma, Thailand, the Malay peninsula, Indonesia, Australia, New Zealand, Japan, Formosa, and the Phillipines would

inevitably follow.[37] The Johnson administration's rhetoric may have differed from that of Eisenhower and Dulles, but the policy of supporting the non-communist regime in Saigon persisted. Rusk described the domino theory as unnecessary, for "it is enough to recognize the true nature of the communist doctrine of world revolution and the militant support that Hanoi and Peiping are giving that doctrine in southeast Asia."[38] According to Rusk, the two attacks on American destroyers in the Gulf of Tonkin were not isolated events but were part of North Vietnam's systematic and deliberate campaign of aggression in southeast Asia.[39]

The August 5 air raid was a retaliation against North Vietnam for the two alleged attacks of August 2 and August 4, which had inflicted no damage upon the American destroyers.[40] The bombings destroyed several shore facilities, approximately two-thirds of the North Vietnamese navy (which consisted of patrol boats), and the largest petroleum storage depot in North Vietnam.[41] Senator Russell Long of Louisiana asked McNamara at the August 6 hearing if the American planes had achieved a "surprise attack" against the North Vietnamese naval bases which was similar to the Japanese surprise attack upon Pearl Harbor; McNamara replied, "Yes, that's exactly true."[42] Almost all the Senators congratulated the administration on the promptness and moderation of the decision to bomb North Vietnam.

J. William Fulbright commended Rusk, McNamara, Wheeler, and President Johnson for the "restraint with which overwhelming power in the area was used, a new attitude on the part of a great power."[43]

Wayne Morse was the only Senator who opposed the administration's Vietnam policy at the August 6 hearing. Morse criticized not only the resolution but the premise of North Vietnamese aggression upon which the administration's policy was based. He denied that the executive branch had produced a "scintilla" of evidence to prove that regular North Vietnamese army and navy units were engaged in aggressive acts against South Vietnam.[44] The Oregon Senator specifically questioned the validity of the administration's version of the Tonkin incidents, asserting that the American destroyers had committed a provocative act by cruising so close to the North Vietnamese shore.[45] (When the transcript of the secret hearing was finally published in 1966, the State Department deleted the exact distance, although McNamara later admitted that the administration had authorized the American vessels to cruise within four miles of the North Vietnamese coastline.)[46]

McNamara and Rusk answered Morse with the rather lame rejoinders that the American-equipped South Vietnamese sea patrol had searched 130,000 junks in 1963 and discovered 140 Vietcong, and that North Vietnam was infiltrating parties of 100 to 200 guerrillas into

South Vietnam through Laos.[47] The administration officials' statements were ambiguous and were not relevant to Morse's questions, for they did not specify the frequency with which the alleged infiltrations occurred and they failed to demonstrate that North Vietnamese regular units were fighting in South Vietnam.

During the brief Senate debate over the resolution Senator George McGovern of South Dakota asked Fulbright about the South Vietnamese operations in the Gulf of Tonkin on July 30, 1964. Fulbright answered McGovern by saying the administration had assured him that the destroyer patrol "was entirely unconnected or unassociated with any coastal forays the South Vietnamese may have conducted."[48] At the August 6 secret hearing, Secretary McNamara had claimed that "our Navy played absolutely no part in, was not associated with, was not aware of any South Vietnamese actions, if there were any."[49] Four years later in testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee, McNamara contradicted his earlier assertion when he admitted the American warships had been cooperating with South Vietnamese naval raids against North Vietnam in July and August, 1964.[50]

During the August, 1964 debate in the Senate, Senator Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin attempted to clarify the meaning of the resolution. When Nelson asked Fulbright if the resolution was "aimed at the

problem of further aggression against our ships," Fulbright replied affirmatively.[51] Nelson offered an amendment to the resolution declaring it to be the policy of the United States to avoid a direct military involvement in the southeast Asian conflict, and Fulbright indicated that the amendment was "an accurate reflection of what I believe is the President's policy, judging from his own statements."[52] Throughout 1964, Johnson assured the Arkansas Senator that he intended to avoid a massive, direct military intervention in the Vietnam war.[53] Fulbright, as floor leader, did not accept Nelson's amendment because it would have required further consideration by the House of Representatives and thus delayed the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution's passage. The Foreign Relations Committee chairman was under pressure from the Johnson administration to pass the resolution immediately in order to emphasize America's unity in opposing potential aggressors.[54]

At one juncture of the debate Fulbright conceded that "the language of the Resolution would not prevent" the Commander in Chief from landing large American armies in Vietnam or China.[55] But he also maintained that "I have no doubt that the President will consult with Congress in case a major change in present policy becomes necessary."[56] Fulbright believed he was summarizing the general sentiment of the Senate (which was also expressed by McGovern, Frank Church of Idaho,

John Sherman Cooper of Kentucky, and others) when he concluded: "I personally feel it would be very unwise under any circumstances to put a large land army on the Asian continent."[57]

Fulbright supported the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution because he did not suspect the President's version of the alleged incidents was untrue, and because he did not wish to cause any political difficulties for Johnson during a campaign in which the alternative candidate was Barry Goldwater, a man whose election Fulbright envisaged as a disaster for the United States.[58] At one point during the campaign Goldwater replied to a question about what policy he would follow in Vietnam by saying, "I would turn to my Joint Chiefs of Staff and say 'fellows, we made the decision to win, now its your problem.'"[59] He had spoken of defoliating the jungle trails in Vietnam with "low-yield atomic bombs."[60] In contrast, Johnson skillfully played the role of the man of peace, declaring: "We are not about to send American boys 9,000 or 10,000 miles away from home to do what Asian boys ought to be doing themselves."[61] Fulbright was convinced that Johnson would use the resolution with wisdom and restraint.

During the Senate's deliberations over the resolution Fulbright assured his colleagues that Johnson did not intend to expand the war. Many Senators thought of the resolution as a typical

Johnsonian political ploy.[62] An anonymous source later quoted Fulbright as having remarked in the Democratic cloakroom at the time that, "This resolution doesn't mean a thing. Lyndon wants this to show he can be decisive and firm with the communists too."[63]

The Johnson administration eventually would refer to the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution and the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization Treaty as constituting the "functional equivalent" of a declaration of war.[64] The language of the resolution included no restrictions upon the authority of the President to "take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression."[65]

In 1964 Fulbright was far more disturbed by the threat of Goldwater's presidential candidacy than he was by events in southeast Asia. He believed that Goldwater essentially advocated a policy of "co-annihilation."[66] When the administration requested Fulbright's support during the Tonkin Gulf crisis in August, he was influenced by a partisan desire to help repudiate the extremist Republican and ensure the triumph of the "moderate" candidate, Lyndon Johnson.[67] He interpreted the administration's request for passage of the resolution as not only an appropriate response to the alleged attacks on American ships, but also as a device to deprive Goldwater of the "soft on communism" charge against Johnson.[68] The resolution and the retaliatory

air raids against North Vietnam could demonstrate Johnson's determination to oppose communist aggression.

From the standpoint of domestic politics, the administration's handling of the Tonkin affair was brilliantly successful. A Louis Harris poll showed the President's positive rating skyrocketing from 42 per cent before the crisis to 72 per cent after his responses to the alleged incidents in the Gulf.[69] Fulbright's support for the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution had helped Johnson to eliminate the Vietnam controversy as an issue in the campaign, a fact which contributed to Johnson's overwhelming victory in November.[70]

During the summer of 1964 the Senator from Arkansas believed that Johnson's account of the events in the Gulf was honest and accurate. It was not until 1966 that he would fully realize his error of substituting his personal trust in the President for a proper institutional balance between the legislative and executive branches, a balance which might have been achieved by holding extended hearings on Vietnam in August, 1964, as Senator Morse advocated.[71] Fulbright later wrote in The Arrogance of Power that if the Senate had thoroughly debated the resolution, or if a careful investigation of the alleged attacks on American ships had been conducted, then "we might have put limits and qualifications on our endorsement of future uses of force in Southeast Asia, if not in the

resolution itself then in the legislative history preceding its adoption."[72] But in 1964 he believed that if the administration ever contemplated a massive expansion of the war his old friend Lyndon Johnson would consult him and weigh his advice thoughtfully.[73] He still relished his role as senior Senate foreign policy partner to the President.[74] It was not until 1966 that he held the hearings Morse had called for in 1964. And only then would he become convinced that in the allegation of unprovoked aggression on the high seas in August, 1964, the administration had deliberately deceived the American public and the Congress.

Johnson's actions during the Tonkin Gulf controversy produced a temporary political triumph, as the Harris poll indicated. But the long-term consequences of the administration's mendacious performance during the affair weakened the President politically, for Congress and the public began to question Johnson's veracity after the facts of the Tonkin episode became public knowledge in the late 1960s. In the middle and later 1960s, Fulbright's realization that the administration had deceived him during the Tonkin crisis helped to galvanize the Senator into an adamant opposition against the Vietnam war. Fulbright began to investigate the Tonkin incidents in 1966, after his exhaustive analysis of the 1965 American intervention

in the Dominican Republic demonstrated that the administration had justified its Dominican policy through false allegations of communist aggression.[75] He would then begin to suspect the administration's accusations of communist aggression in the Gulf of Tonkin had been similarly distorted. His investigations eventually revealed the executive's duplicity during the Tonkin controversy and facilitated the emergence of a "credibility gap" in Washington--a widespread belief that the Johnson administration perennially failed to present candid explanations for its policies.[76]

In 1966 Fulbright investigated the August, 1964 incidents in the Gulf of Tonkin. Cyrus Vance, one of McNamara's chief assistants in the Defense Department, had explained shortly after the first North Vietnamese attack that "We assumed it was brought about by mistake," or by confusion created by the activity of South Vietnamese vessels in the Gulf.[77] Fulbright accepted this view of the first incident.

His doubts about the administration's account of the second attack began when Rear Admiral Arnold True advised Fulbright that the American destroyers probably could not have detected whether the North Vietnamese patrol boats were in attack formation at their reported distance on the night of the second incident.[78] A study by the Foreign Relations Committee staff in 1967 showed that the American destroyers were on an intelligence-

gathering mission on August 4, not on a "routine patrol" as the administration claimed.[79]

The executive branch never adduced evidence to prove that the North Vietnamese gun boats committed hostile acts; in fact, the effects of stormy weather on the radar and sonar of the destroyer called the Maddox, as well as over-enthusiastic sonarmen, may have accounted for the reports of torpedo attacks.[80] Fulbright received "top secret" briefings from the Pentagon in 1966 and 1967, at which the only "evidence" produced to substantiate the administration's version of the events in the Gulf was one machine gun shell said to have been fired from a North Vietnamese gun boat.[81] He became convinced that the second alleged attack had never occurred, and that the administration had falsely represented the Tonkin incidents as acts of blatant aggression in order to generate public support for military action in Vietnam.[82] In the later 1960s, the Tonkin Gulf controversy became the focal point of Fulbright's increasingly vitriolic critique of the Johnson administration's disingenuousness. Fulbright would also criticize the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution as a Presidential usurpation of Congress' constitutional authority to initiate war (the constitutional arguments are discussed in Chapter 4).

One should emphasize that Fulbright's public opposition to the American involvement in the Vietnam

war began roughly eighteen months after the August, 1964 incidents in the Gulf of Tonkin. The obvious question arises: Why was Fulbright so dilatory in challenging the Vietnam policy? The administration's attempt to mislead the Senator concerning the alleged attacks on American destroyers is only a partial explanation, for Fulbright clearly erred in failing to hold extensive hearings to examine the President's account of the incidents as well as the basic policies in Vietnam. Fulbright's fear of the Goldwater threat, his conviction that China was an aggressive power, and his view of Johnson as a "moderate" were probably crucial in leading him to support American policy in Vietnam during 1964. His lack of knowledge about southeast Asia and his belief that the Foreign Relations Committee staff could not compete with the executive branch in the realm of intelligence-gathering also contributed to his tendency of relying upon the administration's judgment regarding American diplomacy in the Far East.

Fulbright's notion that President Johnson was restrained and prudent in foreign policy was not unusual in 1964; many politicians and foreign affairs analysts believed in Johnson's "moderation" at the time. Walter Lippmann concluded in an August 6, 1964 column in the Washington Post that the President intended to exercise American power "with measure, with humanity, and with

restraint."[83] The vast majority of the Congress regarded Johnson's actions during the Gulf of Tonkin crisis as prudent. "At that time," Fulbright later admitted in discussing the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution's passage, "I was not in a suspicious frame of mind. I was afraid of Goldwater."[84] Thorough Foreign Relations Committee hearings on Vietnam might have embarrassed Johnson in the midst of the Presidential campaign, with the Democratic National Convention scheduled to begin on August 24.[85]

Despite Fulbright's anxiety over the Goldwater candidacy, the Arkansas Senator held a genuine conviction that the Chinese were in a belligerent and resentful mood in 1964 and 1965. In the spring of 1965, months after Goldwater had been decisively repudiated at the polls in 1964, Fulbright continued to refer to the Chinese as imperialistic in his private communications with the President.[86] Thus, Fulbright's fear that public criticism of Johnson's Asian policy would strengthen Goldwater and precipitate a recrudescence of extreme anti-communist sentiment in the United States was not the sole motive for his support of America's Far Eastern policy. He vaguely perceived the danger of alleged Chinese aggression as the threat of a conventional imperialism,[87] and he never endorsed Rusk's notion that the Chinese were plotting a uniquely nefarious conspiracy to banish freedom from the earth.

Nevertheless, Fulbright's belief that the Chinese were resentful and hostile towards the West facilitated the administration's efforts to convince him that there was a coordinated North Vietnamese - Chinese campaign of aggression in southeast Asia. The Senator would clarify his thinking about the Far East in 1965-1966, after the military escalation in Vietnam became the central controversy in American foreign policy.

In addition to the reasons cited above for Fulbright's support of the Johnson administration's Vietnam policy, the Senator had maintained throughout the early 1960s that the Presidency must be the dominant institution in the formulation of American diplomacy. According to Fulbright, members of Congress had to devote the majority of their time to the study of domestic affairs, and hence their "advise and consent" function must be secondary to the President's role in foreign policy.[88] In the early 1960s, Fulbright would recall several episodes of American diplomatic history in which the Senate obstructed the President's endeavors in foreign affairs, notably the defeat of the Versailles Treaty and American membership in the League of Nations, and the Senate's opposition to full American participation in a World Court.[89] He frequently cited the demagogical investigations of former Wisconsin Senator Joseph McCarthy as the classic example of the potentially pernicious consequences inherent in "senatorial excursions

into foreign policy."[90] Whatever the merit or lack of merit in Fulbright's historical interpretations, it is clear his plea for a strong, activist President was the standard position of the intellectuals in the Democratic Party during 1964.[91] His favorable perception of the individual who held the Presidential Office in 1964 obviously influenced his theoretical justifications for an increasingly powerful Presidency.

Fulbright would later advocate a much more assertive role for the Senate in foreign policy. "The Senate," he wrote in The Arrogance of Power, "has the responsibility to review the conduct of foreign policy by the President and his advisers, to render advice whether it is solicited or not, and to grant or withhold consent to major acts of foreign policy."[92] The fiasco of American policy in southeast Asia was the catalyst which led Fulbright to re-assess his perspective on the proper institutional balance between the executive and the legislative branches of government. In his 1972 work, The Crippled Giant, he confessed: "I myself was among those who took an ingenuous view of Presidential power until the disaster of Vietnam compelled me to reevaluate my position."[93]

Fulbright was basically an enthusiastic supporter of President Johnson in 1964, but several of his ideas in "Old Myths and New Realities" and in the Senate's Gulf of Tonkin debate foreshadowed his future dissent.

In "Old Myths and New Realities" he had criticized the administration's belligerent anti-communist stance in its Cuban policy. His attack upon the myth that all communist states were relentlessly expansionist was not congenial with Johnson's Weltanschauung.

The March 25, 1964 Senate speech had not questioned American policy in Vietnam, but Fulbright's decision to publicly analyze the southeast Asian crisis was disturbing to the President, who did not desire a thorough public discussion of Vietnam during the election year.[94] Johnson's basic strategy was to delay the crucial decisions in Vietnam until after the election.[95] Thus, he merely expanded American assistance and increased the number of American advisers in South Vietnam, for he feared a direct, large-scale intervention would jeopardize his cherished domestic program and his prospects for being elected.[96] Johnson was pleased, of course, that Fulbright did not follow "Old Myths and New Realities" with an effort to generate a public dialogue on Asian policy in August, 1964.[97]

In 1964 Fulbright was harboring private doubts about the American involvement in Vietnam.[98] He sent a newspaper photograph of South Vietnamese soldiers torturing a suspected communist guerrilla to Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara in May, writing, "I have been gravely concerned over the situation in Vietnam even

without reports of tortures and indiscriminate bombing. We should cut our losses and withdraw."[99] This letter did not have a significant impact on the thinking of the executive branch, and it was largely forgotten after the turmoil over the Gulf of Tonkin crisis and the Presidential campaign. The President privately assured Fulbright that he would not "send in the Marines a la Goldwater," for his administration's Vietnam policy consisted only of "providing training and logistical support of South Vietnamese forces."[100] During the latter half of 1964 and early 1965, Fulbright came to believe that the danger of being confronted with a stark choice between immediate withdrawal and massive escalation in Vietnam was not imminent.[101] He believed that the President was sincerely interested in a political settlement of the war.[102]

In later years, Fulbright would regard his decision not to hold comprehensive hearings on the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution in 1964 as the fundamental error in his responses to America's Vietnam policy from 1964 to 1966.[103] When the Foreign Relations Committee belatedly conducted its 1966 investigation of the Vietnam war, there were approximately 200,000 American soldiers in South Vietnam.[104] At that late date, the administration would successfully exert pressure on the Congress to continue the appropriations for the war by presenting the issue not as a choice of approving or disapproving of the Vietnam war, but of

either supporting or abandoning "our boys out there on the firing line."[105] When the Congress allowed the alternatives to be defined in these terms, there could be little doubt of its support for the war in the late 1960s.

Despite his failure to foster a thorough public debate concerning Vietnam in August, 1964, several of Fulbright's statements during the Senate deliberations over the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution adumbrated his later role as an adversary of U.S. policy in Asia. He clearly did not envisage the resolution as a mandate for an expanded war, since he constantly referred to Johnson's declarations that he sought to avoid a massive military intervention in Vietnam. (It should be acknowledged that the President was uncertain about the degree of military power which would be required to defeat the Vietnamese communists, although he always underestimated their will to fight for a unified Vietnam under Ho Chi Minh).[106] Fulbright also asserted that the President should closely consult with Congress regarding its Vietnam policy in the future.

Most importantly, Fulbright had unequivocally rejected the strategy of deploying American armies on the continent of Asia, for air and sea power were the foundations of America's strength.[107] His response to the administration's decisions during the Tonkin controversy was similar to that of his old friend Walter Lippmann.

Lippmann endorsed the President's actions in the belief Johnson was signaling that American involvement in the Vietnam war would be limited to naval and air support for South Vietnam.[108] "The lasting significance of the episode," Lippmann predicted in August, 1964, "is the demonstration that the United States can remain in Southeast Asia without being on the ground."[109] Fulbright concluded in the Senate's August 6, 1964 debate that he would "deplore" the landing of a large American army on the Asian mainland, for "Everyone I have heard has said that the last thing we want to do is become involved in a land war in Asia."[110]

During the fall of 1964, Fulbright was predominantly concerned with his appeal to the nation to reject Goldwater's vague proposals for gaining a "total victory" in the Cold War. He frequently delivered speeches criticizing Goldwater's militant anti-Soviet attitude. As the historian Lloyd Ambrosius has observed, Goldwater failed to propose a peaceful, positive program for winning a "total victory" in the Cold War. Throughout the early 1960s, Goldwater's suggestions for a victorious Cold Warrior policy were almost entirely negative: the United States should withdraw diplomatic recognition from the Soviet Union, avoid negotiations with communist states, eschew disarmament, abolish the cultural exchange program with the Soviet Union, and terminate all trade with

communist nations.[111] The Arizona Senator's only positive, non-military proposal was his plea that the administration should announce to the world America's determination to achieve a total victory over communism. But such an announcement would have been a statement of purpose rather than a program for achieving the goal.[112] Yet Goldwater still promised a "total victory" without nuclear war.

In responding to Goldwater's foreign policy positions during the early 1960s, Fulbright stressed the absence of specific methods in Goldwater's recommendations:

> It would be beneficial and instructive, I think, if those who call for total victory would spell out for us precisely how it might be achieved . . . Is it to be won by nuclear war--a war which at the very least would cost the lives of tens of millions of people on both sides, devastate most or all of our great cities, and mutilate or utterly destroy a civilization which has been built over thousands of years?[113]

In contrast to Goldwater's opposition to negotiations with the communist world, Fulbright enthusiastically supported such agreements as the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. The Foreign Relations Committee chairman endorsed increased trade and the expansion of the cultural exchange program with the Soviet Union as policies which could reduce the tensions of the Cold War and introduce "a degree of normalcy into our relations with the Soviet Union and other communist countries."[114] On September 8, 1964, Fulbright delivered a Senate speech repudiating the Arizona Senator's belief in American omnipotence:

> The Senator's assumption that the Russians can be counted on to accept humiliation rather than war is a dangerous delusion. It is based on the fantastic premise that the American people will prefer the destruction of their cities and perhaps a hundred million deaths to an adjustment of interests with the communists, but that at the same time, the Russians will surrender to an ultimatum rather than accept the risk of nuclear war . . . The simple point which Goldwater Republicans seem unable to grasp is that no nation can be expected to acquiesce peacefully in its own 'total defeat.'[115]

Fulbright was convinced that the President agreed with him on the need to ameliorate Soviet-American relations, as well as on the necessity of avoiding a military entanglement in the jungles of Indochina. In Fulbright's opinion, only the Goldwater movement and a minority of right-wing Democrats advocated escalation of the American commitment to South Vietnam. The chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee would not have believed that President Lyndon Johnson would begin to implement many of Goldwater's proposals for the Vietnam war within a year after the Gulf of Tonkin crisis.

Chapter II

THE DECLINE OF FULBRIGHT'S CONFIDENCE IN PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S LEADERSHIP, NOVEMBER, 1964 TO MARCH, 1965

In the final weeks of 1964 Senator Fulbright was optimistic about the prospects for ameliorating America's relations with the communist nations of the world. The Senator's old antagonist and the principal spokesman for the radical right in the United States, Barry Goldwater, had been repudiated at the polls in November. Fulbright had repeatedly denounced Goldwater for proposing a radical policy which envisaged the total destruction of communism and the imposition of American ideas of democracy upon the entire world. In contrast, President Johnson proposed a "conservative policy" of preventing communist expansion while negotiating limited agreements with communist nations that would reduce the danger of nuclear war. Fulbright conducted an unusually strenuous campaign of speaking engagements during the presidential race, and competent observers of Arkansas politics attributed Johnson's victory in Arkansas primarily to Fulbright's vigorous efforts on the President's behalf.[1] The Senator was exuberant after the electoral triumph of the politician he had praised so profusely in his speech at the 1964 Democratic Convention:

> The same understanding of human nature which enabled him to lead the Senate so effectively during a

> difficult period in our history will enable him to find a way to resolve differences which exist among nations. I commend Lyndon Johnson to this convention and to all our people as a man of understanding with the wisdom to use the great power of our nation in the cause of peace.[2]

Fulbright continued to support the President despite his private concern (which he had expressed in his May letter to McNamara*) over the administration's Vietnam policy. During 1964 Fulbright discussed the Vietnamese dilemma with Walter Lippmann, who reinforced the Senator's doubts concerning the American military involvement in southeast Asia.[3] But Fulbright's doubts were mitigated by his conviction that Johnson would give a fair private hearing to dissenting views concerning Vietnam. Fulbright's friendship with Johnson strengthened his belief that the President would carefully listen to his ideas. A telegram the Senator and Mrs. Fulbright sent to the Johnsons immediately after the election revealed the cordial personal relationship between the two men and their families: "What a team you are!! Heartfelt congratulations to both of you from both of us, and all best wishes for happy and fulfilling years ahead."[4] Many years later, Fulbright would admit that he had been dilatory in challenging the military escalation policy "primarily because I misjudged the intentions of President Johnson and because I was not informed about Vietnam and China," but he added, "my

---

*See pages 24-25.

friendship with the President also contributed to my reluctance to take issue with him publicly."[5] The warm Fulbright-Johnson relationship in 1964 was perhaps an unfortunate example of the tendency David Halberstam has decried, whereby "key congressmen like William Fulbright, rather than playing their true constitutional roles, were often handled as friends of the White House family."[6] The Senator thought the President was sincerely interested in achieving a political settlement in Vietnam, and that by refraining from public criticism of Johnson's policies he could retain the ability to exert a powerful influence on the administration privately.

As Fulbright later admitted, the belief that he was privately persuading the President of the futility in expanding the military commitment to South Vietnam was an "illusion."[7] In The Arrogance of Power Fulbright would excoriate the policy of the executive branch to notify Congress of decisions which had already been made rather than genuinely consulting it.[8] This policy continued in 1964-1965, though he was not fully cognizant of it at the time. A memorandum in the Pentagon Papers, written by Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs William Bundy in November, 1964, exemplified the administration's attitude towards Congress as one among many external "audiences" to be manipulated in the desired direction (the news media, the American public, and

international opinion were the other principal audiences).[9] Bundy wrote that Fulbright and other "key leaders" of Congress should be consulted, but "perhaps only by notification if we do a reprisal against another Bien Hoa."[10] The Assistant Secretary argued that guerrilla assaults, such as the recent Bien Hoa attack, might be repeated at any time and would "give us a good springboard for any decision for stronger action."[11] The memorandum listed Fulbright as one of fifteen Congressional leaders who were to be notified of "stronger action" in Vietnam, but it did not assign any particular importance to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.[12]

Fulbright was not aware of the cavalier attitude represented by the Bundy memorandum in late 1964. During November of 1964 he had rarely held more confidence in an administration. Shortly after the election he departed for Yugoslavia to confer with Marshal Josip Broz Tito and preside over the signing of an agreement inaugurating Yugoslavia's participation in the Fulbright fellowship program.[13] This assignment was especially rewarding for Fulbright, not only because he regarded the student exchange program as the greatest achievement of his career and was always pleased by its expansion, but also because Yugoslavia was the first communist nation to join the program.[14] In Fulbright's view, the new exchange agreement was a classic example of the Johnson administration's

"conservative" policy of gradually reducing tensions with the communist world and eroding the ideological prejudices against communism which had plagued American diplomacy since the 1940s.[15] He was highly impressed with Tito after his conversation with the Yugoslav leader.[16] Fulbright's favorable perception of Yugoslavia subtly and significantly influenced his thinking on the dilemma in southeast Asia. If Yugoslavia was a communist state which was not aligned with the Soviet bloc and pursued policies often friendly and seldom harmful to U.S. interests, then he began to speculate that a communist but independent and nationalistic Vietnam would serve American interests in southeast Asia far better than a corrupt, unstable regime dependent on American manpower and financial aid.[17] He persistently emphasized his ideas concerning the value of a "Titoist buffer state" for Vietnam in conversations with Johnson during the months after his visit to Yugoslavia.[18]

The Senator delivered a speech at Southern Methodist University a few weeks after he returned to the United States in which he advocated the "building of bridges to the communist world."[19] Fulbright observed that there was a general tendency among communist countries toward more liberal domestic policies and less aggressive foreign policies. Yugoslavia had demonstrated the most outstanding communist progress by adopting a neutralist

diplomacy and permitting substantial liberty for its people. The United States should encourage the independence of Tito's government by engaging in cordial political relations and signing educational exchange agreements with the Yugoslavs, and by according them most-favored nation treatment in trade.[20] Similarly, Fulbright argued that Brezhnev and Kosygin were basically continuing the Khrushchev program of pursuing a prudent course abroad and dismantling of the Stalinist apparatus of police terror at home.[21] This increasing moderation of Soviet policy in the preceding decade should be rewarded by arranging limited accommodations with the Soviet Union which lessened East-West hostility and thus reduced the danger of war. Hence, the United States should continue to negotiate constructive agreements with the U.S.S.R. such as the test ban treaty, the prohibition against placing nuclear weapons in orbit around the earth, and the sale of surplus American wheat to the Russians.[22]

The fundamental assumption of the Southern Methodist address seemed to be that change was virtually an inalterable law of human existence which did not cease to exist when nations became communist. Although Fulbright was disturbed by China's "ideological fanaticism," he believed that Peking might eventually follow the progressive evolutionary pattern of the Soviet Union and assume a more moderate attitude toward the West.[23] He approvingly quoted

a recent article by George Kennan which stated that Americans should not interpret the current Chinese antipathy towards the United States as absolute and permanent. Kennan wrote:

> Neither these men in Peiping nor the regime over which they preside are immune to the laws of change that govern all human society, if only because no single generation, anywhere, ever sees things exactly the same as the generation that went 10 years before it.[24]

Fulbright concluded that China's admission to the United Nations was inevitable.[25]

The passage quoting Kennan was the only point in the speech in which Fulbright indirectly questioned the view of China as an unchanging and malevolent aggressor. Despite the fact that he thought China's admission into the U.N. was inevitable, he said the United States would have to oppose its entry if that occurred in the near future; the Chinese should not be extended diplomatic recognition or allowed into the U.N. because of their "aggression and subversion."[26] Fulbright referred to Chinese aggression frequently in the address, but he failed to cite any specific instances of this alleged Chinese imperialism. The lack of evidence to support his contentions concerning China was in sharp contrast to the passages where he enumerated specific examples of American cooperation with Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union to buttress his arguments for improving relations with those nations. Apparently Fulbright considered Chinese imperialism in the

Far East as so flagrant and obvious that it was unnecessary to adduce evidence to prove Peking's aggression. He was unable to cite any evidence to demonstrate China's alleged imperialism simply because China was not an expansionist power, as he eventually realized.

Fulbright entirely avoided any discussion of the controversy over Vietnam. The Senator as well as several historians later felt that his inaccurate perspective towards China weakened the logic of his critique of the American involvement in Vietnam.[27] Since he accepted the prevailing contemporary view of China as a relentlessly expansionist power, President Johnson could believe in late 1964 and early 1965 that Fulbright agreed with Rusk, McNamara, and the other major advisers on the basic necessity of containing China, and differed only in thinking the existence of a non-communist South Vietnam was peripheral to American interests.[28] The President would decide that Fulbright was wrong, that "the experts knew the facts" about South Vietnam's crucial relevance to American security.[29]

The December, 1964 speech at S.M.U., entitled "Bridges East and West," was the subject of a brief set of remarks delivered on the Senate floor by Senator Frank Church of Idaho on January 6, 1965. Senator Church placed "Bridges East and West" in the Congressional Record declaring, "I have never read a more impressive statement

outlining the goals, methods, and policies our Government should have in mind in our dealings with the Communist world."[30] Church was particularly complimentary of Fulbright's analysis of the communist nations as representing a panoply of change and limited progress rather than a monolithic and belligerent bloc. The Idaho Senator also praised Fulbright for his belief in the futility of total military victory as a panacea for all American difficulties in the international arena.[31] Church did not comment upon the section of the address dealing with China.

A week after Frank Church's tribute to "Bridges East and West" Fulbright identified himself with a mild dissent against Johnson's Vietnam policy by placing in the Congressional Record a Ramparts magazine interview with Church which Fulbright described as "an excellent statement with regard to what our policy should be in southeast Asia."[32] Church strongly opposed escalation and advocated the neutralization of southeast Asia, although he did not endorse an immediate American withdrawal.[33] He speculated that the United Nations might be able to help maintain the territorial integrity of the states in the region. According to Church, the conflict in South Vietnam was a civil war, basically an indigenous revolution against the existing government which only the people of South Vietnam could suppress. America could not "win their war for them,"

especially in a country where the majority of the populace associated all Western nations with imperialism.[34] The South Vietnamese did not recognize the distinction between white soldiers in French uniforms fighting to preserve a French colony and white soldiers in American uniforms fighting to arrest communist expansion.[35] In Church's opinion, the people of Vietnam were not confronted with a choice between the tyranny of the North and the freedom of the South, because South Vietnam was a military despotism just as North Vietnam was. Finally, he asserted that if the military situation in the South drastically deteriorated, the United States should find the maturity to accept the unpleasant reality of a communist Vietnam and eventually withdraw.[36]

Fulbright's insertion of the Ramparts interview with Church into the Congressional Record, along with several editorials approving of Church's position, was a significant departure from his complete avoidance of the Vietnam issue in the December address at Southern Methodist University. If he was determined by early 1965 to refrain from direct public criticism of the Johnson administration, he was equally determined to publicly offer alternatives to Johnson's policies. Fulbright's alternative suggestions would lead him to assume the precarious position in early 1965 of professing support for President Johnson while endorsing proposals which contradicted the

administration's view of the war in Vietnam. His approbation of Church's perspective on the war in the Ramparts article may have been the first of these contradictions, since Johnson and Rusk obviously did not agree with such ideas as Church's assertion that the Vietnamese conflict was a civil war.[37]

It should be acknowledged, however, that Fulbright's endorsement of Church's Ramparts article was only a mild and oblique questioning of America's course in Vietnam, for Church avoided mentioning Johnson or the presidential advisers and made several comments favorable to the administration's position. Dean Rusk certainly would not have argued with Church's claim that the United States must continue its massive military and economic assistance to Saigon, and that the interdiction of the Ho Chi Minh trail in Laos would substantially alleviate the Vietcong's pressure on the South Vietnamese army.[38] Fulbright did not elaborate upon his opinions concerning Laos or aid levels to Saigon, his only remark on Church's article being the general observation that it was excellent. Fulbright's attitude was indirectly expressed by the editorials he placed in the Record, which extolled Church's neutralization proposal and his warnings about the folly of escalating the direct American military involvement in Vietnam.[39]

During January Fulbright began to clarify his thinking about American foreign policy in Vietnam. On January 14 he revealed considerable uncertainty in his letter to an acquaintance stating, "Like everyone else I am more than a little disturbed by the situation in south-east Asia, and more than a little perplexed as to what our proper course should be."[40] Again, in correspondence a few days later with Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, he was unsure: "I have just read the report [a transcript of a C.B.S. documentary on Vietnam]. A classic dilemma if I ever saw one. I confess I have not been able to arrive at a conclusion."[41] By late January Fulbright was becoming more decisive, stating in a letter to a Little Rock constituent, "I agree with your son's idea that we are trying to do the right thing, but the difficulties seem to be beyond our capacity to handle." The letter ended with words which adumbrated his future dissent: "I have been perfectly willing to go along with the efforts of the past, but I am not willing to enlarge this into a full-scale war."[42]

Fulbright's increasing determination in late January to oppose expansion of American military operations in Indochina was expressed publicly as well as in private correspondence. At the end of January a Time newsman asked Fulbright a hypothetical question concerning what he would do if given the choice of escalation or withdrawal

from Vietnam through negotiations.[43] Fulbright replied that he would withdraw.[44] He firmly rejected arguments in favor of escalation through bombing, contending in the Time interview that "You can't selectively do a little bombing."[45] In his opinion, once the bombings began it would be impossible to predict how massive the involvement might become, because "you can't see down the road far enough."[46] The Senator persisted in his belief, however, that the time of the ultimate decision on America's proper strategy in southeast Asia was not imminent.[47]

Late January and early February actually constituted one of the crucial junctures in the administration's deliberations on Vietnam, although in public the President and his aides consistently and disingenuously denied that any major changes were being contemplated.[48] On January 27 Secretary McNamara and Special Assistant for National Security Affairs McGeorge Bundy delivered a memorandum to President Johnson which declared that the fundamental decision could not be delayed any longer and an expanded use of force in Vietnam was necessary.[49] Bundy and McNamara suggested that Bundy should travel to Saigon in early February for an investigation "on the ground." The skeptics within the bureaucracy associated with Under Secretary of State George Ball, who knew of Bundy's inclination to use force, were pessimistic about the prospects for his mission's impact upon American policy.[50]

Fulbright was not thoroughly informed of the top-level discussions in the administration, although Johnson attempted to reassure him by arranging for Dean Rusk to have frequent breakfasts with the Senator. The Secretary would report to the President that Fulbright's views remained unchanged by these meetings, whereupon Johnson would prescribe more Rusk-Fulbright breakfasts, which would have similar results.[51] Fulbright was still able to meet with Johnson personally, but their conversations were often dominated by Johnson's monologues on his valiant efforts to resist extremist pressures for escalation.[52]

The euphoria Fulbright had experienced after the electoral triumph in November had not dissipated by January, despite his concerns over Vietnam and his limited consultations with the President. His enthusiasm for Johnson's domestic legislation was one of the important reasons for his continuing favorable assessment of the President. Fulbright argued forcefully in a January 16 speech at Miami that the United States should renounce its self-appointed rule as global anti-communist gendarme and instead direct its talents and economic resources toward solving domestic problems.[53] The money which had been devoted to the military demands of the Cold War in the previous two decades could have been used to build myriad schools, housing facilities, and hospitals and to combat poverty at home.[54] Fulbright strongly implied that

the Johnson administration would at last reverse the American obsession with opposing communism and channel the nation's energies into domestic affairs.[55] The Senator described Johnson's proposal for federal aid to education, which was presented to Congress a few days before Fulbright's January 16 address, as "a work of high political creativity," and he was confident that "the American people and their leaders are prepared to launch new and creative programs in various areas of our domestic life."[56]

The theme of Fulbright's January 16 speech was almost identical with the central idea of Walter Lippmann's February 2 column in the Washington Post. It was not surprising that the opinions of Fulbright and Lippmann were similar, for Fulbright had been a confidant of Lippmann for many years and the two men were communicating frequently in early 1965.[57] The Lippmann article was even more optimistic than the Fulbright address about the prospects for diverting American energies from the Cold War to domestic affairs under the Johnson administration.[58] Analyzing in retrospect the administration's performance in January, Lippmann wrote that for the first time in the quarter of a century since World War II began, the fundamental attention of the President of the United States was focused not upon the dangers abroad but upon the nation's problems at home.[59] The columnist affirmed that "the state of the world today permits and justifies the preoccupation with American

domestic affairs."[60] He eulogized Johnson's domestic proposals, writing, "we have rarely, if ever, seen at the beginning of a new administration such a coherent program, such insight and resourcefulness."[61]

It would be facile to condemn Fulbright's January 16 speech and Lippmann's February 2 column as exercises in wishful thinking; but it should be considered that in earlier articles Lippmann had warned against foreign entanglements which could destroy Johnson's reforms,[62] and Fulbright's Time interview had delineated his dissent against bombing. Moreover, the administration's plans for escalation in Vietnam were enveloped in secrecy, while the Johnson agenda for domestic reform was attracting an enormous amount of generally favorable publicity in Washington.[63] It seemed unlikely that a Great Society and a war in southeast Asia could be launched simultaneously. And it had only been a few months earlier that Johnson had dramatically portrayed himself as the "man of peace" in the 1964 campaign, proclaiming his absolute refusal to send American boys 10,000 miles away from home to fight a war Asian boys must fight for themselves. Both the renowned Washington Post columnist and the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee had been assured in conversations at the White House that the Vietnamese conflict would not be expanded.[64] Thus, at the end of January Walter Lippmann and J. William Fulbright imagined

broad vistas of time looming ahead, time for the Great Society of Lyndon Johnson to arise and flourish, and time for the gradual termination of America's anti-communist crusade.

The increasing campaign of aerial devastation in February dealt a severe blow to the hopes of those who had counseled restraint in Vietnam. The administration emphatically denied that the February bombings of North Vietnam represented a major policy change, justifying the air raids as retaliatory measures for the February 6 Vietcong attacks on the American army barracks at Pleiku in which nine Americans were killed.[65] In reality the initiation of regular bombing attacks advanced well beyond the limited reprisal strikes during the Tonkin Gulf crisis of August, 1964.[66] As the historian George C. Herring has observed, the Pleiku incident provided the auspicious occasion, not the cause, for implementing the program of air strikes which many administration officials had been advocating for more than two months.[67] Pleiku was not unprecedented; there had been a Vietcong assault on the Bien Hoa air base in November which had resulted in four American deaths; again in December the Vietcong exploded a bomb at Saigon's Brink Hotel, killing two Americans. Yet no retaliatory actions had been taken in late 1964, primarily because of fears of provoking a Vietcong offensive against the rapidly weakening South Vietnamese

regime.[68] By the end of January there was an overwhelming consensus within the bureaucracy that the Saigon government was so feeble only bombing would revive it.[69] William Bundy's November memorandum on Congressional opinion had maintained that "Bien Hoa" might be repeated at any time and would "give us a good springboard for any decision for stronger action."[70] McGeorge Bundy expressed this attitude more succinctly in February when he averred, "Pleikus are like streetcars" (i.e., one comes along every ten minutes.)[71]

McGeorge Bundy returned from Saigon in February recommending a policy of steadily intensifying air attacks. Fulbright was not invited to the crucial National Security Council meetings on Vietnam escalation in early 1965.[72] Senator Mike Mansfield of Montana was asked to attend the N.S.C. conference immediately after the Pleiku attack, however, and Mansfield's views were quite similar to those of Fulbright.[73] Years later Fulbright would remember Mansfield as the one Senator with whom he was cooperating most closely in his efforts to prevent a disastrous enlargement of the southeast Asian conflict.[74] At the N.S.C. meeting after Pleiku Mansfield stated his concern that the retaliatory policy might lead to Chinese intervention, or that it would eventually cause China and Russia to draw closer together and perhaps heal the growing Sino-Soviet split.[75] He offered the general

suggestion that the United States should begin negotiations on the Vietnamese controversy. President Johnson responded that we had disregarded provocation in the past but now communist aggression had become too outrageous, and he was certainly not going to be the President to preside over another "Munich."[76]

Mansfield had been the only critic of the retaliatory policy at the N.S.C. meeting, and Fulbright and Mansfield were the only opponents of bombing when the Congressional leaders were summoned to the White House to be informed of the President's decision.[77] Secretary of Defense Mansfield and other principal administration officials demonstrated to the Congressional leadership why the sole reasonable course of action was to expand the air war.[78] During these February meetings Johnson would first ask for the opinions of the leaders whose support could be expected, such as Everett Dirksen and John McCormack.[79]

Johnson would ask Fulbright and Mansfield for their views last, after a strong majority seemed to be coalescing in support of the President's position.[80] Fulbright repeated the arguments he and Mansfield had been presenting to Johnson in early 1965, that escalation of the bombing would entrap the United States in a quagmire everyone wanted to avoid.[81] The dissent of the Foreign Relations Committee chairman at that time was

largely based upon an instinctive reaction against the excessive use of violence in foreign policy, for he had few facts and figures with which to counter the plethora of intelligence reports and statistics resonating through the phrases of Robert McNamara in the White House conferences of February.[82]

Fulbright did not profess to have a comprehensive knowledge about Vietnam in early 1965. He had always been primarily knowledgeable about European and to a lesser extent Latin American affairs.[83] Throughout the year of 1965 he frequently engaged in lengthy conversations with journalists who had been to Vietnam, and he began to read extensively in the writings of Jean Lacouture, Han Suyin, Philippe Devillers, Bernard Fall, and other experts on China and southeast Asia.[84] Later in the year the Foreign Relations Committee attempted to develop additional independent sources of information on the war by employing two former members of the Foreign Service to travel to Vietnam and send back reports to the committee.[85] By December many competent observers of the Senate felt there were few Senators who had so rigorously studied the history, culture, and politics of southeast Asia as had Fulbright in the course of the year.[86] But it would require considerable time for the Senator to educate himself thoroughly about a region of the world he had considered peripheral to American interests. In early 1965 his opposition to

expanding the war was founded on his suspicion of zealous anti-communism and his reluctance to use force, precepts which were derived from his 22 years' experience in Congress of analyzing American foreign policy.

On February 12, 1965 Fulbright once again attempted to offer an alternative to the retaliatory policy by endorsing United Nations Secretary General U Thant's proposal for negotiations. The Senator asserted that "I think it is always wiser to talk than to fight when you can get the parties together."[87] On February 12 U Thant proposed that both sides enter into discussions aimed at preparing the ground for "formal negotiations for a settlement."[88] The Secretary General's plea was essentially a reiteration of his July, 1964 proposal to re-convene the 1954 Geneva Conference on southeast Asia.[89] U Thant did not try to summon the Security Council because of "its past history and the fact that some of the principal parties are not represented in the U.N.," presumably referring (according to a Washington Post report) to the facts that North Vietnam and China were not members of the U.N. and the Security Council meetings after the Tonkin crisis had not led to a diplomatic conference.[90] In applauding U Thant's plan of re-convening the 1954 Geneva Conference Fulbright observed that it was quite proper for the Secretary General of the U.N. to urge that negotiations be initiated immediately.[91] The administration's

response was diametrically opposed to Fulbright's suggestion. Both the State Department and the White House refused to comment on U Thant's specific proposal, although they definitively rejected the idea that negotiations were in order at that moment.[92]

During the weeks following Fulbright's approval of the February 12 U Thant recommendations, important columnists began referring to him as one of the Senate's prominent critics of military escalation in southeast Asia. On February 21 Drew Pearson stated that Johnson's Vietnam policy was receiving panegyrics from former critics of the President such as Richard Nixon, Barry Goldwater, and Everett Dirksen, while Democratic leaders "Mike Mansfield of Montana, Frank Church of Idaho, and even Bill Fulbright of Arkansas are either openly critical or privately unhappy."[93] Pearson did not elaborate upon his opinions concerning the substance of Fulbright's criticism.

A column by John Chamberlain later in February was explicit in its treatment of Fulbright's critique of American involvement in Vietnam. In an admiring article on Senator Thomas Dodd of Connecticut entitled "The Churchillian Voice of Tom Dodd," Chamberlain maintained that in the early days of the Cold War the Truman Doctrine had committed the United States to protect small nations being threatened by Communist aggression. Tom Dodd was courageously upholding the Truman Doctrine tradition by

defending the Doctrine's application to South Vietnam, the columnist opined, but Chamberlain lamented that "Morse of Oregon, Gruening of Alaska, Fulbright of Arkansas have all sidled away from the Truman Doctrine tradition."[94] There was a distinct implication in John Chamberlain's column that if Tom Dodd was the heir of Winston Churchill and valiant resistance to aggression, then Morse, Gruening, and Fulbright were the legatees of Neville Chamberlain and "appeasement."

Pro-administration journalists and several Republican Senators, especially Everett Dirksen, were criticizing Fulbright in early 1965 for hampering Johnson's foreign policy by advocating cooperation with the communist world.[95] The Foreign Relations Committee chairman eschewed direct criticism of Johnson, despite the fact that his endorsement of U Thant's proposal and his public skepticism in January on the efficacy of bombing had contradicted the administration's views of the war. He still clung to the illusion that he might privately dissuade the President from expansion of the conflict, and he regarded his public professions of loyalty to the administration as strengthening his private influence at the White House.[96]

In conversations with the President during March and April he again stressed the value of a Titoist buffer state for Vietnam. A March 3 Fulbright letter to Johnson revealed that the Senator's favorable perception of

Yugoslavia continued to influence his thinking about American relations with the communist world.[97] In the March 3 letter he related his belief that Tito was an unusually attractive and intelligent leader, and that Tito had requested in the November, 1964 discussion with Fulbright that the Senator convey to Johnson his wishes for a "further strengthening of friendly relations between our countries."[98] Tito had also mentioned a desire for Johnson to visit Yugoslavia in 1965.[99] The Senator persistently argued in private conversations with the President that a unified, communist Vietnam would be similar to the Yugoslavia of Tito in its nationalism and independence, that like Yugoslavia it might eventually engage in amicable relations with the United States, and that a unified, communist Vietnamese state would not represent a mere extension of Communist China.[100]

In early March Fulbright made only the most oblique references in public to his belief that the strength of nationalism, and not communist ideology, was central to the struggle in Vietnam.[101] He vaguely stated in an address at Johns Hopkins University that "I think we ought to ask ourselves hypothetically whether a Communist regime that leans away from China is worse or better from the viewpoint of our political and strategic interests than a non-Communist state, such as Indonesia or Cambodia, that leans toward China."[102] He did not elucidate the significance

of this statement for American policy in southeast Asia. The speech avoided discussion of Vietnam, in keeping with the Senator's strategy of refraining from public criticism of the President.[103] Fulbright's Johns Hopkins address did not attract significant attention.[104]

Fulbright clarified his public position on March 14, 1965 when he appeared on N.B.C.'s Meet the Press. On the N.B.C. program Fulbright doubted that southeast Asia was vital to American security "from a long-term point of view," but he conceded that U.S. interests were involved in Vietnam at that moment simply because of the American military presence in that country.[105] He was pessimistic about the prospects for improving the military situation through the large-scale introduction of American ground forces.[106] The Senator was asked for his opinion concerning the recent proposal of Everett Dirksen for a "no concession-no deal policy on further agreements and trade with the Communists until they halt aggression in Vietnam and elsewhere."[107] Fulbright dismissed the Dirksen suggestion, saying, "This so-called hard line, I think, leads nowhere."[108] He regretted that the Vietnamese conflict was an obstacle to the amelioration of Soviet-American relations, but he maintained that the United States should continue to negotiate constructive agreements with the U.S.S.R. such as the 1963 Test Ban Treaty.[109] Fulbright reiterated the theme of his January 16 Miami

address, calling for a policy of cooperation with the communist world and a re-orientation of American priorities towards solving domestic problems.[110]

In recalling the thesis of the Miami speech, repudiating Dirksen's belligerent ideas, and questioning the wisdom of sending U.S. ground forces to southeast Asia, Fulbright was remaining consistent with his earlier positions on Vietnam. But the general tenor of his remarks contradicted his previous opposition to bombing and his February support for immediate re-convening of the Geneva Conference. He expressed theoretical approval of negotiations, but through the circuitous logic that the air strikes would impress upon the North Vietnamese the "seriousness of the situation" and eventually lead to negotiations.[111] The air raids were appropriate, in Fulbright's opinion, because "the objective of these strikes is to bring about a negotiation."[112] Fulbright accepted the administration's claim that the bombing campaign was a tactic designed to avoid the introduction of American ground troops.[113] He thus reversed the perspective of his public as well as private views in January and February, when he had envisaged bombing as the precursor of a debilitating and inexorably expanding American military involvement in Vietnam.

On the March 14 edition of Meet The Press Lawrence Spivak observed that there were contradictory reports concerning Fulbright's analysis of President Johnson's

course in Vietnam. Some reports held that Fulbright supported Johnson's Vietnam policy, was being consulted constantly by the President, and wielded immense power within the administration's foreign policy councils.[114] Other reports, notably a recent New York Times story, contended Fulbright did not support the February retaliatory policy, did not exert significant influence in the administration's deliberations on Vietnam, and was not being adequately consulted by the President.[115] The New York Times report was obviously closer to reality, for Rusk's frequent breakfasts with Fulbright and Johnson's monologues to the Senator on his moderation and his need for Fulbright's help can hardly be considered aequate consultation. But Fulbright answered Spivak's request for a clarification of which reports were accurate by affirming his support for Johnson's policy in Vietnam and stating that he had been adequately consulted.[116] He did not speculate on the extent of his influence. The Foreign Relations Committee chairman asserted that it would be improper for the Committee to conduct public hearings on the war "while conditions are so critical in Vietnam."[117] The program ended on a melancholy note, with Fulbright concluding that he would be deeply disillusioned by a massive deployment of American ground forces in southeast Asia, but "when we are in this critical a matter we have to support our President, you know that, in our system."[118]

The notion that Congress must dutifully support the President in time of crisis constituted the most glaring flaw in Fulbright's campaign to prevent a disastrous American intervention in Vietnam. As long as Fulbright was competing with Robert McNamara, Dean Rusk, Maxwell Taylor, and McGeorge Bundy for the private attention of the President his protests were ineffective; he had been arguing at least as early as his May, 1964 letter to McNamara that the existence of a non-communist regime in South Vietnam was not crucial to American security, and his reasoning never had any significant impact on the administration. The Vietnam hearings of 1966 would demonstrate that Fulbright was most influential when he was revitalizing the public dialogue on American foreign policy which had become quiescent during the years of Cold War diplomacy in the 1950s and early 1960s. But in 1964 and 1965 Fulbright rejected Wayne Morse's plea for hearings on Vietnam.[119] The President professed to be fearful that a public debate would ignite a recrudescence of extreme anti-communist sentiment in the country, and in hopes of strengthening his influence with Johnson the Arkansas Senator did not attempt to foster such a dialogue in early 1965.[120] Thus, Fulbright averred on Meet the Press that a public debate on the war led by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee would hamper the President's execution of foreign policy during the southeast Asian crisis.

Fulbright had initiated tentative efforts to develop an open discussion of the Vietnam policy in January and February, 1965. He had publicly denied that bombing was a solution to the conflict and endorsed U Thant's proposal for a diplomatic conference on southeast Asia. His criticism of bombing occurred before the air attacks were escalated, and his endorsement of U Thant's recommendation was announced before the administration's rejection of negotiations was clear. By March he was forced to either follow the logic of his previous statements and openly criticize the President's decisions for escalation, or confine his dissent to private conversations. His comments in the Meet the Press appearance revealed his choice of the latter strategy.

It proved to be virtually impossible for the Senator to adhere consistently to this strategy. He would deliver indirect critiques of the administration's foreign policy even when he was attempting to publicize his loyalty to the President. On the Spivak program he had expressed disenchantment with the massive introduction of ground forces into southeast Asia during the same month when Johnson was ordering Marine battalions to South Vietnam.[121]

For a President as intolerant of dissent as was Lyndon Johnson, no public criticism could be allowed. By the summer of 1965 Fulbright concluded that if the President's anti-communist consensus was so stifling that only

secret dissent could be tolerated, then the restoration of the proper constitutional balance between the executive and Congress was imperative.[122] That balance might be restored by a public challenge to Johnson's foreign policy. Fulbright's challenge would occur when he became convinced that Johnson had justified the 1965 American intervention in the Dominican Republic through distorted claims of communist infiltration into that diminutive nation.[123] The administration's distortions of the communist threat in the Caribbean reinforced Fulbright's suspicion that the dangers of Asian communist aggression had been similarly exaggerated, that China was not Nazi Germany reincarnate.[124] Thus, by the end of 1965 he was prepared to conduct the comprehensive public investigation of America's Asian policy which the President had feared and skillfully delayed.

An analysis of Fulbright's responses to Johnson's foreign policy initiatives in late 1964 and early 1965 is largely the story of the waning of the Senator's optimism regarding the President. Fulbright was confident in late 1964 that many communist states, especially Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union, were displaying a more cooperative attitude towards the United States. In his praise of George Kennan's November, 1964 article on China there was even the hope that the Chinese might become less hostile towards the West, despite the Senator's inaccurate

perception of China as imperialistic at that time. Fulbright believed that Johnson would capitalize on this nascent reduction in Cold War animosities by channeling American energies into domestic affairs, consequently redoubling the nation's vitality. The war in Vietnam had all but destroyed Fulbright's optimism by the spring of 1965. He began to fear that the President would not only fail to "build bridges" to the communist world, but would lead America on a violent crusade into the depths of the ominous Vietnamese labyrinth.

Chapter III

THE PRELUDE TO FULBRIGHT'S DISSENT, APRIL-JUNE, 1965

Senator Fulbright was becoming increasingly disillusioned with the American foreign aid program in the mid-1960s. Since the late 1950s he had argued against utilizing foreign aid to support corrupt, reactionary regimes whose only merit was their zealous anti-communism. In late 1964 he notified Dean Rusk of his refusal to manage the foreign aid bill in 1965.[1] The Washington Post columnist William S. White denounced Fulbright's decision as "an unexampled abdication of the traditional responsibility of a chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee."[2] Walter Lippmann's column in early March, 1965 expressed a less heated and more logical view of Fulbright's refusal to manage the bill. The fundamental issue concerning foreign aid, in Lippmann's opinion, was the dispute between Fulbright and most members of the House of Representatives, who resisted expansion of economic aid programs but consistently supported massive military assistance to oppose communism throughout the world. Lippmann believed President Johnson could not support Fulbright because of the House's adamant opposition to the Senator's position, but that the administration basically agreed with

Fulbright's arguments for reduced military assistance and expanded economic assistance.[3] The columnist concluded that Fulbright "is doing wonders to make the country and the Congress begin to re-examine the encrusted deposit of ideas and ideology and prejudices under which our foreign policy labors and groans."[4]

Fulbright eventually acquiesced to administration pressures and agreed to manage the foreign aid bill in 1965. He had proposed the division of military and economic aid into two separate bills, the substitution of multilateral for bilateral assistance, and long-term instead of annual aid authorizations.[5] The administration did not incorporate any of Fulbright's innovations into the aid program.[6] This rejection of Fulbright's proposals, as well as his disagreements with administration officials during the foreign aid hearings in March and April, revealed that the administration's perspective on foreign aid was much more similar to the House of Representatives' view than Lippmann had believed.

David E. Bell, the Administrator of the Agency for International Development, appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee on March 12 to discuss the foreign aid bill. At the March 12 hearing Fulbright enumerated fourteen small nations which were receiving American aid, including South Vietnam, and asked Bell if the United States had vital interests in all of those nations. Bell

delivered two contradictory responses, replying first that American interests were certainly not involved in all of the countries.[7] When Fulbright pressed him to justify aid to countries in which U.S. interests were nonexistent, the A.I.D. Administrator replied that American interests were served whenever a nation preserved its independence of communist domination.[8] Fulbright rejoined: "Now you have come to the crux of it. We are so fascinated with communism that we are just going to keep out the communists all over the world."[9]

Fulbright rejected Bell's contention that anti-communism was a legitimate reason for extending foreign aid to a nation and thus involving the United States in its affairs.[10] He doubted that the United States had any vital interests in South Vietnam. In Fulbright's opinion, economic aid had gradually led to the burgeoning military commitment to South Vietnam, so that American pride and prestige had become inextricably entangled with the campaign to preserve the South Vietnamese regime.[11] He asserted that Americans assumed the nation's interests were involved in South Vietnam simply because of the massive economic and military commitment to that nation. But in Fulbright's view, it was primarily the nebulous and emotional concept of America's "honor, pride, and prestige" which was involved in Vietnam. Bell defended his evaluation of South Vietnam as crucial to American security by

quoting President Eisenhower's 1954 statement to the South Vietnamese: "We support you, we want to help you, we think it is important that your independence be sustained."[12] Fulbright responded that if the United States defined its vital interests in terms of maintaining other nations' independence, then no region of the globe was exempt from American responsibility.[13]

Fulbright continued to question the administration's assumptions concerning Vietnam when Under Secretary of State George W. Ball testified before the Foreign Relations Committee on April 7. The committee's chairman was gravely concerned by the negative Japanese reaction to the American military escalation. He observed that Shunichi Matsumoto, a senior Japanese diplomat, had recently challenged Washington's allegation that the Vietcong insurgency was predominantly a communist movement.[14] Premier Eisaku Sato had sent Matsumoto to survey the situation in Vietnam. In his report to Sato, Matsumoto stated that the Vietcong had no direct connection with China or the Soviet Union. The Vietcong insurgents were basically nationalistic and would not renounce their political and military objectives in the South because of the bombing of North Vietnam.[15] Fulbright inserted in the record of the hearings a New York Times article which attributed great significance to the Matsumoto report, partly because of Matsumoto's stature as the special envoy of Sato, but fundamentally

because his ideas seemed to confirm a skepticism about America's role in Vietnam already evident in Japan. The New York Times news story concluded that despite the support for the U.S. position in the official rhetoric of the Sato government, Japanese public opinion was overwhelmingly negative in its response to President Johnson's Vietnam policy.[16]

George Ball responded to Fulbright's pessimistic statements concerning Japanese public opinion by emphasizing the Sato's regime's steadfast verbal support for the American position.[17] Fulbright proceeded to ask Ball why the two largest Japanese newspapers were so hostile to American policy, especially the newspaper Asahi, which had published an article by Matsumoto summarizing his Vietnam report. Ball and Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations Douglas MacArthur II attempted to denigrate the Japanese criticism by arguing that the two huge Japanese newspapers were infiltrated by communists.[18] Fulbright interrupted this argument to assert that Matsumoto was certainly not a communist, and Premier Sato had authorized his mission. The Senator questioned Ball about the validity of Matsumoto's contention that the Vietcong would not cease their military operations because of the bombing of North Vietnam. Ball rejected Matsumoto's analysis, claiming the Vietcong were commanded by North Vietnam and encouraged by China. The bombing would bring about a cessation of the

North's infiltration and control of the southern guerrillas, according to Ball, thus rendering the South Vietnamese insurrection "quite manageable."[19]

Fulbright continued to elaborate upon the adverse foreign reaction to American policy in Asia. The chairman sardonically commented on Canada's failure to share Washington's perception of China as a malevolent aggressor: "The Canadians, as you know, among our friends have probably the best representation and best reception in China than any, and we usually don't consider the Canadians Communists."[20] Fulbright observed that a recent article from the Toronto Globe and Mail had failed to support American assumptions about the war in southeast Asia. The Toronto Globe described the escalation of the war as a "perilous course" which risked a Chinese retaliation against the inexorably expanding American intervention.[21] Fulbright also fostered a brief discussion regarding Canadian Prime Minister Lester Pearson's critique of Johnson's Vietnam policy, apparently referring to Pearson's appeal for a termination of the U.S. bombing campaign and an immediate effort to conclude a peaceful settlement.[22] He avoided endorsing Pearson's controversial position, but he felt the Canadian Prime Minister's proposals at least deserved serious consideration rather than an irascible dismissal. Ball averred, however, that communist propaganda had indirectly influenced the thinking of the Canadians, the

French, and other peoples who were critical of American policy in Vietnam.[23]

George Ball was probably the most eloquent and vigorous private critic of the military escalation in Vietnam,[24] yet his statements at the foreign aid hearings revealed no intimation of his private dissent. He replied to Fulbright's questions concerning Japanese and Canadian opposition to the U.S. intervention by denouncing North Vietnam's aggression and by stressing the support the United States was receiving from the great majority of its allies. He recounted the Sato government's firm verbal assistance for the American cause in Vietnam. The N.A.T.O. Council had endorsed the American position a week earlier and would regard any American withdrawal as catastrophic, according to Ball.[25] He did concede that the French government disapproved of the U.S. military involvement in southeast Asia. But the French disapprobation, no less than that of Lester Pearson, was influenced by the communist propaganda falsely portraying the Indochinese war as an indigenous revolt. Ball regretted that the complexity of the Vietnamese situation facilitated the dissemination of this communist propaganda throughout the world.[26]

During the course of the hearings, Fulbright had generated a limited amount of constructive debate by trying to elicit from David Bell and G.W. Ball a definition of American interests in Vietnam and an explanation

of the burgeoning international opposition to President Johnson's foreign policy. It was unfortunately an atrophied debate, for there were only a half dozen passages in the entire 650 pages of testimony in which administration witnesses were compelled to defend the Vietnam policy. Only Fulbright, Morse, and Republican Senator George Aiken[27] of Vermont (there were nineteen members on the committee) asked a substantial number of questions about Vietnam, and much of the testimony dealt with less important issues connected with the aid program.

The 1965 foreign aid hearings might have provided an excellent opportunity to conduct a thorough investigation of the Vietnam dilemma; one year later Rusk's testimony for a foreign economic aid authorization to South Vietnam developed into the celebrated 1966 Vietnam hearings, and again in 1968 when Rusk testified for that year's foreign assistance bill the Foreign Relations Committee subjected him to a lengthy and rather hostile interrogation.[28] But in early 1965 few members on the committee were adversaries of the executive branch. Fulbright was still attempting to demonstrate his support for President Johnson, despite his disagreements with administration officials at the hearings.

Fulbright developed several ideas during the foreign aid discussions which were central to his critique of the crusading anti-communism of American diplomacy. He recalled a theme he had been emphasizing since the late

1950s when he repudiated the A.I.D. Administrator's contention that opposition to communism constituted a legitimate basis for extending foreign aid to a government. The Senator persistently affirmed in 1965 and the later 1960s that American pride and prestige rather than any crucial national interests were involved in Vietnam.[29] He also maintained that the aid program had acquired a momentum of its own, so that many Americans were psychologically unable to liquidate the commitment and thus admit that the billions of dollars previously channeled into support of South Vietnam had been a fatuous and futile investment. In this perspective, additional billions would have to be expended to insure that the earlier investment was not wasted.[30]

The chairman had revealed briefly at the 1965 foreign aid hearings that administration witnesses experienced immense difficulties in presenting a persuasive defense of their policies when confronted by critical questioning. For example, the only specific argument David Bell could ultimately muster to define a concrete American interest in Vietnam was the need to uphold Eisenhower's 1954 pledge of support to South Vietnam. G.W. Ball's basic refutation of Matsumoto, Pearson, and the French was the sterile assertion that communist propaganda had misled them. Throughout the later Johnson years the voices of dissent were strengthened

by the abject failure of administration officials to present a cogent justification for President Johnson's foreign policy when they testified before the Foreign Relations Committee.[31]

The administration was hostile to any intensive discussion of the Vietnam war. Secretary McNamara was especially disenchanted by the prospect of appearing before an open session of the Foreign Relations Committee. He insisted that his testimony should be given at an executive session hearing.[32] A transcript of the foreign assistance hearings was made available to the public later in 1965, but many of the statements by Bell, McNamara, and Ball were deleted "in the interest of national security."[33] At one juncture during the McNamara hearing on March 24 Fulbright asked the Secretary of Defense ten consecutive questions about Vietnam, and nine of the responses were either evasions or security deletions.[34] When Rusk testified there was little discussion of southeast Asia. Thus the dialogue on Vietnam at the foreign aid hearings of March and April, 1965 receded into obscurity, emasculated by the President's antipathy towards public debate and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's reluctance to challenge the administration.

Fulbright was especially careful to avoid vehement disputes with the President's advisers in late March and early April, for he believed Johnson was finally

beginning to see the validity of his arguments for a negotiated settlement. On one occasion at the end of March Fulbright privately conferred with Johnson at length, and in contrast to their earlier conversations the President seemed to be attentive and sympathetic.[35] When the administration announced another escalation of the American military effort a few days later Fulbright eschewed definite criticism of the decision.

The President had decided at an April 2 National Security Council meeting to intensify the air attacks against North Vietnam, dispatch several thousand additional troops (there were 28,000 American soldiers in Vietnam at the time) to South Vietnam, and provide assistance for a major expansion of the South Vietnamese military forces.[36] The administration would also increase economic assistance to Saigon.[37] Maxwell Taylor, the Ambassador to Saigon who had recently arrived in Washington to attend the N.S.C. meeting, appeared later on April 2 before a closed joint session of the Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees.[38] Fulbright told reporters after the joint session that he was unhappy and apprehensive about Vietnam because the war "can always escalate beyond control."[39] He precluded an interpretation of this comment as an indictment of Johnson's policy by adding that Ambassador Taylor was "unhappy and apprehensive, too."[40] The Senator was concerned that

the administration had not defined its views of an "acceptable" political settlement, but he continued to profess his general support for the President.[41]

In early April Fulbright attempted to persuade Johnson that a Titoist buffer state in Vietnam would be compatible with American interests. He summarized his ideas about Vietnam in a memorandum which he sent to the White House on April 5, two days before the President was to deliver an important address at Johns Hopkins University.[42] Fulbright's Vietnam memorandum consisted of six basic propositions. First, it would be a disaster for the United States to engage in a massive ground and air war in southeast Asia.[43] A prolonged war in Vietnam would be extremely costly and would revive and intensify the Cold War, which had begun to ease after the Cuban missile crisis.[44] A large-scale air war would not defeat the Vietcong and would risk an intervention by the North Vietnamese Army or even by China.[45] Fulbright predicted that "the commitment of a large American land army would involve us in a bloody and interminable conflict in which the advantage would lie with the enemy."[46]

The memorandum's second point held that Chinese imperialism, and not communist ideology, represented the primary danger to peace in Asia.[47] Fulbright's perception of China as an imperialistic power was the only serious flaw in the memorandum.[48] A year later

he would effectively refute his earlier views by writing that the Chinese tended to be introspective and were vastly more concerned with their domestic objectives of industrialization and social transformation than with supporting foreign revolutions.[49] In 1966 Fulbright asserted that despite the ferocity of China's official rhetoric, the Chinese had made no effort to subjugate the weak and non-aligned nation of Burma, had voluntarily withdrawn from North Korea, and had failed to intervene in Vietnam.[50] The second argument of his April, 1965 paper was accurate where it argued that Chinese ideology could not harm the United States, and the following point of the document correctly stressed the resiliency of Asian nationalism. Fulbright's third proposition stated that the smaller Asian nations were historically afraid of - and independent of - China.[51] Thus, a communist state in Vietnam independent of China, as Tito was independent of Russia, wuld be far more valuable for world security than a feeble anti-communist regime dependent on American dollars and manpower.[52]

The three remaining proposals of the memorandum dealt with Fulbright's appeal for a negotiated settlement. In order to end the war, the United States should declare a moratorium on the bombing, clarify its intentions, and initiate a campaign to persuade the Vietnamese people, north and south, of the economic

and political advantages of a free, independent Vietnamese state.[53] The United States could make its wishes known through Great Britain or Russia that it would accept an independent Vietnamese regime, regardless of political makeup, and that it would cooperate with the other great powers in guaranteeing the independence of Vietnam and the rights of minorities.[54] America should join with the great powers in assuring that the new unified regime would not be the pawn or satellite of any great power.[55] Finally, it would be advantageous for international stability to have a government in Vietnam oriented more towards Russia rather than exclusively towards China, since at least for the moment China was in a belligerent and resentful mood.[56] The inaccurate perspective on China again weakened this final point, but it should be noted that there was an assumption in Fulbright's Vietnam memorandum, as there had been in his 1964 "Bridges East and West" speech, that the Chinese were not immune to the laws of change and their "resentful" attitude was not absolute or permanent.[57]

On the day after President Johnson received the Senator's written recommendations for a diplomatic settlement he invited Fulbright and Mansfield to the White House to discuss the draft of his Johns Hopkins University speech.[58] Fulbright's influence was partially responsible for the passage in Johnson's address

proposing "unconditional discussions."[59] After President Johnson delivered his speech at Baltimore on April 7 Fulbright complimented the President's conciliatory tone.[60] The Johns Hopkins address was crucial in convincing Fulbright that he was persuading Johnson of the futility in escalating the Vietnam war.[61] Fulbright's response to the speech was too sanguine, for Johnson reiterated at Baltimore the fundamental goal of three previous administrations: "Our objective is the independence of South Vietnam and its freedom from attack."[62] Johnson regarded the American bargaining position as much too precarious to begin serious negotiations in the spring of 1965; thus the dramatic peace initiative at Johns Hopkins was primarily designed to silence international and domestic critics of U.S. foreign policy.[63]

If the Johns Hopkins address temporarily muted Fulbright's criticism of President Johnson, it failed to prevent the Senator from offering alternatives to the escalation policy and publicly disagreeing with the President's advisers. It was not illogical for Fulbright to have made a crucial distinction between Johnson and the President's immediate entourage, because Johnson was assiduously cultivating an image of himself as a "dove" surrounded by "hawkish" advisers, particularly in his communications with Fulbright, McGovern, and Church.[64] Fulbright provoked a brief but acrimonious

controversy with Rusk and McNamara on April 18 when he advocated a cessation of the air strikes against North Vietnam in order to open an avenue towards peace negotiations.[65] While the White House refused to comment, Dean Rusk rebuked Fulbright for proposing an action which "would only encourage the aggressor and dishearten our friends who bear the brunt of battle."[66] Secretary McNamara declared that terminating the bombing of North Vietnam would discourage the South Vietnamese people in their struggle to oppose Hanoi's campaign of terror, which was dependent upon the daily flow of men and military equipment from the North.[67] Republican Senator Jacob Javits of New York joined Rusk and McNamara in rejecting Fulbright's proposal, and Senator John Stennis of Mississippi asseverated that far from halting the bombings, the United States must prepare to fight an expanded war for an indefinite period.[68]

It was remarkable for Fulbright's mild criticism (which was expressed in an interview with Jack Bell of the Associated Press) to have provoked such vituperation from the Cabinet officials. Fulbright had merely hypothesized that a temporary cease-fire would be advisable "in the near future before the escalation goes too far" in order to allow all of the belligerents time to calmly reflect upon the situation in Vietnam.[69] He preferred a cease-fire for all combatants, but if that couldn't be obtained then the United States should

unilaterally stop the bombing.[70] In Fulbright's opinion, the air war against the North Vietnamese might galvanize them into more determined resistance to the U.S. military effort.[71] The North Vietnamese might react to aerial devastation as Great Britain had in World War II, when the German air raids had only strengthened British resolve to defeat Hitler.[72] Furthermore, the Foreign Relations Committee chairman felt the Russians might cooperate in bringing about a diplomatic conference on southeast Asia if the air strikes were suspended, but would resist negotiations while the bombing continued.[73] Fulbright approved of Johnson's proposal at Baltimore for a Mekong River Valley economic development program, but essentially his approbation was based on the belief that peace would have to be established as a precondition for inaugurating such a program.[74] He did not think the Mekong River development project was feasible while the war continued.[75]

Fulbright's Associated Press interview was followed by a series of speeches delivered by dissenting Senators in late April. On April 28 Senator Church praised the contributions of Fulbright, Mansfield, and Aiken to the Vietnam debate by inserting into the Congressional Record Arthur Krock's column in the April 22 New York Times. Krock complimented the three members of the Foreign Relations Committee for responsibly fulfilling their constitutional role in advising the President on

foreign affairs.[76] In Krock's opinion, Fulbright had received "unwarranted abuse" from the President's advisers for recommending a temporary suspension of the bombing.[77] He considered the "hysterical attacks on Senator Fulbright" to be evidence that the administration refused to even consider Fulbright's idea.[78]

Krock was complimentary of Mansfield's April 21 speech in the Senate, in which he had proposed the reconvening of the Geneva Conference on the limited basis of guaranteeing the neutrality of Cambodia.[79] Mansfield hoped a Cambodian neutrality agreement would be the preliminary to a diplomatic solution for Vietnam. The Montana Senator's response to the Johns Hopkins address was similar to that of Fulbright in extolling the President's call for unconditional discussions. But Robert McNamara announced another expansion of the war on the same day of Mansfield's speech, prompting Arthur Krock's foreboding conclusion: "Continued escalation of the Vietnam war on a steadily rising scale is our only policy for the restoration of peace in southeast Asia."[80]

Senator Church characterized Joseph Kraft's columns as unusually perceptive analyses of the Vietnam crisis, and placed Kraft's April 23 Washington Evening Star article in the Record.[81] Kraft maintained that the United States must achieve a negotiated settlement immediately, before the great communist powers became directly involved in southeast Asia. He viewed the

substantial reduction in Vietcong attacks during early April as a propitious development. "Taken together with the expressions of such figures as the Pope, Senator J. William Fulbright, Democrat, of Arkansas, and Prime Minister Lester Pearson, of Canada," the nascent decline in Vietcong military activity presented excellent prospects for a cease-fire and discussions.[82] Kraft warned that if the opportunity was missed, a vicious circle of reciprocal escalation would ensue which might lead to general war. In response to the American bombing of North Vietnam the Russians had just begun to provide the North Vietnamese with antiaircraft missiles, whereupon China attempted to surpass the Soviets in demonstrating their support for Hanoi by officially recruiting volunteers, a policy the Chinese had not followed since they intervened in Korea in 1950.[83]

On the same day Church lauded the recommendations of Fulbright and Mansfield, the Foreign Relations Committee chairman delivered a brief set of remarks on the Senate floor. Fulbright approved of Senator Aiken's recent speeches advocating a vigorous role for the United Nations in extricating the United States from the tragic predicament in Vietnam.[84] He inserted a New York Times editorial into the Record which eulogized the "dean of Senate Republicans."[85] The Times editorial criticized the State Department's refusal to encourage U.N. Secretary General U Thant in his campaign to

initiate negotiations on the southeast Asian crisis.[86] The April 28 Senate statements by Fulbright and Church, as well as the other dissenting speeches and interviews in April, offered a definite alternative to the Johnson administration's course in Vietnam. In the critics' view, the United States should suspend the air war against North Vietnam as an initial step towards reconvening the Geneva Conference. They believed Secretary General U Thant should be encouraged in his efforts to arrange a diplomatic conference on southeast Asia.

It was clear in late April that an expansion of the war was opposed by several senior members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the columnists Joseph Kraft and Walter Lippmann, the New York Times editorialists, U Thant and other Asian statesmen, the Pope, Prime Minister Pearson, and Charles de Gaulle. And in addition to this rather formidable array of world leaders, there were other prestigious statesmen who were privately advising the President against escalation in Vietnam, notably Adlai Stevenson and George Ball.

The Senators and foreign policy analysts associated with Fulbright, Mansfield, and Lippmann could not match the powerful influence exerted on American diplomacy by a bipartisan political coalition which was rapidly coalescing in support of the escalation policy during the spring of 1965. William S. White, a Johnson intimate, described this "new coalition" in a Washington Post

column at the end of April. White extolled the leadership of the Republican Party for forming an alliance with the Democratic administration and rallying to the aid of "a country called the United States of America in its terrible and thankless task of standing up all over the world against creeping Communist aggression."[87] Senate Republican Leader Everett Dirksen and House Republican Leader Gerald R. Ford of Michigan were providing invaluable assistance for the President's resolute opposition to communist expansion. Dwight Eisenhower, Richard Nixon, and Barry Goldwater were dutifully aiding the Republican Congressional leadership in this indispensable concert for the survival of America. In contrast to White's panegyrics of the Republicans and the Johnson administration, the journalist lamented that "the chief foreign policy spokesman in the Senate, J. William Fulbright," and Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield were "hampering rather than supporting this Government in its all-national policy to resist Communist aggression in South Vietnam."[88] According to White, Fulbright and Mansfield were the leaders of "a thin but vocal fringe of the Democratic Party" which invariably opposed American military actions in the Congo, Latin America, Vietnam, or any region of the globe where American power was honorably employed.[89]

The Vietnam war was temporarily eclipsed during late April by an American military intervention in the

diminutive and impoverished isle of Hispaniola in the Caribbean Sea. The eastern half of that island, the Dominican Republic, was being ravaged by a rebellion against the pro-American regime of Donald Reid Cabral.[90] By April 28, Reid had been overthrown and civil war was being waged between the regular Dominican military leaders and the supporters of Juan Bosch, the former president.[91] Ambassador W. Tapley Bennett sent a series of cables to Washington, the first emphasizing the need to protect American lives, the later cables predicting "another Cuba" if the military junta's forces collapsed.[92] C.I.A. reports of communist support for the Bosch movement began to alarm Washington officials, especially Thomas C. Mann, the administration's principal Latin American specialist and a zealous anti-communist.[93] President Johnson briefly conferred with Thomas Mann and then instructed McNamara to order U.S. Marines to the Dominican Republic.[94]

A few hours after Fulbright delivered his April 28 Senate remarks on the U.N. and Vietnam, he was summoned to an emergency meeting at the White House. Fulbright and other members of Congress were informed of the administration's decision to land Marines in Santo Domingo for the sole purpose of protecting the lives of Americans and other foreigners.[95] Johnson said nothing of communist infiltration.[96] Fulbright did not express any disapproval of an intervention to save American

lives.[97] Later that evening Johnson appeared before national television cameras to report the Congressional leadership's endorsement of his actions in the Dominican crisis.[98] He told the American people the Marines had landed "in order to give protection to hundreds of Americans who are still in the Dominican Republic and to escort them safely back to this country."[99] Again there was no mention of communism.[100] Yet in another televised address on May 2, the President abruptly reversed the justification for his decision and represented the intervention as a campaign to prevent communist expansion in the Caribbean: "The American nation cannot, and must not, and will not permit the establishment of another Communist government in the Western Hemisphere."[101]

Fulbright, Morse, and Senator Eugene McCarthy of Minnesota were privately disturbed by the apparent metamorphosis of the intervention from an evacuation of American citizens to a crusade against Caribbean communism.[102] Johnson had actually been agitated by the threat of communism on Hispaniola since late April. John Bartlow Martin, the former ambassador to the Dominican Republic, later recounted a conversation at the White House on April 30 in which Johnson proclaimed he did not "intend to sit here with my hands tied and let Castro take that island. What can we do in Vietnam if we can't clean up the Dominican Republic?"[103] Fulbright was perplexed in late April by the conflicting

reports on the revolt in Santo Domingo. The chairman and Senator McCarthy contended that the Foreign Relations Committee should conduct a thorough classified investigation of the Dominican intervention. Dodd, Frank Lausche of Ohio, Karl Mundt of South Dakota, and other members of the committee were disgruntled at the prospect of an exhaustive analysis regarding the administration's actions, but at the insistence of Fulbright and McCarthy the Dominican hearings began in the summer of 1965.[104]

In the beginning Fulbright was not certain that the administration had committed an egregious error in landing over 20,000 American troops in Santo Domingo. But he began to doubt Johnson's judgment in May. His misgivings were intensified by the administration's failure to demonstrate that communists dominated the Dominican revolt. Fulbright became more determined to hold extended hearings after he listened to C.I.A. Director William F. Raborn's briefing shortly after the President decided to intervene. The Foreign Relations Committee chairman asked Raborn to specify the number of communists who were definitely involved in the Dominican revolution. Raborn replied, "Well, we identified three."[105]

Fulbright devoted much of his attention to Vietnam and Europe (and also to domestic affairs) in the six weeks following the initial deployment of Marines in the Dominican Republic. In early May the President requested from Congress a $700 million supplemental

appropriation, explaining that the passage of this appropriation would be considered a vote of confidence in his entire Vietnam policies.[106] The $700 million was primarily intended to cover military expenditures for Vietnam. The Senate passed the measure by an overwhelmingly pro-administration vote on May 6, with only Morse, Gruening, and Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin in opposition.[107]

Fulbright was in Europe at the time of the May 6 vote, delivering speeches before the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe in Strasbourg. At a Strasbourg news conference on May 5, Fulbright advocated a Vietnam settlement based on the 1954 Geneva agreements.[108] The Senator called for the United Nations to supervise the elections envisaged by the Geneva accords. He believed the elections would lead to a nationalist regime which would be determined to maintain its independence of China.[110] A week later in a speech at Vienna he stated that the emerging reconciliation between East and West "can be arrested and reversed at any time by the spreading impact of such occurrences as the tragic war in Vietnam."[111] In the Strasbourg and Vienna statements Fulbright did not deviate from his earlier professions of support for President Johnson,[112] despite his appeal for a negotiated settlement.

The Johnson administration suspended the bombing from May 12 until May 18, prompting Arthur Krock to

disparage the previous Rusk-McNamara invective against Fulbright's proposal for a bombing halt.[113] Three weeks earlier Fulbright's recommendation had provoked a deluge of fiery rhetoric from the Cabinet officials portraying a bombing pause as a betrayal of America's friends and an encouragement to aggressors. Now in May the administration was experimenting with a temporary cessation of the air raids against North Vietnam. In a May 18 New York Times column Krock observed, "The reason why this swift turnabout has embarrassed the Administration is the round of shooting-from-the-hip which the highest officials engaged in, with Fulbright's suggestion as their target."[114] The air strikes were resumed a few hours after the Krock column was written.[115] Fulbright initially responded to the bombing suspension with mildly favorable comments, but in an October, 1965 Meet the Press appearance he argued that a bombing pause must continue much longer than six days to represent a genuine peace initiative.[116] For Fulbright, suspension of the air attacks should have been the prelude to negotiations; for the administration, the ephemeral bombing halt of May was essentially a strategem in the campaign to silence its critics.[117]

Fulbright delivered his last speeches in support of the Johnson administration during the first half of June. Johnson requested an additional $89 million of economic assistance to South Vietnam, Thailand, and Laos in a

June 1 special message to Congress.[118] Fulbright endorsed the proposal for expanded economic assistance in a Senate address of June 7 entitled "Political and Economic Reconstruction in South Vietnam."[119] The June 7 speech was Fulbright's first important Senate discourse concerning Vietnam in 1965. He had been relatively quiet in the aftermath of his confrontation with Rusk and McNamara in April. Earlier in the year he had expressed his views on Vietnam in press conferences, interviews, occasional references to southeast Asia in speeches on foreign affairs, and insertions of articles and editorials into the Congressional Record, such as Frank Church's January Ramparts interview and the April New York Times editorial advocating a vigorous role for the U.N. in southeast Asia. But Fulbright had eschewed major Senate addresses on Vietnam until June 7, partially in order to refrain from direct public criticism of the President.

"Political and Economic Reconstruction in South Vietnam" dealt with two basic issues: Johnson's June 1 request, and the nascent nationalism of underdeveloped countries in Asia, Latin America, and Africa. Fulbright maintained that in Vietnam, as in the other emerging nations, nationalism was a far more powerful force than communist or capitalist ideology. "Communism" or "democracy" would be successful "in the underdeveloped world to the extent - and only to the extent - that they make themselves the friends of the new nationalism."[120]

In Fulbright's opinion, the Vietnamese people were not concerned with the ideological struggle between communism and democracy. He believed the Vietnamese were principally interested in tending their rice crops, educating their children, building a viable economy, and ending the violence which ravaged their land. The meeting of their human needs was "the only meaningful objective of the war and the probable condition of success in the war."[121] Fulbright regretted that American efforts to stabilize South Vietnam's political and economic structure had been dwarfed by American expenditures for war in southeast Asia.

On June 7 Fulbright also enumerated Johnson's recommendations for additional economic assistance to South Vietnam, Thailand, and Laos. Approximately half of the $89 million would be used to finance Saigon's imports of iron, steel, and other materials necessary for industrial expansion, and another $25 million would provide electrical, agricultural, and medical services. The remaining $19 million would be utilized for the development of the Mekong River Basin.[122] It was ironic that Fulbright was endorsing the Mekong project, for in 1965 he had been scathingly critical of such bilateral assistance programs during the foreign aid debate. He had argued that economic aid should be multilateral rather than bilateral in order to attenuate charges of American "neocolonialism" and to help prevent the

United States from becoming increasingly entangled in the internal affairs of other nations.[123] He had denied that vital American interests were involved in many of the underdeveloped nations receiving American aid, including South Vietnam.[124]

Fulbright's June 7 endorsement of the President's Baltimore proposals for a Mekong River Basin project was partially inconsistent with his April Associated Press interview, in which he had doubted the feasibility of inaugurating the Mekong program while the war continued. Even during the June 7 Senate debate Fulbright was ambivalent about the Mekong project. Shortly after he praised Johnson's Baltimore proposals in his speech, he became engaged in a dialogue with Senator Gruening in which he said, "So long as the war is continuing as it is, what we can do in this respect [the Mekong River Basin development] will be limited."[125] Fulbright's fundamental position was probably summarized a few moments later when he reiterated his support for a negotiated settlement as a precondition for the economic development of southeast Asia. He concluded: "What appeals to me the most about the proposal is the possibility--at least, I hope it is a probability that the emphasis will be changed from escalating the war into construction or reconstruction and development in this area."[126]

An unlikely coalition formed on June 7 to oppose the President's request for expanded economic assistance

to South Vietnam. Wayne Morse and Ernest Gruening, the two most radical opponents of Johnson's Vietnam policy,[127] were aligned with a group of Senators who had enthusiastically endorsed expenditures for military escalation in Vietnam, including Bourke Hickenlooper of Iowa and Strom Thurmond of South Carolina. The improbable Hickenlooper-Morse alliance acquired 26 total votes.[128] Johnson's recommendations were supported by the majority of the dissenters against escalation, including Fulbright, Mansfield, McGovern, Nelson, and Church. Dirksen and several fervent anti-communists also voted in favor of the administration. Jacob Javits and Robert Kennedy of New York, as well as Edward Kennedy of Massachusetts and one-third of the entire Senate, abstained. The economic aid passed the Senate by a vote of 42 to 26.

An understanding of the June 7 debate might be enhanced by analyzing the arguments of Hickenlooper, Fulbright, and Morse. Hickenlooper asserted that the Senate did not have sufficient information concerning the economic assistance proposal. In contrast, the Iowa Senator considered the military requests to have been quite specific. When Fulbright pressed him to define exactly what the military appropriations would be used for in Vietnam, the most specific explanations Hickenlooper could offer were "for war," "for military activity," and finally, for "victory."[129] Fulbright

challenged Hickenlooper's statements, maintaining (in a reference to the May 7 passage of Johnson's military appropriation request) "the Senate even more precipitately authorized and appropriated $700 million, and no one knew whether that was to be used for nuclear bombs for Peiping, or what it was to be used for."[130] According to Fulbright, the Senators associated with Hickenlooper had complete trust in the military leaders and allowed them to spend billions of dollars as they pleased, but this pro-military Senate bloc would subject any meager request for economic assistance to the most rigorous and pedantic examination.

Wayne Morse represented the smallest faction in the Senate. He did not oppose all economic aid to South Vietnam, but he did oppose the addition of $89 million to the foreign aid bill, wryly observing, "We had better get the war settled first. I have a little difficulty with the paradox of pouring $89 million of aid into a country and, at the same time, destroying $89 million worth of property."[131] Morse concluded that the Senate could never be adequately informed about the expenditure of the $89 million in a land 9,000 miles from American shores, just as it had not possessed precise information regarding the $700 million military appropriation in May.

The Oregon Senator emphasized the fact that the Vietcong would inevitably capture many of the materials sent to rural areas.[132] Morse's perspective was accurate,

for the Vietcong dominated many rural areas throughout South Vietnam and had frequently captured American commodities (and American weapons) intended for South Vietnam's development.[133] Hickenlooper's June 7 orations on the merits of military appropriations as opposed to economic appropriations were vacuous, although he was probably correct to criticize the precipitous manner in which Johnson demanded Senate approval of his economic aid request. During the June 7 debate Fulbright had failed to explain how the United States could effectively begin an enlarged program of economic development in South Vietnam while the level of violence was expanding. Considering his colloquy with Gruening and his earlier doubts about the Mekong project, he may have actually agreed with Morse's analysis of the prospects for economic aid. But Fulbright was determined to encourage any conciliatory gestures towards the Vietnamese communists in 1965, including the Johns Hopkins proposals. In the early period of the escalation it was common for many of the dissenting Senators and other critics of the American intervention to hope that the President's Baltimore address would be an initial step towards a negotiated settlement; as late as 1966 the southeast Asian expert Bernard Fall suggested that one component of a diplomatic solution for Vietnam might be to "restate and expand the idea of a flexible area-wide rehabilitation program" on the basis of the Baltimore speech.[134]

Fulbright's June 7 speech had not offered an alternative to the Johnson administration's policy. "Political and Economic Reconstruction in South Vietnam" dealt with the broad philosophical problem of the underdeveloped nations' responses to the West, and it described the technical points of the President's June 1 message to Congress. In a major Senate address on June 15, Fulbright attempted to clarify his position concerning the alternatives confronting American policy in southeast Asia. The June 15 speech, entitled "The War in Vietnam" was unquestionably Fulbright's most important Senate discourse on Vietnam in 1965. Johnson invited Fulbright to the White House in early June and delivered another monologue on his valiant resistance to the extremists' demands for massive expansion of the war.[135] This conference with the President was a unique occurrence in Fulbright's career, for it was the only time he ever allowed Johnson to read the draft of one of his speeches.[136] The June 15 address would constitute Fulbright's final effort to maintain his precarious strategy of praising the President while opposing military escalation in Vietnam.

On June 15 Fulbright rejected the arguments in favor of an intensified air war. According to the Foreign Relations Committee chairman, the bombing of North Vietnam had failed to weaken the military capability of the Vietcong. An expanded bombing campaign would invite a large-scale intervention of North Vietnamese troops, and

this intervention "in turn would probably draw the United States into a bloody and protracted jungle war in which the strategic advantage would be with the other side."[137] A decision to escalate the air war to unprecedented levels of destruction would risk Chinese intervention or nuclear war. Fulbright believed that a military victory in Vietnam could be attained "only at a cost far exceeding the requirements of our interest and honor."[138] American policy should be based upon a determination "to end the war at the earliest possible time by a negotiated settlement involving major concessions by both sides."[139] The Senator reiterated his appeal for a return to all the specifications of the 1954 Geneva accords.

Fulbright recited the litany of President Johnson's attempts to end the war through negotiations, above all the Johns Hopkins initiatives. The North Vietnamese and Chinese, he alleged, had repudiated the President's magnanimous offer to enter unconditional discussions for terminating the war.[140] Fulbright admitted, however, that American policy had been characterized by serious errors in the past. In Fulbright's view, the most important mistake had been American encouragement for President Ngo Dinh Diem's violations of the Geneva accords in failing to hold the elections envisaged by the 1954 agreements.[141] He suggested that in contemplating a new diplomatic conference it would be well for

both sides to recall the destructive consequences of their past violations of the Geneva agreements. Fulbright contended American policy had erred most recently by failing to halt the bombing for more than the perfunctory six day suspension in May, 1965.[142]

Despite his admissions of American blunders in the past and his predictions of disaster if the U.S. military intervention expanded, Fulbright urged a restrained "holding action" in Vietnam.[143] He explicitly repudiated a precipitous withdrawal. In a turgid, one-sentence paragraph, Fulbright delineated the justification for American involvement in the Vietnam war, the identical justification he would spend much of the next decade condemning: "I am opposed to unconditional withdrawal from South Vietnam because such action would betray our obligation to people we have promised to defend, because it would weaken or destroy the credibility of American guarantees to other countries, and because such a withdrawal would encourage the view in Peiping and elsewhere that guerrilla wars supported from outside are a relatively safe and inexpensive way of expanding Communist power."[144] It was the most inaccurate statement Fulbright ever uttered on the subject of Vietnam, and it obviously contradicted his earlier views that the Vietnamese conflict was fundamentally a civil war.[145] This sentence of the June 15 speech rendered Fulbright vulnerable to legitimate criticisms that he had vacillated, and it also

facilitated Johnson's ad hominem charges that Fulbright's later denunciations of the Vietnam war were based on personal pique.[146]

The vague notion that "Peiping" either was supporting or was planning to support the communist guerrillas in southeast Asia seriously weakened Fulbright's analysis on June 15. It is ironic that his opposition to the Vietnam escalation in 1965 was hampered by a perspective on China as an aggressive power, for it is clear in retrospect that one of the greatest achievements of Fulbright's 32-year career in Congress was his contribution to the improvement of Sino-American relations from 1966 to 1972. Early in 1966, Fulbright would begin to use the Foreign Relations Committee as a forum for publicizing dissident ideas about China, Vietnam, and the anti-communist ideology. The historian Daniel Yergin has described the 1966 China and Vietnam hearings as "the crucial beginning step within the United States to making a realistic appraisal of American policy in Asia."[147] The genesis of Fulbright's criticism of Johnson's Asian policy can be traced to his January, 1965 Time interview (if not earlier to the "Bridges East and West" speech of 1964). In the Time interview, he advocated probing "for areas of peaceful contact" with China, and he expected the Chinese leadership to gradually become less hostile towards the United States.[148] He was reading voraciously in the

scholarly literature on Far Eastern politics, economics, and history, and his ideas about the Chinese communists were in flux.[149] But his public statements on China in the first half of 1965 were erratic; at times he would revert to the hoary platitudes of the Cold War concerning Chinese malevolence, and on other occasions he would appeal for an amelioration of Sino-American relations.[150]

Perhaps Fulbright felt that he was significantly qualifying his June 15 statement by specifying "unconditional" withdrawal as being unwise. Many other important critics of escalation opposed immediate abandonment of South Vietnam. Walter Lippmann's June 17 column in the Washington Post warned against any desire to "scuttle and run."[151] Lippmann was still trying to avoid direct personal criticism of Johnson,[152] and even complimented him in one passage of the June 17 column:

> In the task of containing the expansion of communism there is no substitute for the building up of strong and viable states which command the respect of the mass of their people. The President, of course, knows this, and has frequently said it.[153]

Nevertheless, Lippmann joined Fulbright in adamantly opposing any expansion of the American military involvement in southeast Asia.[154] The June 15 Senate address and the June 17 column were probably their final major efforts to conciliate the President.

Fulbright's speech fomented a debate which continued throughout the summer of 1965. The Arkansas

Senator became involved in a discussion with several of his colleagues immediately after he finished speaking on June 15. Stuart Symington of Missouri commended Fulbright's address, especially the passages recounting American peace initiatives. He asked Fulbright to clarify his statement about an American holding action. Fulbright maintained that if a diplomatic conference could not be arranged immediately, then the United States should remain in South Vietnam until October and then negotiate a settlement. He thought the monsoons and the Vietcong offensive would be subsiding in October, thus making that month an auspicious juncture to end the war.[155]

A few moments after Symington's remarks, Ernest Gruening eulogized Fulbright's exposition for opposing escalation, endorsing a return to the Geneva agreements, and reminding the Senate that U.S. policy in Vietnam had been plagued by errors in the past. Gruening observed that official U.S. pronouncements rarely admitted any American mistakes or any American violations of the Geneva accords, and he congratulated Fulbright for demonstrating that both sides had violated the 1954 agreements.[156] No one was surprised when Fulbright agreed with Gruening's accolade of his speech.[157]

The June 15 discussion between Fulbright and Republican Senator Leverett Saltonstall of Massachusetts was much less mellifluous than the Fulbright-Gruening

dialogue. Saltonstall was disturbed by the intransigence of "the other side" in rejecting negotiations. According to the Massachusetts Republican, the North Vietnamese had transgressed against agreements in the past and might try to do so again after future negotiations. He felt that Fulbright had not adequately confronted this problem.[158] Fulbright did not deign to repeat his arguments that both sides had violated previous agreements, and responded to Saltonstall by saying he was primarily concerned with preventing an expansion of the conflict "either of worldwide proportions or even as large as the war in Korea was. I do not think that the Korean war was beneficial to the world or to that country."[159] A few days after the June 15 speech, the Republican Congressional leadership delivered a vigorous indictment of the Arkansas Senator's position. House Minority Leader Gerald R. Ford and Senate Minority Leader Everett Dirksen held a joint news conference to attack Fulbright's proposal for a negotiated settlement involving "major concessions by both sides."[160] The Republican doyens averred that far from obtaining a compromise with "the Communists," the United States should specify the concessions which it would refuse to offer.[161]

The controversy between Fulbright and important Republican politicians reverberated through the summer of 1965. In contrast to Fulbright's plea for a bombing

halt, on July 7 Representative Ford called for immediate air strikes against antiaircraft missile sites in North Vietnam. Reporters asked Ford at a news conference whether he would make this recommendation if he knew Russian technicians were present at the missile sites. He replied, "If the Soviet Union wants to participate in escalating the war, I'm fearful they'll have to take the consequences."[162] Fulbright described the Ford statement as the precise attitude which would risk a direct confrontation with the Soviet Union and possibly lead to general war.[163]

Richard Nixon launched the most vitriolic Republican attack on Fulbright in September. While he was visiting South Vietnam on September 5, Nixon held a news conference in which he criticized Fulbright's "so-called peace feelers."[164] Nixon accused Fulbright of advocating a "soft line" towards North Vietnam and "a major concession to the Communists in order to get peace."[165] He pontificated that negotiations would only reward aggression, prolong the war, "encourage our enemies, and discourage our friends."[166] The former Vice President complained that military escalation was proceeding too slowly, and a massive enlargement of U.S. ground forces in Vietnam would be necessary. In Nixon's view, the United States must prepare to fight for four more years, if not longer: "We cannot afford to leave without a victory over aggression."[167] Nixon also warned on September 5 that

if President Johnson "compromised with the Communists" the Republicans would make Vietnam a campaign issue in the 1966 Congressional elections and the 1968 Presidential election.[168]

Immediately following Fulbright's June 15 speech, President Johnson called an impromptu press conference in which he challenged the Congressional critics of his Vietnam policies to repeal the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution.[169] Johnson claimed that virtually all of the dissenting members of Congress had fully approved his policies by passing the Tonkin Resolution and hence could not properly oppose the escalation. Pro-administration Senators and journalists seconded the President's assertions. Senator Dodd answered Fulbright by inserting in the Congressional Record an endorsement of Johnson's Vietnam policy by A.F.L.-C.I.O. president George Meany.[170] On June 23 Johnson's old friend William S. White denounced the recalcitrant bloc of Senators who wistfully dreamed of rendering the communist aggressors more tractable by granting excessive concessions while requesting nothing in return. "The most important of these Senators," White affirmed, "is William Fulbright of Arkansas."[171] According to White, the Chinese laughed at America's dissenting Senators and did not even attempt to conceal their objective of subjugating South Vietnam. The Washington Post columnist bemoaned the pernicious consequences of the Arkansas Senator's "appeasement": "Sen.

Fulbright demanded a suspension of American bombing of the nests of aggression in North Vietnam. The predictable result was more and more aggression."[172]

On June 16, the front-page news reports in both the Washington Post and the New York Times interpreted the Fulbright address as evidence that the President was beginning to recognize the wisdom in avoiding any expansion of the southeast Asian conflict.[173] The Times reported that an increasing number of Senators shared Fulbright's disenchantment with escalation, including McGovern, Church, Morse, Gruening, Albert Gore of Tennessee, and the Republicans Javits, Aiken, and John Sherman Cooper of Kentucky.[174] The Post described Fulbright's appeal for "major concessions" as an "authoritative" statement of President Johnson's position, largely because of Fulbright's extended conference with the President the day before the speech.[175] The President's press conference dispelled this erroneous notion. Two weeks later an Evans and Novak column entitled "LBJ and the Peace Bloc" expressed a more accurate view, arguing that Johnson was conducting a June offensive to disarm his critics.[176] He had recently persuaded Senator Church to deliver a speech praising his ceaseless efforts to restore peace to southeast Asia, and he had even convinced the "arch-critic" Wayne Morse to remain silent during much of June. Finally, Johnson had successfully beseeched Fulbright to extol the

Presidential peace initiatives on June 15, although the mild criticisms in the Foreign Relations Committee chairman's address were sufficient to incur the President's wrath.[177]

Several Senators commended Fulbright's analysis of the Vietnam crisis in the weeks following June 15. Joseph Clark of Pennsylvania endorsed Fulbright's plea for a return to the Geneva accords and placed the June 17 Lippmann column in the Record.[178] Mike Mansfield opined that Fulbright's remarks "constituted a most constructive contribution to the consideration of this critical issue and were in the best traditions of the Senate."[179] Mansfield inserted into the Record a June 17 New York Times editorial approving the Fulbright speech. The Times lauded Fulbright for opposing both "unconditional withdrawal" and escalation: "At a time when some military men and some Republican leaders, including Representative Laird, of Wisconsin, are returning to the Goldwater objective of total victory and calling for stepped-up bombing of North Vietnam, this re-statement of aims is invaluable."[180] Every American, the editorial maintained, should read Fulbright's exposition that military victory could be attained "only at a cost far exceeding the requirements of our interest and our honor."[181] The Times was hopeful the President agreed with Fulbright's arguments.

Senator Church addressed the Senate on July 1 and complimented Fulbright's contributions to the Vietnam

debate. He placed in the Record an address Fulbright had delivered to the Rhodes scholars' reunion at Swarthmore College on June 19. Fulbright's caustic tone on June 19 provided a remarkable contrast to his tortured efforts to praise the President while opposing escalation only four days earlier. The Arkansas Senator contended that in the past few months the state of world politics had "taken an ominous turn," and he quoted Mark Twain's bitter "War Prayer" to illustrate the belligerent passions unleashed by the Dominican and Vietnamese interventions.[182] Fulbright advised his fellow Rhodes scholars that "the nations are sliding back into the self-righteous and crusading spirit of the cold war" essentially because "the crises in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic are affecting matters far beyond the frontiers of the countries concerned."[183] The Dominican intervention threatened to destroy the future of the once promising Alliance for Progress. The Vietnam war, Fulbright charged, was damaging American relations with Eastern European countries and other small nations by disseminating the belief that America was an implacable enemy of nationalism in the underdeveloped world.[184]

Fulbright believed that the most destructive result of the Vietnamese and Dominican crises was the degeneration of Soviet-American relations. The detente which had begun to develop in 1963 was now held in abeyance, largely

because of the remote involvements in Indochina and Hispaniola.[185] Fulbright warned against the dogmatism which envisaged international relations as an immense arena of conflict between virtuous Americans and nefarious communists. It would be constructive, he observed, for Americans to realize that the Russians and the Chinese sincerely believed their policies would lead to world peace and freedom, the identical ultimate goals which Americans pursued.[186] The remark about the Chinese was a general philosophical reflection, but it clearly bore no resemblance to Dean Rusk's specter of the Chinese communist conspiracy against freedom.

Fulbright's June 19 address was a harbinger of the Senator's increasingly vociferous opposition to the Vietnam war during the next decade. His rationale for giving the June 15 Senate speech was clear; he would offer one last major effort to praise Johnson's diplomacy, and if this failed to magnify his influence he would be forced to become openly critical of the President.[187] Frank Church recognized Fulbright's emerging role as a public dissenter on July 1, when he described the Rhodes scholars' reunion discourse as "stark, but accurate."[188] These were the ideas, Church asseverated, of "a political philosopher and foreign affairs analyst unexcelled among those who have held political office in the modern history of our Republic."[189] The Idaho Senator's encomium may have been exaggerated, but he obviously understood

and welcomed Fulbright's burgeoning determination to publicly oppose the Johnson administration's foreign policies.

It should be acknowledged that the language of the June 19 Swarthmore address was highly generalized and theoretical. Fulbright did not refer specifically to President Johnson or any official of the executive branch. The Swarthmore address was somewhat similar to "Old Myths and New Realities" in its theoretical tenor, although "Old Myths" was optimistic about the possibility of improving Soviet-American relations, in contrast to the profound pessimism of the June 19, 1965 speech. The March 25, 1964 Senate address had endorsed the policy of supporting the non-communist regime in Saigon, while the only references to southeast Asia in the Swarthmore speech were reflections about the Vietnam war's pernicious impact upon America's relations with the Soviet Union and the underdeveloped nations of the world.

Fulbright delivered his final effort to praise Johnson's foreign policy in the June 15 Senate discourse in order to exhaust the moribund strategy of hoping to enhance his private influence at the White House by publicly supporting the President. At the time many of Fulbright's aides and several journalists were arguing that he had a responsibility to avoid an open break with the President which could destroy the Senator politically.[190] During the next three months Fulbright

would conclude that his ultimate responsibility consisted in attempting to educate and marshal the force of public opinion against an anti-communist consensus which seemed invincible in 1965.

In 1964 Fulbright's fear that public criticism of Johnson's foreign policy would strengthen Goldwater had contributed to the Senator's support for the Presidential decisions on Vietnam. But in 1965 a resolve to challenge the administration's anti-communist assumptions was replacing his earlier fear that public opposition to the Vietnam policy might ignite an onslaught of McCarthyism from the radical right. During April, 1965 he had publicly confronted the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense over the escalation of the bombings against North Vietnam, and in his June 19 speech he implied that the contemporary American policies in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic were reviving the crusading anti-communism of the early cold war and severely damaging the prospects for Soviet-American detente. In 1965, of course, Fulbright no longer had to fear the Goldwater candidacy; but a more important reason for his nascent determination to oppose the President's diplomacy was his realization that the administration's southeast Asian and Dominican policies were displaying the rigid, global anti-communism the Senator had excoriated in "Old Myths and New Realities." There was a vital difference between Fulbright's views

in "Old Myths and New Realities" and his perspective in the June 19 Swarthmore address, for in March, 1964 he had directed his critique of militant anti-communism against Goldwater and the radical right; by the summer of 1965 he was beginning to direct similar criticisms against the foreign policy of President Lyndon Johnson.

Chapter IV

FULBRIGHT'S FIRST CHALLENGE TO THE ANTI-COMMUNIST CONSENSUS, JULY-SEPTEMBER, 1965

Senator Fulbright's first caustic criticisms of specific Johnson policies dealt with the administration's diplomacy in Europe and Latin America. It was perhaps logical that the Senator's indictment of the administration's global anti-communism was initially focused upon these two regions, because before 1965 Fulbright had primarily been knowledgeable about U.S. relations with Europe and Latin America.[1] During July he asserted that the President was failing to resist the efforts of extreme anti-communists to sabotage American relations with eastern Europe. The dispute over eastern European policy was a comparatively minor episode; but Fulbright's opposition to the administration's intervention in the Dominican Republic precipitated an irreparable break between the Senator and the President and inaugurated Fulbright's role as a dissenter over the last three and a half years of Johnson's Presidency.

In July, 1965, Fulbright criticized the administration for failing to resist extremist pressures against the policy of "building bridges" to the communist world. The most recent example of this failure, in Fulbright's opinion, was the rupture of negotiations between the

Rumanian government and the Firestone Company for the design and engineering of synthetic-rubber plants.[2] A Firestone competitor and an extreme right-wing organization called Young Americans for Freedom had conducted an anti-communist crusade against the Firestone-Rumanian agreements, claiming that the tires which the Rumanian plants would produce would eventually be used by the Vietcong.[3] The opponents of the Firestone contract had denounced it for indirectly supplying the Chinese communists with badly needed technical expertise.[4] Fulbright decried the administration's curious reluctance to support Firestone against the extremists. Such stalwart anti-communists as William F. Buckley, Jr., Strom Thurmond, and John Tower raged at Fulbright and extolled the Y.A.F. for its patriotic stand against the Rumanians who had recently joined with Russian and Chinese officials in a condemnation of American "open acts of war" in Vietnam.[5] Joseph Kraft, Mansfield, and Morse endorsed Fulbright's position.[6]

George Ball investigated Fulbright's allegations,[7] and in the fall of 1965 the State Department successfully defended a group of American tobacco companies who had purchased eastern European tobacco against another series of attacks from anti-communist pressure groups.[8] Fulbright wrote a letter to President Johnson in October congratulating the State Department for its handling of the eastern

European tobacco purchases in contrast to its weak performance in the Firestone fiasco.[9] The Senator was well aware that the Firestone affair and the tobacco purchases were quite insignificant in comparison to Vietnam.[11] But he felt that an important principle was involved, for if extreme anti-communist organizations could influence the U.S. government then there was little hope of conducting a rational foreign policy. Fulbright believed that his criticism during the Firestone episode may have led to the more reasonable State Department response to American trade with eastern Europe in the fall of 1965. This lesson strengthened Fulbright's resolution that he could influence the Johnson administration only by public dissent, and not by private conversations and memoranda.[12]

Fulbright's foreign policy statements in July were highly annoying to President Johnson.[13] The President was increasingly excluding Fulbright and Adlai Stevenson from any significant role in the administration's deliberations on Vietnam.[14] The responses of Fulbright and Stevenson to the Vietnam escalation in early 1965 were somewhat similar. Stevenson was favorably impressed by Johnson's Baltimore speech.[15] The U.N. Ambassador's memoranda to the President in 1965, however, had clearly warned against a precipitous expansion of American military operations in Indochina.[16] Stevenson was disturbed by the bombing of North Vietnam. In a March

memorandum to the President, Stevenson predicted that a limited bombing campaign from the 17th to the 19th parallels would not "produce indications of a [North Vietnamese] willingness to negotiate."[17] He speculated that an expansion of the bombing to population centers and industrial targets farther north might lead the North Vietnamese to negotiate, or it might provoke them into more extensive infiltration of North Vietnamese forces into South Vietnam via Laos; but regardless of Hanoi's reaction, world opinion would be outraged by massive American bombing of Asian noncombatants. Thus, Stevenson concluded that "the worldwide political consequences of such action [air strikes against major population centers] would very probably outweigh any military advantages it might produce."[18] In his view, the United States should enter negotiations even if the Vietnamese communists did not provide any favorable assurances in advance concerning the results of the negotiations.

Stevenson had been cooperating with U Thant in attempting to arrange negotiations on southeast Asia. In his April 28 memorandum to the President, Stevenson stated that U Thant was "strongly convinced that the continued use of force holds no promise for a settlement but only the ever-increasing danger of wider warfare, as well as a reorientation of Soviet foreign policy from limited detente with the West to close cooperation with Communist

China."[19] U Thant proposed a cessation of hostilities in Vietnam, followed by "immediate discussions, in whatever manner the parties prefer, designed to strengthen and maintain the cessation of military activity and to seek the bases for a more permanent settlement."[20] Stevenson argued that a positive American response to the Secretary General's appeal would reinforce the favorable international impression created by the President's Baltimore speech. "The Secretary-General," Stevenson maintained, "by making such an appeal, would become the center of the effort to terminate hostilities in Vietnam, a fact which would facilitate a later move on our part--should we so desire--to involve the United Nations in the role of supervising or policing a negotiated settlement."[21] Stevenson frequently advised the State Department of U Thant's proposal for discussions "with Saigon, Hanoi, and the Viet Cong seated at the table." On July 7 the Ambassador informed the Department that U Thant had recently "repeated several times that it was only realistic that the discussions of a cease-fire would have to include those [the Viet Cong] who are doing the fighting."[22]

The U.N. Ambassador's occasional vague references to "Chinese expansionist plans" weakened the logic of his private communications to the President. Stevenson did not adduce evidence to support the allegations of Chinese expansionism. His statements on China in his 1965

memoranda were difficult to explain, especially in light of later reports by David Halberstam and other writers of his private opposition to the administration's China policy.[23] Perhaps Stevenson believed that whatever influence he still retained as an official of Lyndon Johnson's administration would vanish if he challenged the President's view of China as an aggressor. Fulbright's private communications to the President may have been more blunt than Stevenson's in describing escalation in Vietnam as a disastrous course, but the Senator's April memorandum to the President had also suffered from the reluctance to refute the Cold War hostility toward China. Whatever the explanation for their inaccurate statements on China in 1965, the administration obviously rejected the Fulbright and Stevenson recommendations for a negotiated settlement in southeast Asia.

Stevenson's basic perspective on Vietnam may have been revealed on a July 12 British Broadcasting Corporation television program. B.B.C. correspondent Robin Day asked Stevenson to comment upon a recent exposition by J. William Fulbright in which the Senator had hoped for a "greater emphasis on the political aspects of the problem" in Vietnam.[24] Stevenson replied that all knowledgeable observers of southeast Asian affairs had always regarded the political problems as "uppermost," and "that this isn't a war that can be resolved by military means, nor can

we find a solution there except by political means." A few moments later he dutifully defended American policy, reminding his interviewer that "Communist China is doing its very best to destroy the United Nations," while President Johnson had offered unconditional discussions on Vietnam. Many of Stevenson's friends later maintained that he was depressed by having to defend Johnson's Vietnam and Dominican policies and was considering resigning in early July.[25]

Fulbright and Stevenson were also similar during 1965 in their revulsion against Johnson's policy in the Dominican Republic. The administration's Dominican intervention strengthened their suspicions that the Vietnam escalation was mistaken and precipitous. In late May, Stevenson privately remarked that "if we did so badly in the Dominican Republic, I now wonder about our policy in Vietnam."[26] Among the major public or private critics of Johnson's foreign policy, Fulbright and Stevenson were probably the two statesmen who were most disturbed by the intervention in the Dominican Republic. Several of Stevenson's associates later said the Dominican crisis troubled Stevenson more than any other incident that occurred during his years in the U.N.[27] The Ambassador thought the American intervention had alienated public opinion throughout Latin America and devastated the principle of peaceful international settlements. David

Schoenbrun later publicly reported that Stevenson had described the intervention as a "massive blunder." The President was disgusted by the Schoenbrun story, and instructed his press secretary to dismiss it as a disservice to Stevenson's memory.[28]

The extent of the Fulbright-Stevenson communication concerning Hispaniola is not clear. In June Stevenson wrote a letter to Fulbright, his friend for thirty years, but it dealt with placing restraints on the arms race.[29] Fulbright sent a note to Stevenson on July 13 to forward a constitutent's response for an appointment, apologizing for writing about such a mundane matter during a time of crisis in southeast Asia and the Caribbean.[30] "Now you see in action," the Senator wryly observed in a poignant admission of his lack of power, "the major function of a Senator."[31] Fulbright's pessimism did not inhibit his determination to challenge the administration's foreign policy, for the Foreign Relations Committee investigation into the Dominican crisis was scheduled to begin in mid-July. The Senator's melancholy was exacerbated when Ambassador Stevenson died of a heart attack on July 14, the day the Dominican hearings began.

The decision to hold the hearings accelerated the decline in Fulbright's influence with the administration. On July 27 Johnson summoned eleven Congressional leaders to the White House to discuss the proposals for increasing

the number of American ground forces fighting in Vietnam.[32] In earlier White House meetings the President had asked Fulbright and Mansfield for their expected dissenting opinions only after all the other Congressional leaders had approved of his policies.[33] Now in late July, Johnson's relationship with Fulbright had deteriorated to the extent that the President did not deign to invite him to the July 27 discussions.[34] George Herring has described the July deliberations as "the closest thing to a formal decision for war in Vietnam" and yet the President excluded the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee from participating in the White House discussions regarding the decision.[35] George Smathers, who ranked tenth on the Foreign Relations Committee but was a staunch anti-communist, was asked to attend rather than Fulbright.[36] Thus the President isolated Mansfield, who alone argued against sending more troops.[37] And even Mansfield declared that he would loyally support Johnson's decision, despite his profound skepticism regarding expansion of the war.[38]

The President had decided to increase the number of American troops in South Vietnam from the 75,000 already there to a total of approximately 200,000; but he publicly announced at his July 28 press conference an increase of only 50,000, although he indicated more troops would be sent to Vietnam later to halt the "mounting aggression":

> We did not choose to be the guardians at the gate, but there is no one else.
>
> Nor would surrender in Vietnam bring peace, because we learned from Hitler at Munich that success only feeds the appetite of aggression. The battle would be renewed in one country and then another country, bring with it perhaps even larger and crueler conflict, as we have learned from the lessons of history . . .
>
> I have asked the commanding general, General Westmoreland, what more he needs to meet this mounting aggression. He has told me. We will meet his needs. I have today ordered to Vietnam the Air Mobile Division and certain other forces which will raise our fighting strength from 75,000 to 125,000 almost immediately. Additional forces will be needed later, and they will be sent as requested . . .[39]

Johnson continued to mislead Congress and the public as to the significance of his decisions, denying that he had authorized any change in policy.[40] The United States would have to fight in Vietnam to maintain the credibility of its promises to all other nations, but the President added, "We do not want an expanding struggle with consequences that no one can perceive."[41]

Fulbright was engrossed in his analysis of the Dominican intervention in the six weeks after the July 28 press conference. The Senator's doubts about the administration's actions had increased in May, when the executive branch exaggerated the danger of communist infiltration in Santo Domingo.[42] Admiral Raborn had informed Fulbright on April 28 that three communists were participating in the revolt, but in May U.S. officials publicized a list of fifty-eight communists who were allegedly allied with the pro-Bosch forces.[43] Many of

the fifty-eight people on the list could not have played a role in the rebellion because they were either in prison or out of the country during April.[44] The administration valiantly attempted to explain why fifty-eight communists represented an ominous threat to a nation of three and one-half million people. Dean Rusk declared that the precise number of communists involved in the revolt was unimportant, for "There was a time when Hitler sat in a beer hall in Munich with seven people."[45]

President Johnson was much more imaginative than Rusk in portraying the hideous specter of aggression on Hispaniola, revealing at a June 17 press conference that "some 1500 innocent people were murdered and shot, and their heads cut off."[46] This account mystified the President's aides, for the atrocities Johnson described never occurred.[47] Fulbright would eventually regard the falsehood about the 1500 decapitations as the classic example of Johnson's duplicity.[48] During the Dominican hearings Fulbright asked Thomas Mann to explain the President's macabre assertion on June 17. Mann simply refused to believe that Johnson had uttered the statement, even after Fulbright produced the official State Department bulletin of the June 17 press conference, which reprinted the President's exact words.[49]

The Dominican hearings remained closed to the public for many years after 1965. In 1968 Haynes Johnson

and Bernard Gertzman acquired a limited amount of information concerning the hearings from an anonymous source.[50] (The two journalists were writing a biography of Fulbright.) The most important administration witnesses were Rusk, Thomas Mann, and Cyrus Vance. The administration spokesmen argued that a military dictatorship was preferable to a communist regime.[51] Mann contended that any popular front which included communists was "per se a dangerous thing."[52] He conceded that Juan Bosch was not a communist, but he considered Bosch a "poet professor type" who could be controlled by the Dominican leftists, many of whom had been trained in Cuba.[53] Mann believed that if the communists established a dictatorship in the Dominican Republic, "Haiti would fall within thirty minutes."[54] During the course of the hearings it became clear that the administration thought the communist threat in the Dominican Republic was related to leftist subversion in Colombia, Venezuela, Uruguay, Argentina, Bolivia, Ecuador, British Guiana, Haiti, Honduras, Panama, and Guatemala.[55]

Fulbright observed that according to Mann's analysis, the United States should intervene against any movement in Latin America which had communist support.[56] The result of such a policy would be to restrict the alternatives for all Latin America to either communist rule or a military junta.[57] In Fulbright's opinion, the widespread dissatisfaction with the status quo in Latin

America was justified. If the policy of indiscriminate intervention persisted, then some dissident Latin Americans might conclude that they must become communists in order to change the reactionary character of their pro-United States governments. He hoped the administration would adopt a policy of encouraging changes in Latin America by aiding non-communist reformist groups. Specifically, he argued that the administration would have been wise to support the non-communist rebels in the Dominican revolt.[58]

The Foreign Relations Committee was hopelessly divided over the Dominican controversy. Dodd, Lausche, Hickenlooper, and Russell Long assumed an aggressive anti-communist position during the debate.[59] The largest faction on the committee did not support the "hawks," but also failed to criticize the President.[60] Only four or five Senators supported Fulbright's resolute criticism of the administration's actions.[61] Although the hearings were private, Dodd and others publicly accused Fulbright of being prejudiced against the administration. The dispute within the committee became so acrimonious in August that Fulbright publicly speculated about resigning his chairmanship.[62] The committee never wrote a report on its investigation.

Johnson temporarily reversed his efforts to isolate Fulbright and instructed Rusk to begin another

series of private discussions with the Foreign Relations Committee chairman.[63] Fulbright wrote a speech in August elucidating his opposition to the intervention. His administrative assistant warned him not to deliver it, because it would precipitate an "irreparable break" with Johnson.[64] The aide told Fulbright, "You practically call him a liar."[65] Fulbright discussed his critique of American policy in Santo Domingo with several foreign affairs analysts, including Carl Marcy, the Chief of Staff of the Foreign Relations Committee.[66] When Marcy and the others agreed that his analysis was accurate, Fulbright decided to deliver the address.[67]

On September 15, 1965, Fulbright presented his conclusions concerning the Dominican crisis to the Senate. He asserted that the United States intervened in the Dominican Republic not primarily to save lives, as the administration originally contended, but to prevent the victory of a revolutionary movement which was judged to be communist-dominated. According to Fulbright, the Dominican communists did not participate in planning the revolution. Although they quickly joined the revolt after it erupted, the communists never controlled the rebel forces. The fear of "another Cuba" had little basis in the evidence offered to the Foreign Relations Committee; on the contrary, Fulbright maintained that a chaotic situation existed "in which no single faction

was dominant at the outset and in which everybody, including the United States, had opportunities to influence the shape and course of the rebellion."[68] In their apprehension lest Santo Domingo become another Cuba, American officials had forgotten that there was a crucial difference between communist support and communist control of a political movement, and that it was quite possible to compete with the communists for influence in a reformist coalition rather than abandoning it to them. The Senator argued that the policy followed in the Dominican Republic would have disastrous consequences if applied throughout Latin America:

> Since just about every revolutionary movement is likely to attract communist support, at least in the beginning, the approach followed in the Dominican Republic, if consistently pursued, must inevitably make us the enemy of all revolutions and therefore the ally of all the unpopular and corrupt oligarchies of the hemisphere.[69]

Fulbright criticized the administration's failure to exert a positive influence on the course of events during the early days of the rebellion. On April 25, Juan Bosch's party (the P.R.D. or Dominican Revolutionary Party) requested a "United States presence," and on April 27 the rebels asked for American mediation and a negotiated settlement.[70] Fulbright observed that the P.R.D. entreaty presented an excellent opportunity to encourage the moderate forces involved in the coup, either by providing American mediation or officially indicating

that the United States would not oppose a regime controlled by the P.R.D. But both requests were rejected on the basis of exaggerated estimates of communist infiltration into the revolutionary forces and hostility to Juan Bosch's return to power. Pedro Bartolome Benoit, the leader of the military junta, appealed for American military assistance on April 28. Only American intervention, Benoit pleaded, could avert a communist coup.[71] Washington responded that if Benoit would say American lives were in danger the United States would intervene. Benoit then changed his rationale for needing American troops so as to conform to Washington's response, and within hours Marines landed in Santo Domingo. After an exhaustive analysis of W. Tapley Bennett's cables to Washington, Fulbright decided that the fear of communism was the Ambassador's fundamental reason for recommending the military intervention. The Senator's conclusion followed: "The danger to American lives was more a pretext than a reason for the massive U.S. intervention that began on the evening of April 28."[72]

On September 15 Fulbright denounced the reversal in American attitudes towards Juan Bosch and the P.R.D. during the period from September, 1963 to April, 1965. Fulbright recalled that the United States had supported Bosch while he was President of the Dominican Republic during 1963. President Kennedy attributed such importance

to the Dominican President's success that he sent Vice President Johnson and Senator Hubert Humphrey to Bosch's inauguration in February, 1963.[73] Fulbright reminded the Senate that in December, 1962, Bosch had triumphed in the first free and honest election ever held in the Dominican Republic. After Bosch was overthrown by a military coup in September, 1963, the United States had not recognized the successor regime for three months. The Johnson administration had finally recognized the government which succeeded Bosch only after it began conducting military operations against a band of alleged communist guerrillas in the Dominican mountains. Fulbright strongly suspected that the successor government exaggerated the threat of the guerrillas in order to secure American recognition.[74]

In Fulbright's view, the administration had erred in opposing the P.R.D.'s return to power after Donald Reid Cabral's regime collapsed in April. The Senator conceded Juan Bosch "was no great success as President," yet Bosch was still "the only freely elected President in Dominican history," and "the only President who was unquestionably in tune with the Alliance for Progress."[75] Bosch himself had not been eager to return to Santo Domingo in April, 1965, but Fulbright emphasized that "the United States was equally adamant against a return to power of Bosch's party, the P.R.D., which is the nearest thing to

a mass-based, well-organized party that has ever existed in the Dominican Republic."[76] Fulbright summarized the history of American policy towards the Dominican Republic during the Johnson administration with an unequivocal condemnation: "Thus the United States turned its back on social revolution in Santo Domingo and associated itself with a corrupt and reactionary military oligarchy."[77]

Fulbright proceeded from his indictment of the administration's actions in the Dominican Republic to a general critique of Johnson's foreign policy towards Latin America, observing, "one notes a general tendency on the part of our policymakers not to look beyond a Latin American politician's anti-communism."[78] The Dominican crisis had severely damaged America's reputation among "our true friends" in Latin America, who had supported the ideals of the Alliance for Progress.[79] In the opinion of many Latin American reformists, the United States had suppressed a movement which was sympathetic to the Alliance's goals. The landing of Marines in Santo Domingo violated the O.A.S. Charter's principle of non-intervention, which most Latin Americans considered the quintessence of the inter-American system. Fulbright's reference to the O.A.S. Charter was related to his only passage on Vietnam in the speech; he detected an inconsistency in the administration's zeal to uphold the "ambiguous" commitment to South Vietnam while simultaneously

violating a "clear and explicit treaty obligation" in the Americas.[80] The passage on Vietnam was brief, however, and Fulbright did not elaborate upon this argument.

In his September 15 address Fulbright attacked the global anti-communism of the Johnson foreign policies. "Obviously," the Senator concluded, "if we based all our policies on the mere possibility of communism, then we would have to set ourselves against just about every progressive political movement in the world, because almost all such movements are subject to at least the theoretical danger of Communist takeover."[81] The rigid anti-communist approach contradicted the nation's interests, according to Fulbright. He maintained that diplomacy must be based upon developing "prospects that seem probable" rather than forever attempting to anticipate possible dangers of communism.[82]

Fulbright's final major argument on September 15 dealt with the disingenuous manner in which the administration had justified its actions to the public. "U.S. policy," he charged, "was marred by a lack of candor and by misinformation."[83] Fulbright illustrated the lack of candor and misinformation by referring first to the initial assertions that the United States executed the intervention to save American lives, and second by quoting President Johnson's June 17 statement about the 1500 decapitations in the Dominican Republic. The Senator

tersely noted that there was no evidence to support the President's allegation. Fulbright tried to maintain in the speech, and also in a September 15 letter to Johnson, that he was not attacking Johnson personally but only the substance of the President's policies.[84] The distinction was unimportant. As Daniel Yergin has written, "The speech was aimed at the stupidity and what he was soon calling the arrogance of American power but, though he liked to pretend it was not directed also at Johnson, Johnson rightly saw that it was."[85]

Fulbright defined his purpose in delivering the address as an effort to develop guidelines for future policies, and not simply to lambast the administration for its previous errors. The decision to hold the hearings had apparently begun to exert a minor impact on U.S. policy by September 14, when General Wessin y Wessin, who had been one of the leaders of the military junta during late April, left the Dominican Republic under American pressure. In his speech Fulbright described Wessin's departure as "a step in the right direction."[86] A year later in The Arrogance of Power Fulbright speculated about the effect of his Dominican address. His September, 1965, exposition may have been a factor, he wrote, in the administration's subsequent support for democratic government in the Dominican Republic, thus repairing some of the damage wrought by the April, 1965

intervention in support of the Dominican military.[87] The Senator also conceded the O.A.S. and the Inter-American Force which remained in Hispaniola until the summer of 1966 had restored order and stability. But Fulbright did not agree that the free election of Joachin Balaguer as President of the Dominican Republic on June 1, 1966 vindicated the intervention, for the power of the reactionary military oligarchy remained unimpaired.[88] In Fulbright's view, the administration's actions during the Dominican crisis had alienated virtually all the reformist movements in Latin America and weakened confidence in America's word and intentions throughout the world.[89] He contended in both the September, 1965 speech and in The Arrogance of Power that the American anti-revolutionary bias might drive Latin American reformers into becoming anti-American leftists.[90]

The administration's vehement response to his speech shocked Fulbright. Secretary of Defense McNamara described Fulbright's criticism of Ambassador Bennett as "an unfair attack," and claimed there was "no question" that American citizens were endangered by the Dominican revolution.[91] McNamara did not answer the Senator's assertion that U.S. officials exaggerated the communist threat.[92] Senator Richard Russell of Georgia seconded McNamara's defense of Bennett. Bill Moyers, the President's press secretary, dismissed Fulbright's conclusions as

totally unjustified.[93] Tom Dodd led the pro-administration Senators in a counterattack against the Foreign Relations Committee chairman. According to Dodd, Fulbright suffered "from an indiscriminate infatuation with revolutions of all kinds, national, democratic, or Communist," as well as a general "tolerance of communism."[94] Russell Long rebuked Fulbright's speech by maintaining, "We have information now that the Communists in the Dominican Republic are stronger than Castro was when he started out to take Cuba."[95] Senator Smathers congratulated Long for his astute analysis of the Dominican crisis and added, "Castro proved that it was not necessary to have a large number of communists in order to deliver a country to communism."[96] Representative Ford and Senator Dirksen joined the President's Democratic supporters in condemning the Fulbright speech.

In the first few days after September 15, the debate concerning Fulbright's Dominican address did not focus upon the substance of his analysis. Many of Fulbright's opponents argued that the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee simply did not have the right to deliver such a scathing criticism of the President's foreign policy. William S. White epitomized this attitude when he averred that

> it is not simply with President Johnson and Secretary of State Dean Rusk that Fulbright has broken. He has also broken the unwritten rule of the game, a code which demands of those holding

> high committee chairmanships--and uniquely the chairmanship of foreign relations--a degree of self-restraint and personal responsibility not demanded of the rank and file.[98]

In contrast to White, Republican Senator Margaret Chase Smith of Maine resolutely defended Fulbright's right to dissent, even though she supported the administration's policy in the Dominican Republic.[99] Similarly, Eric Severeid's article in the October 4, 1965 Washington Evening Star commended the Foreign Relations Committee's ex post facto investigation into the Dominican crisis for establishing lessons which would be useful in future policies.[100] Sevareid did not comment upon the substance of Fulbright's conclusions, except to remark he disagreed with them, but he complimented the Senator when he wrote, "the Fulbright speech was a drama simply because it was unique in this period of consensus and a homogenized Congress."[101]

Senator Mansfield also rejected the notion that Fulbright's criticism was irresponsible, although he publicly supported the administration's Dominican policy.[102] Whether Mansfield privately agreed with Fulbright's analysis is uncertain. Mansfield had attended only one of the thirteen Dominican hearings, and he was reluctant to become involved in an open confrontation with the executive branch.[103] The Montana Senator tended to believe that he could influence Johnson's policies more effectively through private remonstrances rather than vociferous public

opposition.[104] Fulbright had agreed with Mansfield's strategy earlier in 1965, but by the autumn he was convinced of his inability to influence Johnson through private communications.[105] After Fulbright became a public adversary of the Johnson foreign policies (including the Vietnam war) in late 1965 and early 1966, he did not cooperate with Mansfield as closely as he had when the two Senators were privately advising against escalation in early 1965.[106]

Joseph Kraft, Walter Lippmann, Morse, McGovern, McCarthy, and Joseph Clark were among the small minority who supported Fulbright during the Dominican furor. Kraft aptly summarized Fulbright's position: "With the Dominican case before him, he sensed a new disposition to identify all social protest with Communist subversion, and a connected tendency to shoot first and think later."[107] In Kraft's view, the administration's rancorous attacks on the Dominican address only intensified the doubts Fulbright raised about U.S. policy in Latin America. The administration failed to resist the extreme anti-communists who were condemning the Foreign Relations Committee chairman. In response to the Fulbright speech, the House of Representatives passed by an overwhelming vote a resolution which endorsed direct American military intervention in Latin America to prevent "subversive action or the threat of it."[108] Armistead Selden of

Alabama sponsored the resolution. According to Kraft, Selden was "wrapping himself in the mantle of anti-communism" in order to ensure his re-election.[109] Kraft asserted that the administration had promoted Thomas Mann, Douglas MacArthur II, and other Foreign Service officers within the State Department whose ideas, careers, and reputations were permanently attached to "the era of unsophisticated, monolithic anti-communism."[110] The State Department forces led by Thomas Mann had "practically invited the Selden resolution."[111] Finally, Kraft concluded, "the White House itself seems to be holding anti-communism as a rod to discipline its congressional majority."[112] If Johnson maintained this rigid anti-communist stance, it seemed doubtful that he could respond constructively to the vast social changes sweeping Latin America, Africa, and Asia. Kraft regretted that the President "has gone soft on Goldwaterism."[113]

Walter Lippmann commended Fulbright's Dominican address in his September 28 Washington Post column. The amelioration of Soviet-American relations, Lippmann wrote, depended upon encouraging "the prudent and the practical to predominate over the ideological and the hot."[114] "In this country," he continued, "the process will require the resumption of public debate--the kind of debate which Senator Fulbright has once again opened up. For the issues which he has posed in his remarkable speech is the

essential issue in our attitude and policy toward the revolutionary condition of our time."[115] Lippmann believed there was no definitive formula which could be applied to determine American foreign policy towards all underdeveloped nations. American diplomacy must be flexible in responding to the infinitely varied circumstances present in Latin American, African, and Asian revolutions. Lippmann recommended a conciliatory attitude or "some kind of accommodation" in order to avoid confrontations with the Soviet Union in the third world. He extolled Fulbright's efforts to revitalize the public dialogue between the administration and its critics. It was imperative to prevent the public debate in America from being monopolized by "the assorted hangers-on, often more Johnsonian than Johnson himself, who are presuming to lay down the rule that only those who conform with the current political improvisations are altogether respectable and quite loyal."[116]

Lippmann had perceived the ultimate significance of the Dominican speech by analyzing it in the global context of Soviet-American relations. Fulbright had criticized far more than the American blunders on a tiny Caribbean island; he had challenged the anti-communist assumptions of an entire era. In evaluating the historical importance of the Dominican address, Daniel Yergin later wrote, "From that moment can be dated the

breakup of the cold war consensus and the beginning of a meaningful dissent."[117] As Haynes Johnson described the September speech, "Not since Borah had criticized the sending of the Marines into Nicaragua in the 1920s had the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee directly challenged an administration of his own party," although "the circumstances were hardly comparable."[118] The Dominican furor had a devastating impact on Fulbright's relationship with Johnson. Many years later the Senator informed an interviewer, "Never again was I consulted."[119] Upon reflecting a moment, he added that he had never been genuinely consulted, for throughout the first half of 1965 Johnson was simply "trying to keep me in bounds, so I wouldn't take issue and embarrass him."[120] Fulbright wrote Johnson a courteous letter in early October, explaining that his speech was intended "to help you in your relations with the countries of Latin America."[121] "Subservience," he reminded Johnson, "cannot, as I see it, help develop new policies or perfect old ones."[122] The President never responded to Fulbright's letter.[123]

During the summer of 1965 Fulbright became convinced that the administration's impetuosity, duplicity, and crusading anti-communism were not confined to U.S. foreign policy in Latin America, but were fundamental characteristics of Johnsonian diplomacy.[124] After his Senate discourse of September 15, Fulbright rapidly began

to intensify his critique of the military escalation in Vietnam. In an October 24, 1965, Meet the Press appearance he reiterated his appeal for a suspension of the air attacks against North Vietnam, arguing that a bombing halt must continue much longer than the six day pause of May in order to represent a genuine peace initiative.[125] When Peter Lisagor asked him if it was not the function of Republicans to dissent from a Democratic President's foreign policy, Fulbright replied that the great majority of the Republicans endorsed Johnson's actions. "I don't understand," he asserted, "why this consensus has reached such a state that people feel Senators, or particularly this Senator, should not speak about any matter in which he dissents from the current views of the administration."[126]

Throughout the N.B.C. program Fulbright defended his analysis of the Dominican crisis. The Vietnam war was almost totally overshadowing the Dominican intervention by October, and the reports in the New York Times and other newspapers concentrated upon Fulbright's recommendations for the Vietnam policy on Meet the Press.[127] The White House issued its customary repudiation of Fulbright's Vietnam proposals.[128]

During the fall of 1965, the discussion of Fulbright's dissenting views began to focus on the substance of his ideas, rather than the question of whether he possessed the right to openly criticize President

Johnson. E.W. Kenworthy's article in the October 31 New York Times presented a succinct assessment of Fulbright's foreign policy positions in the early 1960s. The article was entitled, "Fulbright: Dissenter." Kenworthy recalled that in March, 1961, Fulbright's memorandum on Cuba had urged President Kennedy to tolerate the Castro regime rather than attempting to overthrow it.[129] The Cuban memorandum obviously did not deter Kennedy from authorizing the Bay of Pigs invasion. Kenworthy affirmed that Fulbright had enjoyed a minor success in the summer of 1965, when he was "the prime mover in assembling a group of influential Senators from both parties--who must be nameless--who are credited with re-enforcing the President's growing resistance to those who advocated a call-up of reserve and national guard units last summer."[130] Nevertheless, Kenworthy admitted, Fulbright had been advising Kennedy and then Johnson for five years, yet "much of the advice was, like Robert Frost's road, 'not taken.'"[131] Kenworthy noted the President's hostile reactions to the Dominican address and Fulbright's statement on Meet the Press. The article ended with the somber observation that Fulbright's advice "has more effect after the event than on it. And so it almost certainly will be with policy on the Dominican Republic and Vietnam--if, indeed, it has any effect at all."[132]

In retrospect, it is clear Fulbright's relationship with Johnson had been gradually deteriorating ever since the "Old Myths and New Realities" speech of March 25, 1964. A Newsweek article in late 1965 compared the two speeches, claiming the Dominican address "echoed his earlier salvo against U.S. foreign policy last year."[133] Actually, there was a crucial difference between the two, for "Old Myths and New Realities" was primarily a theoretical attack on the mythical concept of a relentlessly expansionist, monolithic communist bloc.[134] In contrast, "The Situation in the Dominican Republic" of September, 1965 constituted both a critique of America's global anti-communism and a specific denunciation of the 1965 U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic. The March, 1964 Senate address did not, of course, criticize American policy in Vietnam.[135] The most controversial passage of "Old Myths and New Realities" dealt with Cuba.[136] Fulbright argued that the United States should accept the reality of the Castro regime as "a distasteful nuisance but not an intolerable danger" and stop flattering "a noisy but minor demagogue as if he were a Napoleonic menace."[137] Throughout 1964 Johnson and Rusk had carefully disassociated the administration from the ideas expressed in "Old Myths and New Realities."[138] Nevertheless, Fulbright's relations with Johnson had remained outwardly amicable after the March, 1964 speech.

Fulbright's objections to the foreign aid bill in late 1964 and early 1965 were a secondary annoyance to the administration. But his dissent against the bombing of North Vietnam in February and his appeal for a negotiated settlement in his April 5 Vietnam memorandum exasperated the President. From March through the June 15 Senate address Fulbright publicly supported the administration, but his proposal for a bombing halt and his resolute opposition to escalation infuriated Johnson. During the summer he began to excoriate the administration's failure to pursue the policy of "building bridges" to the eastern European nations. The process of Fulbright's alienation from President Johnson culminated in his September condemnation of the Dominican intervention. A few weeks after the Dominican controversy subsided, Fulbright decided to inaugurate an exhaustive Foreign Relations Committee investigation of American foreign policy towards Vietnam and China. There would be a vital difference between the Dominican and the Vietnam hearings, for the latter would be not only public, but nationally televised.

Walter Lippmann was Fulbright's most formidable ally in all of the Senator's major confrontations with the Johnson administration. Lippmann and Fulbright had known each other since the 1940s, and the famous columnist had often eulogized the Arkansas Senator. In a preface to

Karl Meyer's 1963 collection of Fulbright's speeches Lippmann wrote, "The role he [Fulbright] plays in Washington is an indispensable role. There is no one else who is so powerful, and also so wise and if there were any question of removing him from public life, it would be a national calamity."[139] Lippmann delivered a similar accolade to Fulbright after the "Old Myths and New Realities" speech in 1964.[140] He endorsed Fulbright's position during the 1965 foreign aid dispute.[141] The two men had been discussing Charles de Gaulle's neutralization plan for Vietnam at least as early as May, 1964.[142]

During the first half of 1965 Fulbright and Lippmann eschewed direct personal criticism of President Johnson, but adamantly opposed military escalation in southeast Asia. McGeorge Bundy was having a series of private conferences with Lippmann which were similar to Dean Rusk's discussions with Fulbright. As Ronald Steel has observed, Bundy did not believe that he could convince Lippmann to support military escalation, but he thought Lippmann might be "neutralized," or prevented from publicly opposing the administration's policy.[143] Lippmann was invited to the White House on April 6, a few hours after Johnson had conferred with Fulbright and Mansfield about his Baltimore speech. The President assured Lippmann that "the war had to be won on the non-military side."[144] Bundy hinted to Lippmann that

there might be a possibility of a cease-fire.[145] Fulbright and Lippmann later asserted that Johnson misled them about his intentions, and both men began to denounce the Johnson foreign policies in late 1965 and early 1966 when the President's duplicity had become palpable. The extensive personal communications Fulbright and Lippmann had earlier experienced with Rusk, Bundy, and Johnson had virtually ceased by December, 1965.[146]

In 1965 there may have been a minor difference between Fulbright and Lippmann in the sense that Fulbright was incensed by the Dominican intervention, while Lippmann initially argued that the action was defensible, not on the ground that the United States was a "global fire department appointed to stop communism everywhere," but on the "old-fashioned and classical diplomatic ground that the Dominican Republic lies squarely within the sphere of influence of the United States."[147] Later, when it became obvious there had never been a communist threat in Santo Domingo, Lippmann expressed his dismay that Marines had restored the power of a reactionary military dictatorship.[148] And after the Dominican address in September, Lippmann congratulated Fulbright for generating a public dialogue concerning American foreign policy.[149]

In evaluating Fulbright's analysis of the Vietnam war in early 1965 Daniel Yergin has written, "history shows that Fulbright's private arguments to Johnson were

perceptive."[150] The Senator had predicted in his April memorandum that "the commitment of a large land army would involve us in a bloody and interminable conflict in which the advantage would lie with the enemy."[151] It is precisely because Fulbright's prediction was so perspicacious that some foreign policy analysts have criticized him for not being more aggressive in opposing the war. Johnson deceived Fulbright in early 1965, but that does not absolve the Senator from the responsibility of exhausting all methods of resistance against a policy he detested, especially in the years after 1965. Fulbright and the minority of dissenting Senators might have introduced an amendment to terminate the funds for the war during the Johnson administration. Albert Gore later contended that such an action would have "destroyed us and the movement politically."[152] Fulbright reluctantly agreed with Gore's argument in the early period of the war, for he did not sponsor legislation cutting off funds for military operations in southeast Asia until the Nixon administration began.[153]

Fulbright would sponsor an amendment to a defense appropriations bill in 1969 which prohibited the President from using American money to support military operations in Laos and Cambodia.[154] The Fulbright amendment did little or nothing to inhibit Nixon's military incursions into those two countries.[155] Yet it served as the model

for the McGovern-Hatfield amendment to end the war and the Cooper-Church amendments restricting military operations in Laos, Thailand, and Cambodia.[156] The Fulbright amendment may have been similar to many of the Arkansas Senator's foreign policy initiatives; in the beginning it appeared to be a failure, but from a long-term perspective it may have strengthened other dissenters in their determination to oppose the war. One should hasten to add that it was late in the Nixon administration before the Congressional movement to cut off funds for the war in Cambodia succeeded in ending the American military involvement in southeast Asia.[157] Perhaps if the movement had begun in 1965 or 1966 its success might not have been so belated. Senator Gore argued, to the contrary, that opposition to the military expenditures would have simply destroyed the anti-war forces before they could gather political momentum. It is clear that the opponents of the war were a small minority in 1965. But perhaps Fulbright offered the most accurate answer to the question of how to oppose the Vietnam war in his 1972 book, The Crippled Giant. "In our system," Fulbright maintained, "withholding funds is a legitimate, appropriate--and, all too often, the only effective--means of restraining the executive from initiating, continuing, or extending an unauthorized war, or from taking steps which might lead to war."[158] Fulbright's conclusion might provide a fitting epitaph

for an era of Congressional impotence: "It is not a lack of power which has prevented the Congress from ending the war in Indochina but a lack of will."[159] Many of the opponents of the Vietnam war might have wished Fulbright had arrived at this conclusion in 1965, rather than 1972.

If Fulbright's performance in the arena of direct legislative action was belated, it was nevertheless true that during late 1965 Fulbright began to revitalize the process of public debate concerning American foreign policy. The initial reaction to Fulbright's dissent revealed the potentially repressive nature of the American anti-communist consensus. In the first six months of 1965 Fulbright's efforts to foster an open dialogue with the administration had been sporadic, and his statements had often been inconsistent. During the period when he was largely confining his opposition to private remonstrances, his influence on U.S. foreign policy was negligible. After he became one of President Johnson's foremost adversaries in late 1965, Fulbright's admirers attributed a panoply of magnificent achievements to the Senator: supposedly, he had marshaled the forces of public opinion against a disastrous war, he had restrained the crusading anti-communism of American diplomacy, and he had led Congress' struggle to arrest the expansion of the administration's power. It is doubtful that one Senator could have immediately produced all of these alleged

triumphs. Yet Fulbright's dramatic emergence as a dissenter represented a historic accomplishment, for he had demonstrated that an American statesman could repudiate the dogmas of militant anti-communism and retain, or even enhance his public prestige.[160]

Chapter V

FULBRIGHT'S OPPOSITION TO THE VIETNAM WAR, 1966-1968

In the aftermath of the Dominican controversy, President Johnson attempted to ostracize Senator Fulbright from Washington's social and political life. A minor example of the administration's bitterness occurred in December, 1965, when the executive branch rejected the Senator's routine request for a jet to fly to a parliamentarian's conference in New Zealand, causing him to make a tedious four-day journey by a propeller plane.[1] The President no longer permitted Fulbright to engage in lengthy private conversations with him at the White House, and an increasing hostility replaced their earlier friendship.[2] In contrast to the President's repudiations of the Foreign Relations Committee chairman's ideas concerning American foreign policy, Johnson began to praise Governor Orval E. Faubus, a zealous anti-communist who was Fulbright's principal critic in Arkansas.[3]

Johnson's efforts to denigrate Fulbright's foreign policy positions did not deter the Senator from fostering a public debate on the Vietnam war in 1966. During early January he reflected upon the most effective strategy to employ in restraining the administration's Far Eastern policy. The President "takes actions,"

Fulbright informed a constituent in a January 13, 1966 letter, "in the Dominican Republic and in Viet Nam of which I do not approve. Under a strict interpretation of the constitution it would appear that he should request a declaration of war or some other form of approval by the Congress."[4] He observed that Congress possessed the "constitutional recourse" of impeaching the President, but he apparently regarded impeachment as extreme and quixotic, and he did not recommend it.[5] His response to the dilemma of how to oppose the Vietnam war constituted an attempt to mobilize public opinion against the escalation policy, an attempt which Fulbright inaugurated with the Vietnam hearings.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee's nationally televised investigation of the Vietnam war in January and February, 1966 was the first organized forum for dissent against America's involvement in the southeast Asian conflict.[6] There had been sporadic anti-war demonstrations, speeches, and teach-ins in 1965, but there was no genuine, sustained dialogue between the administration and the opponents of the American intervention in Vietnam until 1966. During the 1966 Vietnam hearings the Foreign Relations Committee transferred its respectability to the opposition against the Vietnam war, and began the discrediting of President Johnson's policies which eventually contributed to his decision not to seek

re-election in 1968.[7]

In preparation for the Foreign Relations Committee's analysis of the Johnson administration's Asian policy, Fulbright continued to educate himself about Far Eastern affairs. During the December trip to New Zealand he read Han Suyin's The Crippled Tree, a Chinese engineer's poignant critique of Western imperialism in early twentieth-century China.[8] He was also reading the works of Jean Lacouture, Philippe Devillers, and Bernard Fall during late 1965 and 1966. He began to regard China's official anti-Western rhetoric as an understandable reaction to Western intervention in Chinese internal affairs from the Opium Wars to the 1940s.[9] The Senator agreed with Lacouture's arguments stressing the autonomy of the Vietcong and deprecating Rusk's perspective on the south-east Asian conflict as "a war of aggression, mounted in the North against the South."[10]

On January 28, 1966, the Foreign Relations Committee scheduled Dean Rusk to testify in support of a bill authorizing a supplemental $415 million in foreign economic aid, most of which would be used in Vietnam.[11] There were 180,000 American soldiers in South Vietnam at the time.[12] Three days earlier the Foreign Affairs Committee in the House of Representatives had responded favorably to the Secretary of State's testimony.[13] Rusk's dialogue with the Senate Foreign Relations

Committee was not to be so harmonious. Fulbright's opening statement at the Vietnam hearings revealed that the Senate committee would analyze the central issues of the Vietnam war and would not confine its investigation to the specific proposal for supplemental assistance: "These requests for additional aid cannot be considered in a vacuum, but must be related to the overall political and military situation in Vietnam. I am sure that this hearing will be helpful to the committee and to the public in gaining a better understanding of fundamental questions concerning our involvement in the war."[14]

On the first day of the hearings Fulbright and Senator Albert Gore questioned Rusk's contention that the administration's massive escalation of the war was justified by the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution. Senator Gore claimed that he had voted for the resolution because he had interpreted it as approving the "specific and appropriate response" [the August 5, 1964 air raid] to the alleged North Vietnamese attacks on the American ships in the Gulf of Tonkin.[15] Rusk replied to Gore's statement by simply reading verbatim the two crucial sections of the resolution. The first section authorized the President to take all necessary measures to prevent aggression. The second stated that since the peace and security of southeast Asia were vital to American national interests, the United States was prepared, as the President determined,

to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom.[16]

Fulbright inserted excerpts from the record of the Senate's August, 1964 debate over the Tonkin Resolution into the transcript of the hearings in order to show that Congress had not intended the resolution to be a blank check for the expansion of the military effort in Indochina without the consent of Congress. These excerpts included the passage (which is discussed in the introduction) where Fulbright and Senator Gaylord Nelson had agreed that the resolution was "aimed at the problem of further aggression against our ships."[17] During the August, 1964 debate Fulbright and other Senators had rejected the strategy of a massive deployment of ground forces in Vietnam. Rusk responded to Fulbright's assertions concerning the Tonkin Resolution with platitudes about the perfidy of the North Vietnamese and the need to uphold the credibility of America's commitments. The sterility and evasiveness of Rusk's answers at the hearings strengthened the administration's adversaries; as David Halberstam has written, "From that time on, dissent was steadily more respectable and centrist," primarily because of "the failure of the Administration under intense questioning to make a case for the war."[18]

Fulbright asked Rusk to explain why the administration's stated reason for intervening in Vietnam and its terms for withdrawing seemed to be contradictory. American forces were fighting in southeast Asia, according to Rusk, to help the independent sovereign nation of South Vietnam resist the foreign aggression of its neighbor to the north, and the Geneva Agreements of 1954 were an adequate basis for peace. The fallacy in Rusk's argument was that the Geneva Agreements had stipulated that the 17th parallel was "provisional and should not in any way be interpreted as constituting a political and territorial boundary."[19] If one accepted Rusk's doubtful assumption that there were two legitimate states in Vietman, the conflict was still basically a civil war, for even according to Rusk's estimates eighty percent of the Vietcong were South Vietnamese and there were no Chinese soldiers in South Vietnam.[20]

Fulbright's crucial question about the Geneva Accords concerned the provision for holding elections by 1956. The United States had not signed the Accords, but Undersecretary of State Walter Bedell Smith had issued a unilateral declaration stating that the United States would refrain from the threat or use of force to disturb the Agreements, and would seek to achieve the unification of Vietnam through free elections.[21] In 1955 Eisenhower had acquiesced as John Foster Dulles supported Diem's

refusal to hold the elections which would have, in the opinion of all knowledgeable observers, unified Vietnam under Ho Chi Minh's rule.[22] Rusk stressed the continuity of the Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson policies, and asserted that the United States had failed to honor its commitment with respect to the Geneva Agreements because the prospects for free elections were poor in 1955. Fulbright described this explanation as a "device to get around the settlement" and asked if the prospects for free elections had ever been favorable in 2,000 years of Indochinese history. Rusk then referred to the elections of 1965, which were local elections held only in the areas controlled by the South Vietnamese government, and were irrelevant to the provision for national elections of the Geneva Agreements.[23]

The administration blamed the North Vietnamese for the failure to reconvene the Geneva conference and bring about a cessation of hostilities. According to Rusk, China and North Vietnam had repeatedly stated that negotiations would be possible only when the United States recognized the National Liberation Front (the communist political organization in South Vietnam) as the "sole representative of the South Vietnamese people."[24] Fulbright argued that the NLF's statements were conflicting and that on numerous occasions the NLF had called for free elections to create a coalition government. The

administration's position was more bluntly affirmed by retired General Maxwell Taylor, the President's Special Consultant, who informed the Committee in February that the administration intended to achieve sufficient military successes to force the communists to accept an independent, non-communist South Vietnam. When Fulbright asked Taylor if the Vietcong might be included at a diplomatic conference and if a compromise might be reached on the basis of the existing political and military strength, Taylor dramatically replied, "How do you compromise the freedom of 15 million South Vietnamese?"[25]

Thus, for the Johnson administration the corrupt, authoritarian regime of Nguyen Cao Ky and Nguyen Van Thieu was a valiant defender of freedom. As the Vietnam hearings began Johnson flew to Honolulu to confer with Thieu and Ky. Partly this meeting was a successful effort to dominate the news as the Vietnam hearings were opening.[26] The Honolulu conference was probably Johnson's most spectacular justification for the war; the principal administration officials were present, photographs were taken of Johnson embracing Ky, and Johnson delivered an exuberant declaration pledging America's everlasting friendship to the South Vietnamese people. The South Vietnamese, he pronounced, "fight for dreams beyond the din of battle. They fight for the essential rights of human existence--and only the callous or the timid can ignore their cause."[27] Johnson could not

accept the logic of the "callous and the timid" "that tyranny 10,000 miles away is not tyranny to concern us--or that subjugation by an armed minority in Asia is different from subjugation by an armed minority in Europe."[28] The President proposed a comprehensive program for development of South Vietnam's economy, medical and educational facilities, and agricultural system which Vice President Hubert Humphrey soon began describing as an Asian or Johnson Doctrine which would, in Humphrey's words, realize "the dream of the Great Society in the great area of Asia, not just here at home."[29]

The Honolulu conference caused considerable dismay among the opponents of the war, partly because General Ky had recently expressed his admiration for Adolf Hitler.[30] More importantly, the Honolulu conference created grave doubts about Johnson's sincerity in claiming that the United States was seeking a political settlement, for the President had solidified the alliance between his administration and the government of Ky and Thieu, who were intransigent in their demand that the National Liberation Front be excluded from all negotiations. When the Secretary of State made his second appearance at the Vietnam hearings in February, Fulbright described the administration's attitude as "adamant" and asked Rusk if the U.S. government supported Ky and Thieu in their refusal to accept a coalition. Rusk evaded the question

by relating that Ky had called the NLF the "national enslavement front" at Honolulu.[32]

Johnson revealed that he considered the alleged North Vietnamese-Chinese aggression in southeast Asia to be analogous to the Soviet threat to Europe in the late 1940s by his statement at Honolulu that it was as essential to help "free men" resist "subjugation by armed minorities" in Asia as it was in Europe. "Subjugation by armed minorities" were the famous words of President Truman in the March, 1947 Truman Doctrine speech. When Rusk testified at the hearings in January, he elaborated upon the administration's intention of devising a containment policy for Mao Tse-tung and his presumed surrogate Ho Chi Minh in southeast Asia similar to the containment policy directed against Stalin in Europe.

Rusk began his opening statement at the Vietnam hearings by quoting the basic formula of the Truman Doctrine: "I [Truman] believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures." "That is the policy we are applying in Vietnam," Rusk proclaimed.[33] For Rusk, the Vietnam war was ultimately a clash of ideologies, in which the Truman Doctrine must triumph over the Chinese dogma of "wars of national liberation." In 1968 the Foreign Relations Committee again held televised hearings on Vietnam,

and Fulbright then questioned Rusk as to whether China or North Vietnam represented the threat to American security. Rusk replied that the danger emanated from the Chinese doctrine of world revolution. Fulbright responded by stating the fact that Lin Piao, the Chinese theorist and politician who was the author of the doctrine, had written that if a war of national liberation fails to "rely on the strength of the masses, but leans wholly on foreign aid, no victory can be won, or consolidated even if it is won."[34]

Thus the Chinese dogma of supporting wars of national liberation emerges to a large extent as an expression of sympathy for third world revolutions rather than a declaration of an intent to sponsor worldwide subversion and guerrilla warfare. The absence of a Chinese military presence in Vietnam was palpable evidence of this fact. Yet at one point in the 1966 hearings Rusk asserted that the struggle in southeast Asia was not the United States' war, but "Mao Tse-tung's war" because of China's support for Ho Chi Minh.

George F. Kennan challenged many of the administration's basic assumptions concerning Vietnam when he testified at the hearings in February. Kennan was a former Ambassador to the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia, and had been chairman of the State Department's Policy Planning Committee in the late 1940s.[36] In contrast to Rusk's

opening statement that the Truman Doctrine must be applied to southeast Asia as it had been applied to Europe in the 1940s, Kennan began his presentation by calling Vietnam an area of minimal military and industrial importance and asserting that "if we were not already involved in Vietnam I would know of no reason why we should wish to become so involved."[37] Kennan refuted Rusk's contention that a communist Vietnam would be a Chinese satellite, stating that nationalism is a universal human phenomenon and does not magically desert men when they become communists.[38] In the opinion of Fulbright and Kennan, Yugoslavia was an example of a communist country which had followed a neutral course in the East-West rivalry and which certainly was not a puppet of either of the great communist powers. The existence of the Soviet Union as an alternative ally within the communist world rendered it unnecessary for a communist Vietnam to become merely an extension of Chinese power.[39]

The question of whether China was an expansionist state was one of the fundamental issues debated at the Vietnam hearings. Fulbright and Kennan doubted the validity of the popular view of China as a relentlessly aggressive power, observing that there was a significant disparity between the Chinese leaders' violent rhetoric and their actions. Neither Fulbright nor Kennan expressed the opinion that China was not a difficult nation to deal with. Fulbright described their conduct as "outrageous";

Kennan stated that the idea that China was the center of the universe had always presented problems in China's relations with other countries.[40] But the Senator regarded the arrogant anti-American statements of the Chinese as an understandable reaction against the century or more of humiliation inflicted upon China by the West from the Opium Wars to the 1940s. In late February General Taylor conceded in testimony before the Committee that the Chinese had been justified in their grave concern and military response to the possibility of an American invasion in 1950, when MacArthur was rapidly advancing towards the Yalu.[41] Fulbright noted that according to Taylor the Indian troops had started the brief war with China in 1962 by moving forward into the disputed territory along the Chinese border. Kennan did not excuse the Chinese aggression in seizing Tibet in 1959, but he pointed out that Chiang Kai-shek was fully in agreement with Mao Tse-tung in considering Tibet to be an integral part of China. Thus, many of the international controversies involving China in the postwar years would have existed even if China had not been a communist country, in Kennan's judgment, for the problems originated in traditional emotions of Chinese nationalism and xenophobia.[42]

Kennan's basic critique of the American policy in Vietnam focused upon his conviction that the Johnson administration had "become enslaved to the dynamics of a

single unmanageable situation" and had thereby caused a "grievous disbalance" in the entire global structure of American diplomacy.[43] The administration's escalation of the war had violated one of the cardinal precepts of American foreign policy since the Korean war, which was never to risk a military confrontation with China on the Asian land mass. Moreover, the Vietnam war forced Russia to compete with China in vilifying the American imperialists, for Chinese propaganda had consistently accused the Russians of somehow being in collusion with the United States in southeast Asia.[44] The central issues of international relations, such as nuclear armaments control agreements, the problems of Germany, and the future of the United Nations and China had all been placed in abeyance in deference to this one remote involvement.[45]

Retired General James Gavin presented the "enclave theory" as an alternative to the escalation policy when he appeared at the hearings in February. In 1954 General Gavin and General Matthew Ridgway had helped persuade President Eisenhower to reject the plan of Admiral Radford, Dulles, and Nixon to intervene in Vietnam to rescue the French from military disaster. Gavin had believed that an intervention would have been a tragic mistake because of the difficulties in the terrain and the possibility of a Chinese intervention.[46] The General reiterated his basic argument in 1966.

Gavin suggested that the United States should confine its military activities to enclaves along the coast or other areas where American air and sea power could be decisive, cease enlarging its ground force, and desist from the bombing of North Vietnam as an initial step towards achieving a diplomatic solution.[47] He urged the administration to renounce its infatuation with the air war, for it was in his estimation one of the greatest illusions of modern times that air power could win a war.[48] The bombings were not "psychologically punishing" the North Vietnamese as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Wheeler claimed, but were largely only succeeding in seriously damaging America's image before the court of world opinion.[49]

The American bombing campaign had been utterly futile. Johnson began the systematic bombing of North Vietnam shortly after the Vietcong killed nine Americans at the U.S. base in Pleiku in February, 1965. Apparently the air strikes galvanized the North Vietnamese into even more frenzied military resistance against the Americans, for North Vietnamese infiltration into the south had increased from 800 men per month in the summer of 1965 to 4,500 men monthly in early 1966.[50] Gavin believed that if the Johnson strategy of aerial devastation combined with ever expanding ground combat forces continued for a substantial length of time, the Chinese would re-open the

Korean front and invade South Vietnam. The Chinese, with their virtually limitless supplies of manpower, could probably only be defeated through the use of nuclear weapons in Gavin's opinion.[51] Some of the Chinese leaders were saying at the time that even if China suffered 200 or 300 million casualties from a nuclear attack, they would still have several hundred million people with which they could win any war.[52] This was perhaps the ultimate fear of the opponents of the Vietnam war; that America had "become enslaved to the dynamics" of a situation which might lead to a nuclear war with China.

Fulbright believed China would intervene in southeast Asia only if the Chinese political leaders concluded that the United States was planning to expand the war into a conquest of North Vietnam or an invasion of the Chinese mainland. The Senator repudiated the view of China as an aggressive power after the pattern of Nazi Germany. The Johnson administration, however, seems to have equated Nazi aggression in Europe with the alleged North Vietnamese and Chinese threat in southeast Asia; those who called for an American withdrawal from Vietnam were advocating appeasement. Rusk replied to the question of whether the Vietnam war presented a situation different from Hitler's expansionism in Europe by saying, "There are differences but there are also enormous similarities."[53] When Rusk spoke of "this phenomenon of Aggression" he did not draw

a significant distinction between the Vietnam dilemma in the 1960s and German aggression in the 1930s. At one point during the Vietnam hearings Rusk proclaimed, "Hitler could see the Japanese militarists were not stopped in Manchuria. Now, what happens here in southeast Asia if Peiping discovers that Hanoi can move without risk?"[54] Henry Cabot Lodge, the Ambassador to South Vietnam, sent a telegram to the Foreign Relations Committee as the Vietnam hearings were opening declaring: "We, Vietnamese and Americans, are doing in Vietnam in 1966 what the free nations failed to do in 1936 when Hitler went into the Rhineland."[55]

Fulbright tried to refute the notion that there was a basic similarity between the China of Mao Tse-tung and the Germany of Hitler in his book The Arrogance of Power. This book was based on the Vietnam hearings and a series of lectures the Senator delivered in April, 1966 at Johns Hopkins University. "China," the Senator wrote, "is not judged to be aggressive because of her actions; she is presumed to be aggressive because she is communist."[56] The ferocity of Peking's language had obscured the fact that China had allowed her neighbors to remain independent. China had withdrawn her troops from North Korea in 1958 although there was no external pressure to do so, and had not attempted to dominate the weak and non-aligned nation of Burma.[57] Fulbright agreed with Kennan that even though

North Vietnam was to some extent dependent on China for economic and logistical support to prosecute the war, North Vietnam remained substantially in control of its own affairs.[58]

Fulbright did not romanticize China. He stated that the Chinese would have to abandon their ancient image of China as the celestial empire in a world of barbarians and their more recent role as the nominal champion of world revolution before an amelioration of American-Chinese relations could occur.[59] But Fulbright depicted the basic American perspective on the Vietnam war as the consummate example of the ideological prejudice which had distorted the judgments of Americans since the 1940s. Ho Chi Minh was the hated tyrant, while Ky and Thieu were valiant democrats fighting for their nation's freedom; North Vietnam was China's puppet while South Vietnam was America's stalwart ally; and China was the true aggressor in southeast Asia despite the fact that there were no Chinese troops on the soil of China's southern neighbor, whereas the hundreds of thousands (over 200,000 in 1966, over 500,000 in 1968) of American soldiers in a land 8,000 miles from America's shores were resisting foreign aggression.[60]

If the United States considered it vital to its national interests to construct a bulwark against the alleged "Chinese imperialism" in Vietnam, Vietnamese nationalism alone could have provided that bulwark.

Americans must acknowledge, Fulbright wrote, that Ho Chi Minh and his communist allies in South Vietnam represented the genuine nationalist movement of Vietnam, which was the only nation in the world which won its independence from colonial rule under communist leadership.[61]

Fulbright argued that the unilateral nature of the American intervention in Vietnam indicated that America's allies did not share the Johnson administration's view of the conflict as a manifestation of international communist aggression. He believed any political settlement would have to be only tolerable and not satisfactory, such as the 1962 Geneva Accords providing for the neutralization of Laos. Fulbright admitted at the Vietnam hearings that it was true, as Rusk never tired of asseverating, that the North Vietnamese had consistently violated those agreements by infiltrating troops and equipment through Laos to assist the communists in South Vietnam.[62] But as unsatisfactory as the 1962 Accords were, Fulbright asserted that they were diplomatic triumphs in the sense that hundreds of thousands of American soldiers were not engaged in the Sisyphean task of eliminating the communist guerrillas from the jungles of Laos.[63]

The Foreign Relations Committee succeeded in strengthening the opposition to the war in 1966 despite several difficulties during the hearings. Fulbright could not persuade General Matthew Ridgway to testify before the

Committee. Ridgway held profound doubts about the war and might have powerfully reinforced Kennan's views, but he could not bring himself to publicly criticize a war while American troops were still fighting.[64] Senator Mansfield did not make a significant contribution to the Committee's investigation of the Vietnam policy, attending only one of the six hearings. A minority of "hawks" on the Committee continued to praise the administration and disparage Fulbright's foreign policy positions.[65] Nevertheless, Fulbright was receiving far more support from the members of the Foreign Relations Committee in 1966 than he had a year earlier. During the Dominican controversy there were probably four or five Senators who supported Fulbright; by the time of the Vietnam hearings and the "Arrogance of Power" speeches of early 1966, approximately ten of the nineteen members of the Committee agreed with Fulbright's critique of America's crusading anti-communism.

The Fulbright hearings gradually produced a crucial and salutary change in television coverage of Vietnam, despite the failure of C.B.S. to carry the Kennan hearing. C.B.S. would have absorbed a financial loss if it had covered the Kennan hearing, and some of the C.B.S. executives were reluctant to publicize the controversial ideas of an intellectual who was not an administration witness.[66] However, N.B.C. televised the Kennan hearing, and C.B.S. televised four of the six hearings, including

Gavin's testimony. Before the Vietnam hearings, television had been a reliable ally of the administration, usually reporting pro-war goals and statements without criticism. The fact that administration witnesses, and especially Dean Rusk, delivered the bulk of the testimony legitimized the Vietnam hearings to the public.[67] But it was obvious that Rusk's answers to the difficult questions at the hearings had not been convincing. During the Vietnam hearings, for the first time national television reported in detail the dissenting views of critics such as Fulbright, Morse, and Gore. After the hearings, the television networks exhibited an increasing tendency to report both pro-war and anti-war analyses of the southeast Asian conflict.[68]

In Fulbright's "Arrogance of Power" speeches of April, 1966 the Senator intensified and elaborated upon his indictment of the Johnson administration's foreign policy. The speeches formed the nucleus of his book The Arrogance of Power (published later in 1966), in which Fulbright summarized the basic foreign policy proposals he had advocated in 1964, 1965, and 1966. One part of the book reiterated the theme of his "Old Myths and New Realities" and "Bridges East and West" speeches of 1964 in appealing for the policy of "building bridges" to the communist world. Another chapter reiterated the thesis of Fulbright's September, 1965 Dominican address. The most detailed sections of the book dealt with the controversies

over America's Asian policy which Fulbright, Rusk, Taylor, Gavin, and Kennan had debated at the Vietnam hearings.

In The Arrogance of Power Fulbright delineated a program for the eventual restoration of peace in Vietnam. The initial point in his program was a recommendation that the South Vietnamese government should seek negotiations with the National Liberation Front. The United States should remind the contemporary regime in Saigon, the Senator maintained, that America would not become committed to the objective of complete military victory for the government of Ky and Thieu or any successor government. "At the same time," he continued, "as the Saigon government makes direct overtures to the National Liberation Front the United States and South Vietnam together should propose negotiations for a cease-fire among military representatives of four separate negotiating parties: the United States and South Vietnam, North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front."[69] While the United States was inaugurating these peace initiatives, it should terminate the bombing of North Vietnam and pledge to withdraw American military forces from Vietnam.

According to Fulbright, the four principal belligerents should direct their negotiations towards organizing a national referendum acceptable to the South Vietnamese government and to the National Liberation Front. The United States should commit itself explicitly

to accept the results of the national referendum in order to allay suspicions that America and the South Vietnamese government would repeat the error of 1956, when the Diem regime failed to hold the elections envisaged by the Geneva Agreements. In Fulbright's opinion, "the outcome of a referendum in South Vietnam cannot be predicted," but he observed that elections might reveal "the full diversity of South Vietnamese society, with the National Liberation Front emerging as a major political force in the country but with the Buddhists and Catholics, the Cao Dai and the Hoa Hao also showing themselves to be important forces in their respective zones of influence."[70]

After the principal belligerents arranged a cease-fire and a national referendum for South Vietnam, Fulbright proposed that "an international conference should be convened to guarantee the arrangements made by the belligerents and to plan a future referendum on the reunification of North Vietnam and South Vietnam."[71] All of the great powers, including the Soviet Union and China, should participate in this conference. In addition to the plans for the reunification of Vietnam, the international conference should negotiate a multilateral agreement for the neutralization of all southeast Asia.

If the negotiations failed, Fulbright conceded that the United States should retire to General Gavin's "enclave theory," (discussed above) although the Senator

did not refer to Gavin's theory by name. One should emphasize that Fulbright proposed the coastal enclave strategy only if determined, constant, and sincere American efforts to negotiate a peaceful settlement failed.[72] The administration, of course, repudiated Fulbright's peace program.

The Senator concluded his plea for the restoration of peace in southeast Asia by quoting a speech Charles de Gaulle delivered in Cambodia on September 1, 1966. De Gaulle predicted a triumph for American diplomacy if the United States followed a course of accommodation and neutralization in Vietnam: "In view of the power, wealth, and influence at present attained by the United States, the act of renouncing, in its turn, a distant expedition once it appears unprofitable and unjustifiable and of substituting for it an international arrangement organizing the peace and development of an important region of the world, will not, in the final analysis, involve anything that could injure its pride, interfere with its ideals and jeopardize its interests. On the contrary, in taking a path so true to the Western genius, what an audience would the United States recapture from one end of the world to the other, and what an opportunity would peace find on the scene and everywhere else."[73]

In a memorable passage of The Arrogance of Power, Fulbright defended the right of a patriot to advocate

dissident ideas concerning American diplomacy. "Gradually but unmistakably," he wrote, "America is showing signs of that arrogance of power which has afflicted, weakened and in some cases destroyed great nations in the past. In so doing we are not living up to our capacity and promise as a civilized example for the world. The measure of our falling short is the measure of the patriot's duty of dissent."[74] Fulbright urged Americans to eschew "the arrogance of power, the tendency of great nations to equate power with virtue and major responsibilities with a universal mission."[75]

President Johnson interpreted the Arkansas Senator's "arrogance of power" rhetoric as a personal attack upon his administration. Fulbright continued to argue that his criticisms were directed against the substance of Johnson's foreign policy, and were not accusations that Lyndon Johnson was an arrogant politician. In a May, 1966 letter to the President, Fulbright attempted to clarify the thesis of his speeches: "Greece, Rome, Spain, England, Germany, and others lost their pre-eminence because of failure to recognize their limitations, or, as I called it, the arrogance of their power; and my hope is that this country, presently the greatest and the most powerful in the world, may learn by the mistakes of its predecessors."[76] He added that he was confident America would not succumb to the "arrogance of power" under President Johnson's

leadership. This additional comment was not consistent with some of the more critical passages in Fulbright's speeches; it was part of a forlorn effort to deter Johnson's tendency to personalize their conflict. The Senator had written a somewhat similar letter to the President in March, 1966, requesting that the administration should at least devote careful study to his proposal for the neutralization of Vietnam "before it is discarded as unreasonable."[77] The Department of State, he observed, had recently rejected the neutralization idea "as being quite unthinkable."[78] He respectfully recommended that the Policy Planning Staff conduct a thorough investigation of the neutralization proposal.

The President's remarks at a Chicago fund-raising dinner in mid-May, 1966 delineated his response towards Fulbright's attempt to restore a modicum of direct communication between the Foreign Relations Committee chairman and the administration. Johnson disparaged the opponents of the Vietnam war with the following animadversions: "I do not think that those men who are out there fighting for us tonight think that we should enjoy the luxury of fighting each other back home. There will be Nervous Nellies and some who become frustrated and bothered and break ranks under the strain and turn on their leaders, their own country, and their own fighting men."[79]

By the spring of 1966, a pattern had emerged which would persist, with minor variations, for the remainder of Johnson's Presidency. Throughout the interminable period of American military escalation during 1966, 1967 and early 1968, Fulbright repeatedly urged a cessation of the military intervention and pleaded for the neutralization of Vietnam. The administration incessantly reiterated its position and dismissed the Foreign Relations Committee chairman's recommendations.

During the last three years of the Johnson administration Fulbright argued that the Tonkin Resolution did not provide any legal justification for the war in Vietnam. Fulbright emphasized Johnson's almost pacifistic rhetoric during the 1964 Presidential campaign and the assurances given by the administration at the time of the resolution's passage that it was intended to prevent a war by demonstrating to the Chinese and North Vietnamese that America was determined to oppose aggression. The Tonkin Resolution, Fulbright continued to maintain, amounted to Congressional acquiescence in the executive's exercise of the war power, which the Constitution vested in Congress and which Congress had no right to renounce.[80]

The significance of the August, 1964 resolution lies in its symbolic nature as evidence of Congress' willingness to allow the President to acquire virtually complete control of foreign policy. Senator McGovern later stated

that the momentum in favor of escalation in the Johnson administration was already so powerful by August, 1964 that the Gulf of Tonkin crisis had no real effect on the administration's thinking concerning Vietnam.[81] McGovern's contention may have been accurate; as early as February, 1964, the President authorized the "34A" program of clandestine military operations against North Vietnam.[82] Although Johnson referred to the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution in justifying his Vietnam policy during the early period of his Presidency, he did not continue to do so after 1966. The fact that Fulbright and other dissenting Senators were publicizing the doubtful circumstances surrounding the resolution's passage may have contributed to the President's reluctance to rely on the resolution in defending his policies during 1967. In an August, 1967 press conference Johnson described the resolution as a courtesy extended to Congress to permit them to "be there on the takeoff as well as on the landing. We did not think the resolution was necessary to do what we did and what we're doing."[83]

President Nixon continued his predecessor's policy of disregarding Congress' views concerning the resolution. When in 1971 Fulbright and other opponents of America's Vietnam policy finally succeeded in repealing the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution, the only legislative instrument which provided some facade of constitutional legitimacy for the Vietnam war, Nixon continued the war as if nothing of

consequence had happened.[84]

Fulbright later wrote that the Congress thought it was acting to help prevent a large-scale war in southeast Asia by passing the Tonkin Resolution.[85] Actually, there was considerable confusion in Congress over precisely what the resolution signified. Senator Nelson offered his amendment (which declared it to be the policy of the United States to avoid a military intervention in Vietnam) in order to clarify the meaning of the resolution, for he claimed to be "most disturbed to see that there is no agreement in the Senate on what the joint resolution means."[86] The Pentagon Papers stated that beyond the central belief that "the occasion necessitated demonstrating the nation's unity and collective will in support of the President's action and affirming U.S. determination to oppose further aggression, Congressional opinions varied as to the policy implications and the meaning" of the almost unanimous support for the resolution. According to the Papers, "several spokesmen stressed that the resolution did not constitute a declaration of war, did not abdicate Congressional responsibility for determining national policy commitments and did not give the President carte blanche to involve the nation in a major Asian war."[87]

The Johnson administration claimed that the American commitment to Vietnam centered upon the SEATO treaty. Fulbright argued that the SEATO treaty did not

commit the United States to defend member nations against internal revolts. In case of a threat of internal subversion, the only obligation of the SEATO treaty was to consult; in the event of encountering an act of internal aggression, the members were to "meet the common danger" in accordance with their constitutional processes.[88] Even if Johnson had been correct in his view of the conflict as a war of foreign aggression mounted by the North against the South, the war would still have been unconstitutional. Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution states that Congress' power to declare war cannot be discharged either by treaty in which the House of Representatives does not participate, or by provision of appropriations for a war initiated by the President on his own authority.[89]

In addition to his indictment of the war's unconstitutionality, the Arkansas Senator increasingly decried the domestic repercussions of America's intervention in southeast Asia. He began describing Johnson's "Great Society" as a "sick society" in 1967. At an American Bar Association meeting of August, 1967 Fulbright sadly enumerated the statistics on the American death toll during a single week of July, 1967: 164 Americans were killed and 1,442 were wounded in Vietnam, while 65 Americans were killed and 2,100 were wounded in urban riots in the United States.[90] The war not only diverted resources from health, education, and welfare programs, but perhaps even more

seriously, it disseminated the idea that violence was an effective means of solving social and political problems.[91]

There was a total dichotomy between the perspectives of Fulbright's August, 1967 address, entitled "The Price of Empire," and the Senator's January, 1965 speech at Miami. In January, 1965, he had believed President Johnson would concentrate on domestic reconstruction and end America's preoccupation with opposing communism abroad. By 1967, he was convinced that Johnson's foreign policy had grievously exacerbated America's domestic maladies. Administration officials produced impressive statistics concerning the gross national product to demonstrate that the United States could afford both the Vietnam war and the Great Society. But the statistics, in Fulbright's view, could not explain "how an anxious and puzzled people, bombarded by press and television with the bad news of American deaths in Vietnam, the 'good news' of enemy deaths--and with vividly horrifying pictures to illustrate them--can be expected to support neighborhood anti-poverty projects and national programs for urban renewal, employment and education. Anxiety about war does not breed compassion for one's neighbors; nor do constant reminders of the cheapness of life abroad strengthen our faith in its sanctity at home. In these ways the war in Vietnam is poisoning and brutalizing our domestic life."[92]

Fulbright responded to the administration's economic statistics with a brief comparison of defense and social spending in recent American history. Since 1946, he observed, 57% of the expenditures in the regular national budget had been devoted to military power, whereas 6% were spent on education, health, labor, housing, and welfare programs. The Johnson administration's budget for fiscal year 1968 was consistent with the postwar trend, calling for $75 billion in military spending and only $15 billion for "social functions."[93] According to Fulbright, Congress had not been reluctant to reduce expenditures on domestic programs, but was much too willing to provide virtually unlimited sums for the military.

"The Price of Empire" was not entirely negative. The Senator eulogized the burgeoning protest movement against the Vietnam war. He dismissed the notion that the young idealists who opposed the war were radical. He predicted that the regenerative influence of the younger generation would eventually prevail over the truly radical super-patriots who were attempting to transform the United States into the self-appointed gendarme of the world. The struggle between these "young idealists" and the advocates of the Vietnam war, Fulbright asserted, was a conflict between "two Americas." The modern ultra-patriots represented an emerging imperial America which contradicted the ideals of the "traditional" America, the America of

Jefferson, Lincoln, and Adlai Stevenson. In Fulbright's view, the opponents of the Vietnam war were remaining true to the traditional American values in their desire to abandon the quest for empire and devote the nation's energies to achieving freedom and social justice at home, and the "fulfillment of our flawed democracy."[94]

Domestic opposition to the Johnson administration's southeast Asian policy increased rapidly during the summer and fall of 1967. By August, 1967, draft calls were exceeding 30,000 per month, and more than 13,000 Americans had died in Vietnam. The President announced a 10 percent surtax to cover the spiraling costs of the war. In August, public opinion polls revealed that for the first time a majority of Americans believed the United States had been mistaken in intervening in Vietnam. Public approval of Johnson's handling of the war plummeted to 28 percent by October.[95]

The opposition to the war increasingly focused on the bombing, which many dissenters regarded as futile and immoral. By 1967 the United States had dropped more bombs in southeast Asia than in all theaters during World War II. The President expanded the number of sorties in 1967 and authorized air attacks on steel factories, power plants, and other targets around Hanoi and Haiphong, as well as on previously restricted areas along the Chinese border. Civilian casualties mounted as high as 1,000 per week

during periods of heavy bombing. The air war inflicted severe damage on North Vietnam's raw materials, vehicles, and military equipment, but these losses were offset by increased Soviet and Chinese aid to North Vietnam. The Soviet Union assisted North Vietnam in the construction of a powerful anti-aircraft system centered around Hanoi and Haiphong. Nine hundred and fifty American aircraft were destroyed over Vietnam from 1965 to 1968. As George Herring has described the futility of the air strikes, "The limited success of air power as applied on a large scale in Korea raised serious questions" about the military effectiveness of bombing, "and the conditions prevailing in Vietnam, a primitive country with few crucial targets, might have suggested even more." North Vietnamese infiltration into South Vietnam increased from roughly 35,000 men in 1965 to about 90,000 in 1967 despite the intensification of the bombing.[96]

American officials asserted that the United States was "winning" the war, claiming that 220,000 enemy soldiers had been killed in "search and destroy" missions in South Vietnam by late 1967. These figures were based on "body counts" which were notoriously unreliable, since it was not possible to distinguish between Vietcong and noncombatants. Moreover, approximately 200,000 North Vietnamese reached draft age every year, and Hanoi was able to replace its losses and match each American escalation.

If the North Vietnamese and Vietcong began to suffer unusually severe casualties in a particular military engagement, they would often simply disappear into the South Vietnamese jungle or retreat into North Vietnam, Laos, or Cambodia. Although there were 450,000 American soldiers in Vietnam by mid-1967, General Westmoreland urged the President to send 200,000 additional troops. The General conceded that even with 650,000 men the war might last two more years; with only a half million troops Westmoreland believed the war could last five more years or longer.[97]

Political, social, and economic conditions in South Vietnam were rapidly deteriorating. American spending had a devastating impact on the fragile economy of South Vietnam, where prices increased 170 percent from 1965 to 1967. The expansion of Vietcong and American military operations had driven four million South Vietnamese (about one-fourth of South Vietnam's population) from their native villages. These refugees drifted into the already overcrowded cities or were herded into refugee camps. The United States furnished $30 million per year to the Saigon government for care of the displaced villagers, but much of the money never reached the refugees. A large portion of South Vietnam's population thus became rootless and embittered, and the refugee camps were often infiltrated by Vietcong fifth columns. In The Arrogance of Power

Fulbright lamented the "fatal impact" of American economic and military power on South Vietnam and other under-developed countries. "With every good intention," he wrote, "we have intruded on fragile societies, and our intrusion, though successful in uprooting traditional ways of life, has been strikingly unsuccessful in implanting the democracy and advancing the development which are the honest aims of our 'welfare imperialism.'" The Senator doubted "the ability of the United States or any other Western nation to go into a small, alien, undeveloped Asian nation and create stability where there is chaos, the will to fight where there is defeatism, democracy where there is no tradition of it, and honest government where corruption is almost a way of life."[98]

Nguyen Cao Ky candidly admitted that "most of the generals are corrupt. Most of the senior officials in the provinces are corrupt." But Ky excused the corruption by claiming that it "exists everywhere, and people can live with some of it. You live with it in Chicago and New York."[99] The September, 1967 elections in South Vietnam again revealed the weak and corrupt nature of the Thieu-Ky regime, for even after the Saigon government disqualified many opposition candidates and fraudulently manipulated some of the election returns, the Thieu-Ky ticket received only a plurality of 35 percent of the vote. The chaos and corruption in America's South Vietnamese ally contributed

to the American public's disillusionment with the war.[100]

By late 1967 there was an increasingly vociferous and expanding bloc of Senators who agreed with Fulbright's indictment of the war. According to a majority of the members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Dean Rusk should have defended the administration's southeast Asian policies in a public hearing.[101] In December, 1967, Rusk rejected the Committee's invitation to testify at an open hearing. Fulbright renewed the Committee's request in early 1968 shortly after the Vietcong launched the Tet offensive, a massive assault against the major urban areas in South Vietnam.[102] "What is now at stake," the chairman contended in a February 1968 letter to President Johnson, "is no less urgent a question than the Senate's constitutional duty to advise, as well as consent, in the sphere of foreign policy."[103] The members of his committee, Fulbright maintained, were anxious to clarify for the American people the implications of U.S. policy in Vietnam. In the midst of widespread disenchantment with the administration's southeast Asian policies, President Johnson acquiesced to Fulbright's request, and a few weeks later Rusk testified before the Committee.

The day before Rusk's testimony in 1968, the New York Times published reports of General William Westmoreland's proposal for 206,000 additional troops in Vietnam. The Pentagon Papers described the publication of the

Westmoreland recommendation as a "focus" for political debate which intensified public dissatisfaction with the war.[104] Rusk appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee on March 11, 1968, ostensibly for the purpose of discussing foreign aid. Instead the televised hearings became a two-day grilling of the Secretary on Vietnam, with Fulbright sharply questioning Rusk over the Tonkin crisis and the administration's interpretation of the Tonkin Resolution, Rusk's views on Lin Piao's doctrine of world revolution (discussed above), and the reports of Westmoreland's requests for more troops. Rusk refused to discuss possible troop increases, though he confirmed that an "A to Z" policy review was being conducted by the President and his advisers.[105]

During the hearings Fulbright stressed the irrelevance of Indochina to America's vital national interests. The administration described the conflict in Indochina as an "exemplary war" which was discouraging the communists from promoting subversive activities in other third world nations. Fulbright execrated this notion as a reversion to the crusading anti-communism of the earlier postwar years and averred that far from proving to the communist powers that wars of national liberation could not succeed, the Vietnam war was demonstrating to the world that even with an army of a half million men and expenditures of $30 billion per year America could not win a civil war for a

regime which was incapable of inspiring the patriotism of its own people.[106]

Fulbright bluntly dismissed the administration's version of the Gulf of Tonkin incidents as untrue. He stated that if the United States would begin bombing North Vietnam in retaliation against doubtful skirmishes which had not damaged the U.S. armed forces, then the North Vietnamese must have understandably concluded in 1964 that America was determined to attack them regardless of their actions.[107] By March, 1968, of course, the Arkansas Senator had criticized the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution on innumerable occasions. The dialogue between Fulbright and Rusk at the 1968 hearings was essentially a repetition of the opposing arguments they had been advancing since 1966. Rusk's sterile, evasive answers did not differ significantly from the testimony he had delivered at Foreign Relations Committee hearings throughout the Johnson Presidency.

If the 1968 Fulbright-Rusk confrontation was not different in substance from earlier debates between the chairman and the Secretary, it was nevertheless true that the political atmosphere in which the debate occurred had changed dramatically. Walter Cronkite had eloquently summarized the prevailing public mood in his widely publicized television broadcast on February 27: "To say that we are closer to victory today is to believe, in the face of evidence, the optimists who have been wrong in

the past." "We are mired in stalemate," Cronkite pronounced.[108] Public opinion polls in March indicated that approximately 75% of the American people believed U.S. policies in Vietnam were failing.[109] The March 11 and 12 Foreign Relations Committee hearings reinforced Secretary of Defense Clark Clifford's nascent conviction that major actions must be taken to reduce America's military involvement in Vietnam.[110]

Shortly after the conclusion of the second day's hearings, the returns from the Presidential primary in New Hampshire revealed surprisingly strong support for the President's challenger, Senator Eugene McCarthy.[111] On March 16 Senator Robert Kennedy declared that he would seek the Democratic Presidential nomination on a platform of opposition to the war.[112] Ten days later the Senior Informal Advisory Group, consisting of Dean Acheson, George Ball, Matthew Ridgway, Cyrus Vance, McGeorge Bundy and others advised the President to order a reduction in the bombing.[113] In a nationally televised address on March 31, the President announced his withdrawal from the Presidential campaign, a token troop increase, and the de-escalation of the air war against North Vietnam in order to obtain Hanoi's entry into negotiations.[114]

The March 10 New York Times publication, the Foreign Relations Committee hearings, and the apparent political strength of the anti-war candidates Kennedy and

McCarthy clearly demonstrated that significant and growing elements of the American public believed that the costs of the war had reached unacceptable levels. According to the Pentagon Papers, the President's dramatic change in tactics was based upon two major considerations. One was the opinion of his principal advisers, especially Secretary of Defense Clifford, that the troops General Westmoreland requested would not make a military victory any more likely.[115] The revelation of the Vietnamese communists' power during the Tet offensive was crucial in Johnson's belated acceptance of Clifford's evaluation of the military realities.[116] The Pentagon study described the second major consideration leading to Johnson's March 31 speech as "a deeply felt conviction of the need to restore unity to the American nation."[117]

The March, 1968 decisions constituted an end to the Johnson administration's escalation of the Vietnam war. But the administration did not alter its fundamental goals, for Johnson remained determined to secure an independent, non-communist South Vietnam.[118] Fulbright quickly recognized the limited nature of the President's changes. On April 2, he registered his disillusionment with Johnson's address: "Today, within 48 hours, it appears that it [the March 31 de-escalation of the air war] was not a significant change at all."[119] He publicized the disturbing fact that on April 1 U.S. planes

bombed North Vietnamese targets 205 miles north of the Demilitarized Zone.[120] On April 1, administration spokesmen revealed American planes could still strike targets only 45 miles from Hanoi under the terms of Johnson's bombing pause.[121] Fulbright believed a total and unilateral cessation of the bombing would be necessary as a significant inducement towards a cease-fire.[122] The Senator refuted the notion that he and Wayne Morse were somehow endangering American lives in Vietnam by their adamant opposition to Johnson's southeast Asian policies, stating "the idea that what the Senator from Oregon and I and others who seek an end to the war advocate is not protecting the lives of our boys is absurd. What we advocate, is, really, the only effective way to protect their lives; namely, stop the war."[123]

Lyndon Johnson complained in his memoirs that the media devoted considerable attention to Fulbright's views on Vietnam but virtually ignored the pro-administration positions of Frank Lausche and Mike Mansfield.[124] Johnson was correct in arguing that Mansfield approved of the March reductions in the bombing campaign. But the Montana Senator had also implied that the bombing halt should have been more extensive, and he described Fulbright's April contributions to the Vietnam debate as "worthwhile."[125] The President claimed in his memoirs that Fulbright's persistent opposition to the war during 1968 interfered

with the administration's negotiating efforts at the Paris peace talks, which began on May 13. Johnson lamented that the North Vietnamese could quote the anti-war statements of Charles de Gaulle, Robert Kennedy, and J. William Fulbright in an attempt to "turn the Paris talks into a propaganda sideshow."[126]

Johnson's innuendo concerning the Paris deliberations was obviously an effort to blame the failure of his diplomacy on his domestic critics and Hanoi. Fulbright was deeply interested in the success of the Paris negotiations, as he indicated in a May 7 letter to the President. He vaguely but approvingly referred to "a very cordial and reassuring visit" he had recently enjoyed with his old friend Clark Clifford, one of the primary architects of the de-escalation policy (he did not mention any details of the Clifford conversation.)[127] "I am so pleased," Fulbright informed Johnson, "that Paris was agreed upon, and you certainly have the best wishes of all of us for success. If we could only get a general cease-fire, then the pressure would relax and perhaps a reasonable compromise might be developed."[128]

Unfortunately, the President's inflexible attitude towards the Paris discussions was not conducive to a "reasonable compromise." The interminable quarreling at Paris in 1968 seems to have confirmed Fulbright's April 2 prediction that Johnson's tactical changes would not lead to

constructive negotiations. Walt Rostow and other advisers to the President persuaded him that the enemy forces had exhausted their military strength during the Tet offensive and the United States could therefore afford to be demanding at Paris.[129] The North Vietnamese were equally intransigent.[130] By the end of Johnson's Presidency in January, 1969, the nominal achievements of the Paris negotiations consisted of an agreement on a speaking arrangement which enabled the United States and Saigon to claim a two-sided conference, and a seating arrangement which permitted Hanoi to claim the presence of four delegations, including the National Liberation Front.[131]

Throughout much of 1968, Fulbright was engrossed in his re-election campaign, which attracted significant national attention. Three Democratic politicians opposed the Senator, and all three attacked his foreign policy positions. One of his opponents repeated the hoary charge that Fulbright was "giving aid and comfort" to America's communist enemies.[132] The Senator vigorously maintained his indictment of the Vietnam war during the campaign and defeated his three challengers in the Democratic primary.[133] His right-wing Republican opponent in 1968 also utilized the strategy of condemning Fulbright's ideas concerning American foreign policy. Ronald Reagan, John Tower, the reactionary millionaire H.L. Hunt, and Republican Presidential nominee Richard Nixon opposed Fulbright's

re-election.[134] Senator Edward Kennedy endorsed Fulbright.[135] The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee relentlessly advanced his critique of America's crusading anti-communism to the Arkansas electorate (Fulbright also discussed many domestic issues during the 1968 campaign) and eventually defeated the Republican candidate by 100,000 votes.[136]

There had been a dramatic reversal in Fulbright's political fortunes since 1965. When Fulbright emerged as an adversary of Johnson's foreign policy in late 1965, many political analysts regarded him as a maverick who had wrought his own destruction through his heretical dissent. In February, 1966, President Johnson privately boasted that he would destroy the political careers of Fulbright, Robert Kennedy, and other Senate "doves" within six months.[137] By 1968, the public had repudiated Johnson's Vietnam policies so thoroughly that he no longer dared to travel openly around the country.[138] Kennedy was demonstrating impressive political strength at the time of his assassination in June,[139] and Fulbright won a triumphant re-election after reiterating his opposition to the Vietnam war throughout 1968.

Fulbright was far from optimistic at the end of 1968, despite his electoral victory. There were still a half million American soldiers in Vietnam. During the Presidential campaign, Richard Nixon proclaimed that "Those

who have had a chance for four years and could not produce peace should not be given another chance," but he had carefully avoided any explanation of how he planned to end the war.[140] Early in the Nixon Presidency Fulbright would correctly conclude that Nixon was determined to pursue Johnson's fundamental goal of establishing an independent, non-communist South Vietnam.[141] The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee would oppose Nixon's Vietnam policies at least as adamantly as he had opposed the Johnson escalation policies.

Four years after the Republican Presidential candidate had lambasted the Democrats for failing to bring peace to southeast Asia, the deluge of American bombs upon Indochina continued on an ever more destructive scale. By 1972 Nixon had succeeded only in establishing himself as "the greatest bomber of all time," in the words of the Washington Post.[142] In Fulbright's scathing indictment of recent U.S. foreign policy, The Crippled Giant, the Senator lamented President Nixon's failure to deviate from the fundamental objectives of the Johnson administration despite the palpable weakness of Thieu's regime, the military resilience of the Vietnamese communists, and the burgeoning domestic opposition to America's futile crusade in Vietnam: "Employing the insane anti-logic which has characterized this war from its beginning, the Nixon Administration pointed with pride to its troop withdrawals,

as if the substitution of a devastating, permanent air war for large-scale American participation in the continuing ground war represented the course of prudence and moderation as between the radical 'extremes' of expanding the war and ending it."[143]

Chapter VI

CONCLUSION

Fulbright's opposition to the obsessive anti-communism of recent American diplomacy was not an abject failure, despite the interminable and disastrous intervention in Vietnam. The Arkansas Senator had contributed to the creation of a general American consensus against military expeditions into regions of the globe where vital American interests were not involved; by the late 1970s, public opinion polls revealed that the vast majority of the American people opposed U.S. military involvement in the third world and believed that the Vietnam war was "more than a mistake, it was fundamentally wrong and immoral."[1] Whether a large majority of Americans agreed with Fulbright's dissent against the anti-communist ideology by the 1970s was not clear. However, his constant appeals for the amelioration of American relations with the great communist powers throughout the 1960s foreshadowed and facilitated the detente policies which National Security Adviser Henry Kissinger pursued in the early 1970s.

Fulbright maintained in The Crippled Giant that by the time of the President's journey to China in February, 1972, Nixon's foreign policy was no longer dominated by the rigid anti-communism of the Truman Doctrine. Henry

Kissinger had persuaded Nixon by the early 1970s that China's policies in Indochina were no more than conventional great-power maneuverings in a region the Chinese had always considered to be their "sphere of influence."[2] Fulbright was not optimistic about the prospects for establishing a permanent foundation of international peace and security on the basis of Kissinger's "geopolitical or balance of power approach," for he believed the nineteenth century European "balance of power policies" had culminated in the first world war.[3] Yet Fulbright supported the Kissinger foreign policy, (except in Indochina) which was based upon a scholarly, dispassionate analysis of specific advantages and threats to America's vital national interests. The Foreign Relations Committee chairman described the geopolitical diplomacy of Dr. Kissinger as an "enormous improvement upon the policies of the Cold War crusaders, whose ideological prejudices led them to imagine that all communist states were aggressive and united in their determination to destroy the free world."[4]

During Nixon's visit to China he declared it to be the objective of the United States to withdraw its soldiers from Vietnam (the 1973 cease-fire agreements would provide for the withdrawal of the last 27,000 American troops from South Vietnam), and at some unspecified date in the future to remove its military installations from Taiwan.[5] Both the Chinese and American governments agreed

to seek to achieve "normalization of relations." Nixon did not attempt to explain why it was necessary for thousands of Americans to continue risking their lives in Vietnam to "contain" Chinese imperialism when the President could drink toasts of friendship with the Chinese leaders in Peking.[6] Fulbright continued to denounce the administration's "unreconstructed" policies in Vietnam.[7]

During the Nixon Presidency Fulbright was active in the Congressional movement to terminate funds for the war. His reluctance to sponsor legislation ending appropriations for the war had probably been the only significant flaw in his opposition to the Vietnam war in the later years of the Johnson administration. Fulbright believed that the Senators who would have voted for an amendment cutting off the war funds would have been a small minority, and President Johnson would have claimed such an amendment's resounding defeat as another triumphant Congressional endorsement of his Vietnam policy.[8] The anti-war forces, in Fulbright's view during the Johnson years, would have to change public opinion concerning the war and gather strength in the Senate before introducing amendments to terminate funds for the war.[9] Yet it might also be argued that if Fulbright had voted against the appropriations for the war in the early years of the escalation, he might have established the precedent that no member of Congress should ever feel obligated to support funds for a war he detested. A

dissenting vote by Fulbright might have encouraged other Senators to become more resolute in opposing the Vietnam war. These arguments are conjectural, however, and one could easily sympathize with Fulbright's perspective, since the dissident bloc of Senators constituted a small minority throughout most of the Johnson Presidency.

It is clear that Fulbright was dilatory in publicly challenging the escalation policy in Vietnam during 1964 and 1965. The crucial reasons for his indecisive public responses to Johnson's Vietnam policies in late 1964 and early 1965 were his conviction that Johnson was moderate and reluctant to use force, his fear of the Goldwater Presidential candidacy, his inaccurate view of China as an aggressive power, and his belief until the summer of 1965 that he could influence Johnson through private communications. Fulbright envisaged his emerging adversary role with distaste, for in the years before 1965 he had preferred to exert influence quietly within the policy-making process.[10] The Senator's scholarly approach to foreign policy controversies also tended to delay the presentation of his public positions, for he would deliver important statements on U.S. policies only after extended periods of laborious research. His careful strategy, however, had the salutary effect of convincing many Americans that Fulbright was not an irresponsible radical, but that he was a moderate who had arrived at his adversary role

only after a painful and judicious re-evaluation of American diplomacy.

Fulbright's record after 1965 is much more difficult to criticize (with the possible exception of the controversy over termination of the war appropriations.) The journalist I.F. Stone, an early critic of America's involvement in the southeast Asian conflict who had disparaged Fulbright's views on Vietnam in 1964-1965, argued that Fulbright's opposition to the Vietnam war after 1965 was so courageous and eloquent "that it makes much that went before forgivable."[11] According to Robert Beisner, Fulbright and other dissenters directed an attack on the Vietnam war which was among "the most comprehensive, meticulously detailed, merciless and unremitting ever to be directed at a government of the United States in its conduct of foreign affairs."[12] David Halberstam described the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and its chairman as "the center of opposition" to the war.[13] Perhaps the historian Daniel Yergin delivered the most perceptive assessment of Fulbright's opposition to the Vietnam war: "What is most important to say about Fulbright and Vietnam is that, though he was not the first Senator to oppose the United States involvement in war there, he, more than any other politician except perhaps Eugene McCarthy, made opposition respectable, even possible. His example seemed to say that you could still be a loyal

American and not subscribe to the militant anti-Communist creed."[14]

During the later 1960s, Fulbright used his position as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee to disseminate the knowledge that China was not a relentlessly expansionist power and North Vietnam was not a Chinese satellite. Fulbright further attempted to argue that the Vietnam war was not simply a unique aberration arising from the dynamics of an incredibly complicated situation, but was a manifestation of a historical phenomenon which had afflicted all the great nations of the past.[15] The United States was exhibiting in Vietnam "the arrogance of power," the tendency of nations at the apogee of their power to see their economic and political ascendancy as proof of their national virtue and to confuse their immense responsibilities with an obligation to eradicate evil from the universe.[16] If the United States hoped to avoid allowing "the arrogance of power" to dominate its foreign policy, the people of America must recognize that communism is a method of organizing society, not a nefarious conspiracy to banish freedom from the earth.[17]

It should be acknowledged that many Americans remained hostile to Fulbright's ideas concerning U.S. foreign policy. The Congressional movement to terminate funds for the war did not succeed until late in the Nixon administration.[18] Many of the more zealous anti-communists

remained unrepentant, lamenting that America had failed to unleash sufficient violence against the Vietnamese communists. In the late 1970s the scholar Guenter Lewy, the columnist George Will, and others began an intellectual counter-offensive against the "no more Vietnams" consensus. Will vaguely asserted that a failure to intervene in future foreign crises could lead to the "loss" of the Middle East and the collapse of N.A.T.O.[19] In contrast to Fulbright's "arrogance of power" thesis, McGeorge Bundy contended that Vietnam was totally unique, and therefore no lessons could be learned from America's tragic experience in southeast Asia.[20]

It is likely that from the perspective of the small group of elitists who essentially directed American diplomacy during the 1960s, the American withdrawal from Vietnam did not symbolize the repudiation of the policy of enhancing America's credibility in the role of the global anti-communist gendarme. McGeorge Bundy, one of the principal architects of America's strategy in Vietnam, had written in 1965 that the plan of "sustained reprisal against North Vietnam may fail. . . . What we can say is that even if it fails, the policy will be worth it"; the implication being that even a disastrous war effort would strengthen American credibility by demonstrating that the United States was not only a powerful nation but was utterly determined to exercise its power.[21] America

evacuated Vietnam after the terror bombings of North Vietnam completed the most massive campaign of aerial devastation in the history of warfare.[22] This senseless paroxysm of violence in 1972 could only be explained as one last, defiant affirmation by the United States that even after the expenditure of over $200 billion, after the "roles of America and Russia have been reversed in the world's eyes" in Arnold Toynbee's words, and after decades of war in which as many as 2 million people may have been killed in Indochina, America remained undaunted in its will to use its matchless power, in its resolve to confront what Kissinger had called "the risks of Armageddon."[23] Six years after the Foreign Relations Committee hearings on Vietnam had revitalized the essential process of serious, sustained dialogue between the public and the policy-making elite, the United States was not only still fighting in Vietnam, but the quest for upholding America's "credibility" had attained its frenzied zenith.

Nixon's tactics of escalating the air war, expanding the South Vietnamese ground forces, and withdrawing American troops were clearly effective in delaying the success of the Congressional movement to end the war. Yet when Richard Nixon, the infamous anti-communist of the 1950s, could visit Peking and drink toasts to Mao Tse-tung in February, 1972, then travel to Moscow in May and simultaneously address the Russian and American peoples on

international television, Fulbright was not naive when he approved of the "welcome reversal" in American diplomacy with respect to the great communist powers.[24] The improvement of American relations with the Soviet Union and China rendered the U.S. involvement in Vietnam completely irrational, for the United States had originally intervened in southeast Asia to block the expansionism of an allegedly Soviet-controlled communist monolith across Asia, and America had enlarged its commitment to South Vietnam to halt the presumed aggression of China.[25] Nixon evaded charges of pursuing contradictory foreign policies by increasingly referring to Vietnam as a test of American determination to maintain world order, but Fulbright dismissed this nebulous concept as no more convincing than the earlier rationalizations for the Vietnam war.[26] Nevertheless, Fulbright continued to support the Kissinger-Nixon detente policies until the end of his Senate career in 1975.

President Johnson's diplomacy had not deviated from the postwar anti-communist dogmas, either in Vietnam or in his policies towards the great communist powers. E.W. Kenworthy had obviously been correct when he predicted in 1965 that the Johnson administration would repeatedly reject the Arkansas Senator's advice regarding the southeast Asian conflict. Fulbright's influence upon public opinion constituted the fundamental significance of his opposition to

the Vietnam war. The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee had gradually changed the ideas of many Americans concerning U.S. foreign policy; if the public opinion polls and foreign affairs analysts such as Daniel Yergin and David Halberstam were correct, then by the mid-1970s the vast majority of the American people belatedly endorsed Fulbright's dissent against the war. Whether Fulbright and the other major critics of the war had fostered a permanent re-evaluation of public attitudes towards American foreign policy was uncertain, however, and it was clear that even in the 1970s the Senator's plea for an amelioration of American relations with the Soviet Union frequently encountered hostility.[27]

Yet it is true that many Americans eventually recognized the validity in Fulbright's indictment of anti-communist military expeditions abroad, especially when he appealed for a return to the "traditional America" of John Quincy Adams, Lincoln, and Adlai Stevenson, the America which abhorred the dream of an imperial destiny for the United States.[28] Any claim of a partial and belated victory for the Vietnam war's adversaries must be juxtaposed, of course, with the Johnson and Nixon administration's long succession of political "triumphs" in escalating and prolonging the tragic American military commitment to South Vietnam. Nevertheless, Fulbright and the other antagonists of the rigid anti-communist world view had helped to create

a general consensus against "future Vietnams" by the mid-1970s, so that the opponents of the Vietnam war may have achieved a certain limited (and not necessarily permanent) victory in the political struggle which began in 1965-1966 and continued through the 1970s. Perhaps this limited victory of the dissenters had been assured, in a symbolic sense, from the day at the 1966 Vietnam hearings when George Kennan and J. William Fulbright endorsed the proposition that John Quincy Adams' famous pronouncement of July 4, 1821 had directly addressed the America of the latter twentieth century: "Wherever the standard of freedom and independence has been or shall be unfurled, there will be America's heart, her benedictions, and her prayers. But she goes not abroad in search of monsters to destroy."

Notes

INTRODUCTION

[1]Brock Brower, "The Roots of the Arkansas Questioner," Life, May 13, 1966, p. 107.

[2]Kurt Tweraser, "The Advice and Dissent of Senator Fulbright: A Longitudinal Analysis of His Images of International Politics and His Political Role Conceptions," Diss. American University, 1971, p. 560.

[3]Congressional Record, March 25, 1964, p. 6,232.

[4]Ibid., p. 6,232.

[5]Ibid., p. 6,232.

[6]Haynes Johnson and Bernard M. Gwertzman, Fulbright the Dissenter (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1968), p. 188.

[7]Norman A. Graebner, Cold War Diplomacy: American Foreign Policy, 1945-1975 (New York: D. Van Nostrand, 1977), p. 214.

[8]J. William Fulbright, Old Myths and New Realities (New York: Vintage, 1964), p. 44.

[9]Tweraser, "The Advice and Dissent of Senator Fulbright," p. 567.

[10]Fulbright, Old Myths and New Realities, p. 8.

[11]Ibid., p. 8.

[12]Ibid., p. 9.

[13]Ibid., p. 10.

[14]Ibid., p. 10.

[15]Congressional Record, March 25, 1964, p. 6,230.

[16]Ibid., p. 6,230.

[17]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 187.

Notes: Introduction

[18]Walter Lippmann, "A Senator Speaks Out," Newsweek, April 13, 1964, p. 19.

[19]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 187.

[20]Ibid., p. 187.

[21]J. William Fulbright, The Crippled Giant: American Foreign Policy and Its Domestic Consequences (New York: Vintage, 1972), p. 24.

[22]Ibid., p. 24.

[23]Ibid., p. 24.

[24]Fulbright, Old Myths and New Realities, p. 44.

[25]Congressional Record, March 25, 1964, p. 6,231.

[26]Ibid., p. 6,232.

[27]Ibid., p. 6,232.

[28]Ibid., p. 6,232.

[29]J. William Fulbright, "Old Myths and New Realities," in Ideas and Diplomacy: Readings in the Intellectual Tradition of American Foreign Policy, edited with commentary by Norman A. Graebner (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), p. 868.

[30]U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. Supplemental Foreign Assistance: Fiscal Year 1966--Vietnam. Hearings, 89th Congress, 2d Session, on S. 2793, To Amend Further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, As Amended, January 28, February 4, 8, 10, and 18, 1966. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1966), p. 56.

[31]J. William Fulbright, The Arrogance of Power (New York: Vintage, 1966), p. 52.

[32]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 195.

[33]Tristram Coffin, Senator Fulbright: Portrait of a Public Philosopher (New York: E.P. Dutton, 1966), p. 216.

[34]U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations and Committee on Armed Services. Southeast Asia Resolution. Joint Hearing on a Joint Resolution to Promote

Notes: Introduction

the Maintenance of International Peace and Security in Southeast Asia. 88th Congress, 2d. Session, August 6, 1964. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1966), p. 1.

[35]Coffin, p. 216.

[36]U.S. Congress. Senate. Southeast Asia Resolution, p. 3.

[37]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 227.

[38]U.S. Congress. Senate. Southeast Asia Resolution, p. 5.

[39]Ibid., p. 1.

[40]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 194.

[41]U.S. Congress. Senate. Southeast Asia Resolution, p. 7.

[42]Ibid., p. 18.

[43]Ibid., p. 10.

[44]Ibid., p. 13.

[45]Ibid., p. 16.

[46]Walter LaFeber, America, Russia, and the Cold War, 1945-1971 (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1972), p. 250.

[47]U.S. Congress. Senate. Southeast Asia Resolution, p. 16.

[48]Congressional Record, August 6, 1964, p. 18,402.

[49]Neil Sheehan, et al., The Pentagon Papers (New York: Bantam, 1971), p. 265.

[50]LaFeber, p. 250.

[51]U.S. Congress. Senate. Supplemental Foreign Assistance: Fiscal Year 1966--Vietnam, p. 54.

[52]Fulbright, The Crippled Giant, p. 190.

Notes: Introduction

[53]Doris Kearns, Lyndon Johnson and the American Dream (New York: Signet, 1976), p. 205.

[54]LaFeber, p. 251.

[55]Fulbright, The Crippled Giant, p. 188.

[56]Ibid., p. 189.

[57]Congressional Record, August 6, 1964, p. 18,406.

[58]Fulbright, The Arrogance of Power, p. 52.

[59]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 190.

[60]Ibid., p. 191.

[61]Fulbright, The Crippled Giant, p. 191.

[62]Hugh Gregory Gallagher, Advise and Obstruct: The Role of the United States in Foreign Policy Decisions (New York: Delacorte Press, 1969), p. 317.

[63]Ibid., p. 318.

[64]Fulbright, The Crippled Giant, p. 182.

[65]Ibid., p. 182.

[66]Daniel Yergin, "Fulbright's Last Frustration," The New York Times Magazine, November 24, 1974, p. 78.

[67]Fulbright, The Arrogance of Power, p. 52.

[68]George C. Herring, America's Longest War: The United States and Vietnam, 1950-1975 (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1979), p. 123.

[69]Ibid., p. 123.

[70]Ibid., p. 123.

[71]David Halberstam, The Best and the Brightest (New York: Fawcett Crest, 1972), p. 506.

[72]Fulbright, The Arrogance of Power, p. 51.

[73]Halberstam, The Best and the Brightest, p. 506.

Notes: Introduction

[74]Yergin, p. 78.

[75]Ibid., p. 78.

[76]Johnson and Gwertzman, pp. 193-199.

[77]Ibid., p. 194.

[78]Coffin, p. 218.

[79]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 199.

[80]Herring, pp. 120-121.

[81]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 198.

[82]Personal interview with J. William Fulbright, August 4, 1978.

[83]Walter Lippmann, "In the Gulf of Tonkin," Washington Post, August 6, 1964, Sec. A, p. 21.

[84]Tweraser, "The Advice and Dissent of Senator Fulbright," p. 552.

[85]Halberstam, The Best and the Brightest, pp. 507-509; Kearns, p. 211.

[86]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 205.

[87]Tweraser, "The Advice and Dissent of Senator Fulbright," p. 522.

[88]Ibid., p. 566.

[89]J. William Fulbright, "The Senate and Foreign Affairs," Doherty Lecture, University of Virginia, April 21, 1961, in Fulbright of Arkansas: The Public Relations of a Private Thinker, ed. Karl Meyer (Washington: Robert B. Luce, 1963), p. 266.

[90]Ibid., p. 266.

[91]Halberstam, The Best and the Brightest, p. 522.

[92]Fulbright, The Arrogance of Power, p. 44.

[93]Fulbright, The Crippled Giant, p. 229.

[94]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 190; Halberstam, The Best and the Brightest, p. 489.

Notes: Introduction

[95]Halberstam, The Best and the Brightest, p. 489.

[96]Herring, p. 108.

[97]Halberstam, The Best and the Brightest, p. 489.

[98]Yergin, p. 77.

[99]Ibid., p. 77.

[100]Kearns, p. 205.

[101]Tweraser, "The Advice and Dissent of Senator Fulbright," p. 578.

[102]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 205; Personal interview with J. William Fulbright, August 4, 1978.

[103]Personal interview with J. William Fulbright, May 21, 1981.

[104]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 232.

[105]Fulbright, The Crippled Giant, p. 197.

[106]Herring, p. 122, pp. 143-144.

[107]Fulbright, The Crippled Giant, p. 189.

[108]Halberstam, The Best and the Brightest, p. 512.

[109]Walter Lippmann, "In the Gulf of Tonkin," Washington Post, August 6, 1964, Sec. A, p. 21.

[110]Congressional Record, August 6, 1964, p. 18,403.

[111]Lloyd E. Ambrosius, "The Goldwater-Fulbright Controversy," The Arkansas Historical Quarterly, Volume XXIX, Number 3, Autumn, 1970, p. 268.

[112]Ibid., p. 268.

[113]Ibid., p. 268.

[114]Ibid., p. 267.

[115]Ibid., p. 269.

Notes

CHAPTER II

[1]Tweraser, "The Advice and Dissent of Senator Fulbright," p. 526.

[2]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 191.

[3]Ronald Steel, Walter Lippmann and the American Century (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1980), p. 550; Halberstam, The Powers That Be, p. 696; Personal interview with J. William Fulbright, May 21, 1981.

[4]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 191.

[5]J. William Fulbright, letter to the author, October 1, 1981.

[6]Halberstam, The Powers That Be, p. 687.

[7]Personal interview with J. William Fulbright, August 4, 1978.

[8]Fulbright, The Arrogance of Power, p. 49.

[9]Sheehan et al., p. xiii.

[10]Ibid., p. 363.

[11]Ibid., p. 363.

[12]Ibid., p. 363.

[13]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 192.

[14]Ibid., p. 192.

[15]Congressional Record, January 6, 1965, p. 315.

[16]J. William Fulbright, Letter to President Lyndon Johnson, March 3, 1965, J. William Fulbright Papers, University of Arkansas Library, Fayetteville, Arkansas.

[17]Tweraser, "The Advice and Dissent of Senator Fulbright," p. 582.

[18]Coffin, p. 243.

Notes: Chapter II

[19]Congressional Record, January 6, 1965, p. 315.

[20]Ibid., p. 317.

[21]Ibid., p. 317.

[22]Ibid., p. 318.

[23]Ibid., p. 318.

[24]Ibid., p. 318.

[25]Ibid., p. 318.

[26]Ibid., p. 318

[27]Yergin, p. 78.

[28]Tweraser, "The Advice and Dissent of Senator Fulbright," p. 608.

[29]Yergin, p. 78.

[30]Congressional Record, January 6, 1965, p. 315.

[31]Ibid., p. 315.

[32]Congressional Record, January 12, 1965, p. 538.

[33]Tweraser, "The Advice and Dissent of Senator Fulbright," p. 579.

[34]Congressional Record, January 12, 1965, p. 539.

[35]Ibid., p. 539.

[36]Ibid., p. 539.

[37]Coffin, p. 226.

[38]Congressional Record, January 12, 1965, p. 539.

[39]Ibid., p. 541.

[40]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 201.

[41]Ibid., p. 202.

[42]Ibid., p. 202.

Notes: Chapter II

[43]Tweraser, "The Advice and Dissent of Senator Fulbright," p. 578.

[44]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 202.

[45]"Foreign Relations: The Ultimate Self-Interest," Time, January 22, 1965, pp. 14-18.

[46]Ibid., p. 15.

[47]Tweraser, "The Advice and Dissent of Senator Fulbright," p. 579.

[48]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 201.

[49]Kearns, p. 272.

[50]Halberstam, The Best and the Brightest, p. 628.

[51]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 203.

[52]Personal interview with J. William Fulbright, February 6, 1981.

[53]"Fulbright Urges U.S. Drops Cold War Stress," Washington Post, January 17, 1965, Sec. A, p. 4.

[54]Ibid., p. 4.

[55]Ibid., p. 4.

[56]Ibid., p. 4.

[57]David Halberstam, The Powers That Be (New York: Dell, 1979), p. 696.

[58]Walter Lippmann, "The Johnson Beginning," Washington Post, February 2, 1965, Sec. A, p. 11.

[59]Ibid., p. 11.

[60]Ibid., p. 11.

[61]Ibid., p. 11.

[62]Walter Lippmann, "The Principle of the Great Society," Washington Post, January 12, Sec. A, p. 13.

[63]Kearns, p. 222.

Notes: Chapter II

[64]Halberstam, The Powers That Be, p. 763.

[65]Herring, p. 129.

[66]Ibid., p. 130.

[67]Ibid., p. 130.

[68]Ibid., p. 127.

[69]Ibid., p. 128.

[70]Sheehan et al., p. 363.

[71]Halberstam, The Best and the Brightest, p. 646.

[72]Ibid., p. 632.

[73]Ibid., p. 632.

[74]Personal interview with J. William Fulbright, February 6, 1981.

[75]Halberstam, The Best and the Brightest, p. 632.

[76]Ibid., p. 633.

[77]Tweraser, "The Advice and Dissent of Senator Fulbright," p. 580.

[78]Ibid., p. 580.

[79]Halberstam, The Best and the Brightest, p. 728.

[80]Ibid., p. 729.

[81]Ibid., p. 279.

[82]Yergin, p. 80.

[83]Personal interview with J. William Fulbright, February 6, 1981.

[84]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 233.

[85]Letter received from J. William Fulbright, November 2, 1978.

[86]Personal interview with Carl Marcy, August 4, 1978.

Notes: Chapter II

[87]Carroll Kilpatrick, "Peace Talks Urged by Thant," Washington Post, February 13, 1965, Sec. A, p. 1.

[88]Ibid., p. 1.

[89]Ibid., p. 11.

[90]Ibid., p. 11.

[91]Ibid., p. 1.

[92]Ibid., p. 1.

[93]Drew Pearson, "Side-Door to Viet-Nam," Washington Post, February 21, 1965, Sec. E, p. 7.

[94]John Chamberlain, "Churchillian Voice of Tom Dodd," Washington Post, February 23, 1965, Sec. A, p. 18.

[95]"Fulbright Red Policy Ridiculed by Dirksen," Arkansas Gazette, March 7, 1965, Sec. A, p. 3.

[96]Yergin, p. 78.

[97]J. William Fulbright, Letter to President Lyndon Baines Johnson, March 3, 1965, J. William Fulbright Papers, University of Arkansas Library, Fayetteville, Arkansas.

[98]Ibid.

[99]Ibid.

[100]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 204.

[101]Coffin, p. 242.

[102]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 204.

[103]Tweraser, "The Advice and Dissent of Senator Fulbright," p. 579.

[104]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 204.

[105]Meet the Press, produced by Lawrence E. Spivak, guest: Senator J.W. Fulbright, National Broadcasting Company, March 14, 1965, p. 2.

[106]Ibid., p. 9.

Notes: Chapter II

[107]"Fulbright Red Policy Ridiculed by Dirksen," Arkansas Gazette, March 7, 1965, Sec. A, p. 5.

[108]Meet the Press, March 14, 1965, p. 3.

[109]Ibid., p. 4.

[110]Ibid., p. 6.

[111]Ibid., p. 5.

[112]Ibid., p. 3.

[113]Tweraser, "The Advice and Dissent of Senator Fulbright," p. 579.

[114]Meet the Press, March 14, 1965, p. 1.

[115]Ibid., p. 1.

[116]Ibid., p. 2.

[117]Ibid., p. 3.

[118]Ibid., p. 3.

[119]Halberstam, The Best and the Brightest, p. 507.

[120]Tweraser, "The Advice and Dissent of Senator Fulbright," p. 580.

[121]Herring, p. 132.

[122]Halberstam, The Powers That Be, p. 699.

[123]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 219.

[124]Halberstam, The Powers That Be, p. 697.

Notes

CHAPTER III

[1]Warren Unna, "Aid Bill Task Is Given up by Fulbright," Washington Post, December 24, Sec. A, p. 1.

[2]William S. White, "Schoolboy Antics," Washington Post, February 1, 1965, Sec. A, p. 16.

[3]Walter Lippmann, "Money and Foreign Policy," Washington Post, March 9, 1965, Sec. A, p. 17.

[4]Ibid., p. 17.

[5]Warren Unna, "Aid Bill Task Is Given up by Fulbright," Washington Post, December 24, 1965, Sec. A, p. 10.

[6]Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, "Foreign Aid by Consensus," Washington Post, February 8, 1965, Sec. A, p. 17.

[7]U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. Foreign Assistance, 1965. Hearings, 89th Congress, 1st Sess., on the Foreign Assistance Program, March 9, 10, 12, 15, 17, 19, 22, 23, 24, 25, 29, and April 7, 1965. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1965), p. 168.

[8]Ibid., p. 169.

[9]Ibid., p. 169.

[10]Ibid., p. 169.

[11]Ibid., p. 164.

[12]Ibid., p. 168.

[13]Ibid., p. 169.

[14]Ibid., p. 645.

[15]Ibid., p. 646.

[16]Ibid., p. 647.

[17]Ibid., p. 645.

[18]Ibid., p. 645.

Notes: Chapter III

[19]Ibid., p. 646.

[20]Ibid., p. 646.

[21]Ibid., p. 648.

[22]Herring, p. 135.

[23]U.S. Congress. Senate. Foreign Assistance, 1965, p. 649.

[24]Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., Robert Kennedy and His Times (New York: Ballantine, 1978), p. 799.

[25]U.S. Congress. Senate. Foreign Assistance, 1965, p. 649.

[26]Ibid., p. 649.

[27]Ibid., p. 481.

[38]Sheehan et al., p. 607.

[39]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 240.

[30]Fulbright, The Arrogance of Power, p. 234.

[31]Halberstam, The Powers That Be, p. 706.

[32]U.S. Congress. Senate. Foreign Assistance, 1965, p. 319.

[33]Ibid., p. ii.

[34]Ibid., p. 491.

[35]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 205.

[36]John W. Finney, "U.S. Plans Step-Up in Troops and Aid for Vietnam War," New York Times, April 3, 1965, Sec. 1, p. 1.

[37]"LBJ to Increase Pressure on Hanoi with Troops, Aid," Arkansas Gazette, April 3, 1965, Sec. A, p. 1.

[38]John W. Finney, "U.S. Plans Step-Up in Troops and Aid for Vietnam War," New York Times, April 3, 1965, Sec. 1, p. 3.

[39]Ibid., p. 3.

Notes: Chapter III

[40]"'Most Unhappy,' Fulbright Says," Arkansas Gazette, April 3, 1965, Sec. A, p. 1.

[41]John W. Finney, "U.S. Plans Step-Up in Troops and Aid for Vietnam War," New York Times, April 3, 1965, Sec. 1, p. 3.

[42]Tweraser, "The Advice and Dissent of Senator Fulbright," p. 581.

[43]Coffin, p. 243.

[44]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 205.

[45]Yergin, p. 78.

[46]Ibid., p. 78.

[47]Coffin, p. 243.

[48]Yergin, p. 78.

[49]Fulbright, The Arrogance of Power, p. 150.

[50]Ibid., p. 152.

[51]Tweraser, "The Advice and Dissent of Senator Fulbright," p. 582.

[52]Ibid., p. 582.

[53]Coffin, p. 243.

[54]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 206.

[55]Coffin, p. 244.

[56]Tweraser, "The Advice and Dissent of Senator Fulbright," p. 582.

[57]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 206.

[58]Ibid., p. 206.

[59]E.W. Kenworthy, "Fulbright: Dissenter," New York Times, October 31, 1965, Sec. E, p. 4.

[60]"Stopping Raids Might Pay Off, Fulbright Says," Arkansas Gazette, April 19, 1965, Sec. A, p. 1.

Notes: Chapter III

[61]Personal interview with J. William Fulbright, February 6, 1981.

[62]Graebner, Cold War Diplomacy, p. 135.

[63]Herring, p. 136.

[64]Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, "Quieting the Peace Bloc," Washington Post, April 14, 1965, Sec. A, p. 21.

[65]"Stopping Raids Might Pay Off, Fulbright Says," Arkansas Gazette, April 19, 1965, Sec. A, p. 1.

[66]"Fulbright Urges Halt in Bombings," New York Times, April 19, 1965, Sec. 1, p. 1.

[67]Jack Bell, "Viet Pause Is Urged by Fulbright," Washington Post, April 19, 1965, Sec. A, p. 1.

[68]Ibid., p. 2.

[69]"Stopping Raids Might Pay Off, Fulbright Says," Arkansas Gazette, April 19, 1965, Sec. A, p. 1.

[70]"Fulbright Urges Halt in Bombings," New York Times, April 19, 1965, Sec. 1, p. 3.

[71]"Stopping Raids Might Pay Off, Fulbright Says," Arkansas Gazette, April 19, 1965, Sec. A, p. 1.

[72]Ibid., p. 1.

[73]"Fulbright Urges Halt in Bombings," New York Times, April 19, 1965, Sec. 1, p. 3.

[74]"Stopping Raids Might Pay Off, Fulbright Says," Arkansas Gazette, April 19, 1965, Sec. A, p. 2.

[75]Ibid., p. 1.

[76]Congressional Record, April 28, 1965, p. 8800.

[77]Ibid., p. 8800.

[78]Ibid., p. 8801.

[79]Ibid., p. 8800.

[80]Ibid., p. 8801.

Notes: Chapter III

[81]Ibid., p. 8802.

[82]Ibid., p. 8802.

[83]Ibid., p. 8802.

[84]Ibid., p. 8785.

[85]Ibid., p. 8784.

[86]Ibid., p. 8784.

[87]William S. White, "Congressmen Support President," Washington Post, April 30, 1965, Sec. A, p. 27.

[88]Ibid., p. 27.

[89]Ibid., p. 27.

[90]Fulbright, The Arrogance of Power, p. 86.

[91]Tweraser, "The Advice and Dissent of Senator Fulbright," p. 591.

[92]Fulbright, The Arrogance of Power, pp. 89-90.

[93]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 208.

[94]Ibid., p. 209.

[95]Fulbright, The Arrogance of Power, p. 49.

[96]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 209.

[97]Fulbright, The Arrogance of Power, p. 49.

[98]Lyndon Baines Johnson, The Vantage Point: Perspectives of the Presidency, 1963-1969 (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1971), p. 196.

[99]Ibid., p. 196.

[100]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 209.

[101]Ibid., p. 210.

[102]Ibid., pp. 212-215.

[103]Ibid., p. 210.

Notes: Chapter III

[104]Congressional Record, September 17, 1965, p. 24,222; Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 215.

[105]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 205.

[106]Schlesinger, Robert Kennedy and His Times, p. 786.

[107]Ibid., p. 786.

[108]"Fulbright Urges Vietnam Solution," New York Times, May 6, 1965, Sec. 1, p. 4.

[109]Ibid., p. 4.

[110]Ibid., p. 4.

[111]Tweraser, "The Advice and Dissent of Senator Fulbright," p. 586.

[112]"Fulbright Urges Vietnam Solution," New York Times, May 6, 1965, Sec. 1, p. 4.

[113]Arthur Krock, "In the Nation: The Stone the Builders Refused," New York Times, May 18, 1965, Sec. 1, p. 38.

[114]Ibid., p. 38.

[115]Tom Wicker, "U.S. Raids North Vietnam After 6-Day Lull Brings No Overture From Hanoi," May 19, 1965, Sec. 1, p. 1.

[116]Meet the Press, produced by Lawrence E. Spivak, guest: Senator J.W. Fulbright, National Broadcasting Company, October 24, 1965, p. 7.

[117]Herring, p. 136.

[118]Tweraser, "The Advice and Dissent of Senator Fulbright," p. 586.

[119]Congressional Record, June 7, 1965, p. 12,733.

[120]Ibid., p. 12,733.

[121]Ibid., p. 12,733.

[122]Ibid., p. 12,732.

Notes: Chapter III

[123]Congressional Record, March 4, 1965, p. 4,191.

[124]U.S. Congress. Senate. Foreign Assistance, 1965, p. 168.

[125]Congressional Record, June 7, 1965, p. 12,734.

[126]Ibid., p. 12,737.

[127]I.F. Stone, "Fulbright: From Hawk to Dove," The New York Review of Books, January 12, 1967, p. 8.

[128]Congressional Record, June 7, 1965, p. 12,740.

[129]Ibid., p. 12,738.

[130]Ibid., p. 12,738.

[131]Ibid., p. 12,731.

[132]Ibid., p. 12,739.

[133]Frances Fitzgerald, Fire in the Lake: The Vietnamese and the Americans in Vietnam (New York: Vintage, 1972), p. 168; Coffin, p. 236.

[134]Bernard Fall, Last Reflections on a War (New York: Schocken, 1972), p. 190.

[135]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 214.

[136]Ibid., p. 214.

[137]Congressional Record, June 15, 1965, p. 13,656.

[138]Ibid., p. 13,656.

[139]Ibid., p. 13,656.

[140]Ibid., p. 13,656.

[141]Ibid., p. 13,657.

[142]Ibid., p. 13,657.

[143]E.W. Kenworthy, "Fulbright Urges a Holding Action in Vietnam War," New York Times, June 16, 1965, Sec. 1, p. 1.

Notes: Chapter III

[144]Congressional Record, June 15, 1965, p. 13,656.

[145]Congressional Record, January 12, 1965, p. 539.

[146]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 214.

[147]Yergin, p. 80.

[148]"Foreign Relations: The Ultimate Self-Interest," Time, January 22, 1965, p. 16.

[149]Halberstam, The Powers That Be, p. 692; Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 233.

[150]"Foreign Relations: The Ultimate Self-Interest," Time, January 22, 1965, p. 16.

[151]Walter Lippmann, "Whom We Support," Washington Post, June 17, 1965, Sec. A, p. 21.

[152]Ronald Steel, Walter Lippmann and the American Century (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1980), p. 575.

[153]Walter Lippmann, "Whom We Support," Washington Post, June 17, 1965, Sec. A, p. 21.

[154]Ibid., p. 21.

[155]Congressional Record, June 15, 1965, p. 13,658; Tweraser, "The Advice and Dissent of Senator Fulbright," p. 588.

[156]Congressional Record, June 15, 1965, p. 13,658.

[157]Ibid., p. 13,658.

[158]Ibid., p. 13,658.

[159]Ibid., p. 13,658.

[160]"Fulbright Proposal Attacked by G.O.P.," New York Times, June 19, 1965, Sec. 1, p. 12.

[161]Ibid., p. 12.

[162]E.W. Kenworthy, "G.O.P. House Leader Urges Bombing Hanoi's Missile Sites," New York Times, July 8, 1965, Sec. 1, p. 6.

Notes: Chapter III

[163]Ibid., p. 6.

[164]Neil Sheehan, "Nixon Bids U.S. Press for VictorY," New York Times, September 6, 1965, Sec. 1, p. 2.

[165]Ibid., p. 2.

[166]Ibid., p. 2.

[167]Ibid., p. 2.

[168]Ibid., p. 2.

[169]Coffin, p. 257.

[170]Ibid., p. 257.

[171]William S. White, "Power Counts: Viet Nam Peacemakers Irrelevant," Washington Post, June 23, 1965, Sec. A, p. 27.

[172]Ibid., p. 27.

[173]Howard Margolis, "Fulbright Would Ease Viet Stand," Washington Post, June 16, 1965, Sec. A, p. 1, p. 20; E.W. Kenworthy, "Fulbright Urges a Holding Action in Vietnam War," New York Times, June 16, 1965, Sec. 1, p. 1, p. 4.

[174]E.W. Kenworthy, "Fulbright Urges a Holding Action in Vietnam War," New York Times, June 16, 1965, Sec. 1, p. 4.

[175]Howard Margolis, "Fulbright Would Ease Viet Stand," Washington Post, June 28, 1965, Sec. A, p. 15.

[176]Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, "LBJ and the Peace Bloc," Washington Post, June 28, 1965, Sec. A, p. 15.

[177]Halberstam, The Best and the Brightest, p. 729; Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, "LBJ and the Peace Bloc," Washington Post, June 28, 1965, Sec. A, p. 15.

[178]Congressional Record, June 17, 1965, p. 14,016.

[179]Ibid., p. 14,016.

[180]"A Limited Objective in Vietnam," Editorial, New York Times, June 17, 1965, Sec. 1, p. 32.

[181]Ibid., p. 32.

Notes: Chapter III

[182]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 207.

[183]Congressional Record, July 1, 1965, p. 15,460.

[184]Ibid., p. 15,460.

[185]Ibid., p. 15,460.

[186]Ibid., p. 15,460.

[187]Personal interview with J. William Fulbright, August 4, 1978; Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 214.

[188]Congressional Record, July 1, 1965, p. 15,460.

[189]Ibid., p. 15,460.

[190]Meet the Press, October 24, 1965, p. 2; Halberstam, The Powers That Be, p. 699.

Notes

CHAPTER IV

[1]Personal interview with J. William Fulbright, February 6, 1981.

[2]Murrey Marder, "Fulbright Scores Pressure Groups," Washington Post, July 26, 1965, Sec. A, p. 1.

[3]Fulbright, The Arrogance of Power, p. 124.

[4]Murrey Marder, "Fulbright Scores Pressure Groups," Washington Post, July 26, 1965, Sec. A, p. 1.

[5]Congressional Record, August 10, 1965, p. 19,754.

[6]Joseph Kraft, "The United States and Europe," Washington Post, September 1, 1965, Sec. A, p. 25; Congressional Record, July 26, 1965, p. 18,233.

[7]Congressional Record, August 10, 1965, p. 19,755.

[8]Fulbright, The Arrogance of Power, p. 125.

[9]J. William Fulbright, Letter to President Lyndon Baines Johnson, October 12, 1965, J. William Fulbright Papers, University of Arkansas Library, Fayetteville, Arkasas.

[10]Congressional Record, July 26, 1965, p. 18,233.

[11]Ibid., p. 18,233.

[12]Fulbright, The Arrogance of Power, p. 63.

[13]Ibid., p. 63; Halberstam, The Best and the Brightest, p. 729.

[14]Ibid., p. 729.

[15]Walter Johnson, ed., The Papers of Adlai E. Stevenson, Volume VIII: Ambassador to the United Nations, 1961-1965 (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1979), p. 833.

Notes: Chapter IV

[16]John Bartlow Martin, Adlai Stevenson and the World: The Life of Adlai E. Stevenson (Garden City, New York: Anchor, 1978), p. 798.

[17]Walter Johnson, ed., p. 723.

[18]Ibid., p. 724.

[19]Ibid., p. 747.

[20]Ibid., p. 747.

[21]Ibid., p. 748.

[22]Ibid., p. 813.

[23]Halberstam, The Best and the Brightest, p. 128.

[24]Walter Johnson, ed., p. 830.

[25]Martin, p. 861.

[26]Walter Johnson, ed., p. 765.

[27]Martin, p. 844.

[28]Walter Johnson, ed., p. 836.

[39]Martin, p. 848.

[30]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 216.

[31]Ibid., p. 216.

[32]Lyndon Baines Johnson, p. 150.

[33]Halberstam, The Best and the Brightest, p. 729.

[34]Ibid., p. 729.

[35]Herring, p. 142.

[36]Lyndon Baines Johnson, p. 150.

[37]Halberstam, The Best and the Brightest, p. 729.

[38]Ibid., p. 729.

[39]Herring, p. 142; Graebner, Cold War Diplomacy, p. 133; Lyndon Baines Johnson, p. 153; Halberstam, The Best and the Brightest, p. 729.

Notes: Chapter IV

[40]Herring, p. 140.

[41]Graebner, Cold War Diplomacy, p. 133.

[42]Tweraser, "The Advice and Dissent of Senator Fulbright," p. 593.

[43]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 210.

[44]Tweraser, "The Advice and Dissent of Senator Fulbright," p. 593.

[45]Ibid., p. 594.

[46]Ibid., p. 495.

[47]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 211.

[48]Ibid., p. 212.

[49]Ibid., p. 216.

[50]Ibid., p. 266.

[51]Ibid., p. 215.

[52]Ibid., p. 215.

[53]Tweraser, "The Advice and Dissent of Senator Fulbright," p. 593; Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 215.

[54]Johnson and Gwertzman, pp. 213-215.

[55]Ibid., p. 216.

[56]Ibid., p. 216.

[57]Ibid., pp. 214-216.

[58]Ibid., pp. 215-216.

[59]Tweraser, "The Advice and Dissent of Senator Fulbright," p. 595.

[60]Ibid., p. 595.

[61]Ibid., p. 595.

[62]Congressional Record, August 25, 1965, p. 21,663.

Notes: Chapter IV

[63]Coffin, p. 203.

[64]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 217.

[65]Coffin, p. 206.

[66]Personal interview with J. William Fulbright, February 6, 1981.

[67]Personal interview with Carl Marcy, February 6, 1981.

[68]Congressional Record, September 15, 1965, p. 23,859.

[69]Ibid., p. 23,856.

[70]Ibid., p. 23,859.

[71]Ibid., p. 23,857.

[72]Ibid., p. 23,857.

[73]Ibid., p. 23,858.

[74]Ibid., p. 23,858.

[75]Ibid., p. 23,858.

[76]Ibid., p. 23,858.

[77]Ibid., p. 23,859.

[78]Ibid., p. 23,855.

[79]Ibid., p. 23,861.

[80]Ibid., p. 23,860.

[81]Ibid., p. 23,858.

[82]Ibid., p. 23,858.

[83]Ibid., p. 23,859.

[84]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 218.

[85]Yergin, p. 78.

[86]Congressional Record, September 15, 1965, p. 23,859.

Notes: Chapter IV

[87]Fulbright, The Arrogance of Power, p. 63.

[88]Ibid., p. 84.

[89]Ibid., p. 84.

[90]Congressional Record, September 15, 1965, p. 23,856; Fulbright, The Arrogance of Power, p. 92.

[91]Congressional Record, October 22, 1965, p. 28,402.

[92]Ibid., p. 28,402.

[93]Ibid., p. 28,404.

[94]Ibid., p. 28.402.

[95]Congressional Record, September 15, 1965, p. 23,862.

[96]Ibid., p. 23,863.

[97]Congressional Record, October 22, 1965, p. 28,402.

[98]William S. White, "Fulbright's Folly: An Irresponsible Speech," Washington Post, September 17, 1965, Sec. A, p. 22.

[99]Congressional Record, October 6, 1965, p. 26,107.

[100]Congressional Record, October 22, 1965, p. 28,389.

[101]Ibid., p. 28,389.

[102]Congressional Record, September 17, 1965, p. 24,223.

[103]I.F. Stone, "Fulbright: The Timid Opposition," The New York Review of Books, January 26, 1967, p. 10; Congressional Record, September 17, 1965, p. 24,223.

[104]I.F. Stone, "Fulbright: The Timid Question," The New York Review of Books, January 26, 1967, p. 10.

[105]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 218.

Notes: Chapter IV

[106]Congressional Record, September 17, 1965, p. 24,224; Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 218; Lyndon Baines Johnson, p. 494; I.F. Stone, "Fulbright: The Timid Opposition," The New York Review of Books, January 26, 1967, p. 10.

[107]Congressional Record, October 22, 1965, p. 28,386.

[108]Ibid., p. 28,387.

[109]Ibid., p. 28,387.

[110]Ibid., p. 28,387.

[111]Ibid., p. 28,387.

[112]Ibid., p. 28,387.

[113]Ibid., p. 28,387.

[114]Walter Lippmann, "Soviet-American Relations," Washington Post, September 28, 1965, Sec. A, p. 15.

[115]Ibid., p. 15.

[116]Ibid., p. 15.

[117]Yergin, p. 78.

[118]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 218.

[119]Yergin, p. 78.

[120]Ibid., p. 78.

[121]J. William Fulbright, Letter to President Lyndon Baines Johnson, October 12, 1965, J. William Fulbright Papers, University of Arkansas Library, Fayetteville, Arkansas.

[122]Ibid., p. 1.

[123]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 220.

[124]Yergin, p. 78; Personal interview with J. William Fulbright, August 4, 1978.

[125]Meet the Press, October 24, 1965, p. 7.

Notes: Chapter IV

[126]Ibid., p. 3.

[127]"Johnson's Stand on Vietnam Raids is Affirmed Again," New York Times, October 26, 1965, Sec. 1, p. 1.

[128]Ibid., p. 1.

[129]E.W. Kenworthy, "Fulbright: Dissenter," New York Times, October 31, 1965, Sec. 3, p. 4.

[130]Ibid., p. 4.

[131]Ibid., p. 4.

[132]Ibid., p. 4.

[133]Congressional Record, October 22, 1965, p. 28,405.

[134]Graebner, Ideas and Diplomacy, p. 864; Tweraser, "The Advice and Dissent of Senator Fulbright," p. 512.

[135]Schlesinger, Robert Kennedy and His Times, p. 781; Tweraser, "The Advice and Dissent of Senator Fulbright," p. 538.

[136]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 187.

[137]Ibid., p. 188.

[138]Ibid., p. 187.

[139]Walter Lippmann, Preface to Fulbright of Arkansas: The Public Positions of a Private Thinker, ed. Karl Meyer, p. ix.

[140]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 189.

[141]Walter Lippmann, "Money and Foreign Policy," Washington Post, March 9, 1965, Sec. A, p. 17.

[142]Steel, p. 550.

[143]Steel, p. 557; Yergin, p. 78.

[144]Steel, p. 566.

[145]Ibid., p. 567.

Notes: Chapter IV

[146]Walter Lippmann, "Soviet-American Relations," Washington Post, September 28, 1965, Sec. A, p. 15.

[147]Yergin, p. 78.

[148]Ibid., p. 78.

[149]Ibid., p. 80.

[150]Ibid., p. 82.

[151]Ibid., p. 82.

[152]Fulbright, The Crippled Giant, p. 194.

[153]Yergin, p. 82.

[154]Graebner, Cold War Diplomacy, p. 163.

[155]Fulbright, The Crippled Giant, p. 197.

[156]Ibid., p. 194.

[157]Yergin, p. 82.

Notes

CHAPTER V

[1]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 224.

[2]Halberstam, The Powers That Be, p. 700.

[3]Coffin, p. 271.

[4]J. William Fulbright, Letter to Jack L. Bodie, January 13, 1966, J. William Fulbright Papers, University of Arkansas Library, Fayetteville, Arkansas.

[5]Ibid., p. 1.

[6]William A. Williams, The Tragedy of American Diplomacy (New York: Delta, 1972), p. 12.

[7]Tweraser, "The Advice and Dissent of Senator Fulbright," p. 572.

[8]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 233; Fulbright, The Arrogance of Power, p. 147.

[9]Fulbright, The Arrogance of Power, pp. 140-150.

[10]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 233.

[11]U.S. Congress. Senate. Supplemental Foreign Assistance: Fiscal Year 1966--Vietnam, p. 1.

[12]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 232.

[13]Ibid., p. 233.

[14]U.S. Congress. Senate. Supplemental Foreign Assistance: Fiscal Year 1966--Vietnam, p. 2.

[15]Ibid., p. 53.

[16]Ibid., p. 53.

[17]Ibid., p. 54.

[18]Halberstam, The Powers That Be, p. 706.

[19]Fulbright, The Arrogance of Power, p. 116.

Notes: Chapter V

[20]U.S. Congress. Senate. Supplemental Foreign Assistance: Fiscal Year 1966--Vietnam, p. 26.

[21]Ibid., p. 48.

[22]Williams, p. 300.

[23]U.S. Congress. Senate. Supplemental Foreign Assistance: Fiscal Year 1966--Vietnam, p. 49.

[24]Ibid., p. 668.

[25]Ibid., p. 545.

[26]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 235.

[27]U.S. Congress. Senate. Supplemental Foreign Assistance: Fiscal Year 1966--Vietnam, p. 400.

[28]Ibid., p. 401.

[29]Fulbright, The Arrogance of Power, p. 53.

[30]Coffin, p. 276.

[31]U.S. Congress. Senate. Supplemental Foreign Assistance: Fiscal Year 1966--Vietnam, p. 391.

[32]Ibid., p. 577.

[33]Ibid., p. 2.

[34]U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. Foreign Assistance Act of 1968, Part 1--Vietnam. Hearings, 90th Congress, 2d. Session, on S. 3091, A Bill to Amend Further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as Amended, and for Other Purposes, March 11, 12, 1968. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1968), p. 97.

[35]U.S. Congress. Senate. Supplemental Foreign Assistance: Fiscal Year 1966--Vietnam, p. 73.

[36]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 236.

[37]Thomas A. Bailey, A Diplomatic History of the American People (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1974), p. 919.

[38]U.S. Congress. Senate. Supplemental Foreign Assistance: Fiscal Year 1966--Vietnam, p. 337.

Notes: Chapter V

[39]Ibid., p. 367.

[40]Ibid., p. 393.

[41]Ibid., p. 535.

[42]Ibid., p. 392.

[43]Ibid., p. 367.

[44]Ibid., p. 676.

[45]Ibid., p. 367.

[46]Ibid., p. 235.

[47]Coffin, p. 283.

[48]U.S. Congress. Senate. Supplemental Foreign Assistance: Fiscal Year 1966--Vietnam, p. 244.

[49]Ibid., p. 230.

[50]Ibid., p. 299.

[51]Ibid., p. 233.

[52]Ibid., p. 240.

[53]Ibid., p. 617.

[54]Ibid., p. 596.

[55]Ibid., p. 82.

[56]Fulbright, The Arrogance of Power, p. 151.

[57]Ibid., p. 152.

[58]U.S. Congress. Senate. Supplemental Foreign Assistance: Fiscal Year 1966--Vietnam, p. 367.

[59]Fulbright, The Arrogance of Power, p. 155.

[60]Ibid., p. 108.

[61]Ibid., p. 118.

[62]U.S. Congress. Senate. Supplemental Foreign Assistance: Fiscal Year 1966--Vietnam, p. 663.

Notes: Chapter V

[63]Ibid., p. 662.

[64]Halberstam, The Powers That Be, p. 706.

[65]I.F. Stone, "Fulbright: The Timid Opposition," The New York Review of Books, January 26, 1967, p. 13.

[66]Halberstam, The Powers That Be, p. 704.

[67]Ibid., p. 706.

[68]Ibid., p. 706.

[69]Fulbright, The Arrogance of Power, p. 189.

[70]Ibid., p. 192.

[71]Ibid., p. 193.

[72]Ibid., pp. 188-197.

[73]Ibid., p. 200.

[74]Ibid., p. 22.

[75]Tweraser, "The Advice and Dissent of Senator Fulbright," p. 575; Fulbright, The Arrogance of Power, p. 9.

[76]J. William Fulbright, Letter to President Lyndon Baines Johnson, May 9, 1966, J. William Fulbright Papers, University of Arkansas Library, Fayetteville, Arkansas.

[77]J. William Fulbright, Letter to President Lyndon Baines Johnson, March 19, 1966, J. William Fulbright Papers, University of Arkansas Library, Fayetteville, Arkansas.

[78]Ibid.

[79]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 242.

[80]Fulbright, The Crippled Giant, p. 186.

[81]Personal interview with George McGovern, August 6, 1978.

[82]Sheehan et al., p. 235.

[83]Fulbright, The Crippled Giant, p. 186.

Notes: Chapter V

[84]Ibid., p. 182.

[85]Ibid., p. 188.

[86]U.S. Congress. Senate. Supplemental Foreign Assistance: Fiscal Year 1966--Vietnam, p. 58.

[87]Sheehan et al., p. 268.

[88]J. William Fulbright and John Stennis, The Role of Congress in Foreign Policy (Washington: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1971), transcript of Fulbright-Stennis debate, Rational Debate Seminars Series, July, 1971, p. 55.

[89]Ibid., p. 54.

[90]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 308.

[91]Ibid., p. 308.

[92]Ibid., p. 304.

[93]Ibid., p. 309.

[94]Ibid., p. 304.

[95]The analysis of the Vietnam war on pages 179 to 183 relies upon statistics found in George Herring's chapter on the war in 1967, "On the Tiger's Back: The United States at War, 1965-1967," in America's Longest War, pages 145 to 183.

[96]Herring, pp. 145-183.

[97]Ibid., pp. 145-183.

[98]Fulbright, The Arrogance of Power, pp. 15-19.

[99]Herring, p. 163.

[100]Ibid., pp. 145-183.

[101]J. William Fulbright, Letter to President Lyndon Baines Jones, February 7, 1968, J. William Fulbright Papers, University of Arkansas Library, Fayetteville, Arkansas.

[102]Herring, p. 183.

Notes: Chapter V

[103]J. William Fulbright, Letter to President Lyndon Baines Johnson, February 7, 1968, J. William Fulbright Papers, University of Arkansas Library, Fayetteville, Arkansas.

[104]Sheehan et al., p. 607.

[105]U.S. Congress. Senate. Foreign Assistance Act of 1968, Part 1, Vietnam, p. 9.

[106]Ibid., p. 13.

[107]Ibid., p. 13.

[108]Herring, p. 198.

[109]Ibid., p. 199.

[110]Ibid., p. 199.

[111]Halberstam, The Best and the Brightest, p. 790.

[112]Schlesinger, Robert Kennedy and His Times, p. 920.

[113]Sheehan et al., p. 610.

[114]LaFeber, p. 272.

[115]Sheehan et al., p. 612.

[116]Ibid., p. 611.

[117]Ibid., p. 612.

[118]Herring, p. 205.

[119]Congressional Record, April 2, 1968, p. 8,569.

[120]Ibid., p. 8,670.

[121]Ibid., p. 8,571.

[122]Ibid., p. 8,569.

[123]Ibid., p. 8,576.

[124]Lyndon Baines Johnson, pp. 493-495.

[125]Congressional Record, April 2, 1968, p. 8,577.

Notes: Chapter V

[126]Lyndon Baines Johnson, p. 508.

[127]J. William Fulbright, Letter to President Lyndon Baines Johnson, May 7, 1968, J. William Fulbright Papers, University of Arkansas Library, Fayetteville, Arkansas.

[128]Ibid.

[129]Herring, p. 205; Graebner, Cold War Diplomacy, p. 139; Halberstam, The Best and the Brightest, p. 787.

[130]Graebner, Cold War Diplomacy, p. 139.

[131]Ibid., p. 141.

[132]Gary Herlick, "J.W. Fulbright, Senator from Arkansas," in Ralph Nader Congress Project: Citizen Look at Congress (Washington: Grossman, 1972), p. 9.

[133]Ibid., p. 9.

[134]Ibid., p. 9.

[135]Ibid., p. 10.

[136]Ibid., p. 10.

[137]Schlesinger, Robert Kennedy and His Times, p. 827.

[138]Graebner, Cold War Diplomacy, p. 139.

[139]Schlesinger, Robert Kennedy and His Times, p. 981.

[140]Jonathan Schell, The Time of Illusion (New York: Vintage, 1975), p. 18.

[141]J. William Fulbright, Letter to General W. Peyton Campbell and Reverend Mouzon Mann, September 8, 1969, J. William Fulbright Papers, University of Arkansas Library, Fayetteville, Arkansas; J. William Fulbright, Letter to Ted Crabtree, June 10, 1969, J. William Fulbright Papers, University of Arkansas Library, Fayetteville, Arkansas; Herring, p. 217.

[142]Fulbright, The Crippled Giant, p. 74.

[143]Ibid., p. 74.

Notes

CONCLUSION

[1]Herring, p. 267.

[2]U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. China and the United States: Today and Yesterday. Hearings, 92d. Congress, 2d. Session, on China Today and the Course of Sino-U.S. Relations, February 7 and 8, 1972. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1972), p. 91.

[3]Ibid., p. 7.

[4]Fulbright, The Arrogance of Power, p. 139.

[5]Bailey, p. 943.

[6]Schell, p. 206.

[7]Fulbright, The Crippled Giant, p. 96.

[8]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 222.

[9]Yergin, p. 82.

[10]Johnson and Gwertzman, p. 221.

[11]I.F. Stone, "Fulbright: From Hawk to Dove," The New York Review of Books, January 12, 1967, p. 10.

[12]Herring, p. 171.

[13]Halberstam, The Best and the Brightest, p. 511.

[14]Yergin, p. 82.

[15]Fulbright, The Arrogance of Power, p. 22.

[16]Ibid., p. 21.

[17]Ibid., p. 81.

[18]Herring, p. 256.

[19]Ibid., p. 269.

[20]Ibid., p. 269.

Notes: Conclusion

[21]Schell, p. 365.

[22]Ibid., p. 250.

[23]Sheehan et al., p. ix.

[24]Schell, p. 259.

[25]Herring, p. 270.

[26]Ibid., p. 270.

[27]Personal interview with J. William Fulbright, February 6, 1981.

[28]Fulbright, The Arrogance of Power, p. 245; Johnson and Gwertzman, pp. 239-241.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Primary Sources

Correspondence, Articles, Speeches, and Books by J. William Fulbright

James William Fulbright Papers, Special Collections, University of Arkansas Library, Fayetteville, Arkansas.

Fulbright, James William. Prospects for the West. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1963.

_____. Fulbright of Arkansas: The Public Positions of a Private Thinker, ed. Karl E. Meyer, with a Foreword by Walter Lippmann. [A collection of Fulbright's speeches and memoranda]. Washington: Robert B. Luce, Inc., 1963.

_____. Old Myths and New Realities. New York: Random House-Vintage Books, 1964.

_____. The Arrogance of Power. New York: Random House-Vintage Books, 1967.

_____. The Crippled Giant: American Foreign Policy and Its Domestic Consequences. New York: Random House-Vintage Books, 1972.

_____. The Pentagon Propaganda Machine. New York: Random House-Vintage Books, 1971.

_____. Letter to the author, November 2, 1978.

_____. Letter to the author, January 29, 1979.

_____. Letter to the author, October 1, 1981.

_____, and John Stennis. The Role of Congress in Foreign Policy. [Transcript of the Fulbright-Stennis debate, Rational Debate Seminars]. Washington: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1971.

Government Publications

a. Congressional Record, 1945-1975

b. Congressional Hearings

U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. Military Situation in the Far East. May 3-August 17, 1951. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1951.

_____. Subcommittee. Nomination of Philip C. Jessup to Be United States Representative to the Sixth General Assembly of the United Nations. September 27-October 18, 1951. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1951.

_____. Mutual Security Act of 1952. March 13-April 4, 1952. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1952.

_____. Mutual Security Act of 1953. May, 1953. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1953.

_____. Mutual Security Act of 1954. June, 1954. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1954.

_____. The Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty. November, 1954. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1954.

_____. Foreign Assistance, 1965. March and April, 1965. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1965.

_____. Supplemental Foreign Assistance, Fiscal Year 1966--Vietnam. January and February, 1966. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1966.

_____. U.S. Policy With Respect to Mainland China. March, 1966. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1966.

_____. Foreign Assistance, 1966. April and May, 1966. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1966.

_____. Foreign Assistance Act of 1968. March, 1968. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1968.

_____. The Impact of the War in Southeast Asia on the United States Economy. April-August, 1970. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1970.

_____. The Moral and Military Aspects of the War in Southeast Asia. May, 1970. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1970.

_____. China and the United States: Today and Yesterday. February, 1972. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1972.

_____. The Causes, Origins, and Lessons of the Vietnam War. May, 1972. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1972.

_____. Committee on Armed Services and Committee on Foreign Relations, Joint Hearing. The Southeast Asia Resolution. August, 1964. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1966.

c. Presidential Papers

Truman, Harry S. Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: Harry S. Truman, April 12, 1945 to January 20, 1953. Volumes I-VIII. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1961-1966.

Eisenhower, Dwight D. Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: Dwight D. Eisenhower, January 20, 1953 to December 31, 1955. Volumes I-III. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1960.

Kennedy, John F. Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: John F. Kennedy, 1963. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1964.

Johnson, Lyndon B. Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: Lyndon B. Johnson, 1963-1966. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1965-1967.

d. State Department Publications

Foreign Relations of the United Nations, 1945, Volume 1, General: The United Nations. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1967.

Foreign Relations of the United States, 1948, Volume II, Germany and Austria. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1973.

Foreign Relations of the United States, 1948, Volume III, The Far East: China. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1973.

Foreign Relations of the United States, 1950, Volume VI, East Asia and the Pacific. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1976.

Foreign Relations of the United States, 1950, Volume VII, Korea. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1976.

Foreign Relations of the United States, 1952-1954. United Nations Affairs. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1979.

Foreign Relations of the United States, 1952-1954, Volume XVI, The Geneva Conference. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1981.

Newspapers

Arkansas Gazette.

New York Times.

St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Washington Post.

Magazines

Newsweek.

Time

U.S. News and World Report.

Interviews

Senator J. William Fulbright	August 4, 1978. June 27, 1979. February 6, 1981. May 21, 1981. October 16, 1981.
Senator George McGovern	August 6, 1978.
Senator Claude Pepper	May 19, 1981.
Senator John Sparkman	July 28, 1978.

Carl Marcy (former chief of Staff of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee) — February 6, 1981.

Norville Jones (former member of Senator Fulbright's staff) — July 14, 1978.

Bob Snider (former member of Senator John McClellan's staff) — July 11, 1978.

II. Secondary Sources

Acheson, Dean. Present at the Creation: My Years in the State Department. New York: Norton, 1969.

Alexander, Charles C. Holding the Line: The Eisenhower Era, 1952-1961. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1975.

Ambrose, Stephen E. Rise to Globalism: American Foreign Policy, 1938-1976. New York: Penguin Books, 1976.

Ambrosius, Lloyd E. "The Goldwater-Fulbright Controversy," The Arkansas Historical Quarterly, Autumn, 1970.

Ashmore, Harry S. An Epitaph for Dixie. New York: Norton, 1958.

_____. Arkansas: A History. New York: Norton, 1978.

_____ and William C. Baggs. Mission to Hanoi: A Chronicle of Double-Dealing in High Places. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1968.

Bailey, Thomas A. A Diplomatic History of the American People. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1974.

Barnet, Richard J. Roots of War. New York: Penguin Books, 1972.

Bernstein, Barton, ed. Towards a New Past: Dissenting Essays in American History. New York: Random House-Vintage Books, 1968.

Blum, John Morton. V Was for Victory. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1970.

Brauer, Carl M. John F. Kennedy and the Second Reconstruction. New York: Columbia University Press, 1977.

Brower, Brock. "The Roots of the Arkansas Questioner," Life, May 13, 1966.

Burns, James MacGregor. Roosevelt: The Soldier of Freedom. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1970.

Coffin, Tristram. Senator Fulbright: Portrait of a Public Philosopher. New York: E.P. Dutton, 1966.

Donovan, Robert J. Conflict and Crisis: The Presidency of Harry S. Truman, 1945-1948. New York: Norton, 1977.

_____. Tumultuous Years: The Presidency of Harry S. Truman, 1949-1953. New York: Norton, 1982.

Donovan, Timothy, and Willard Gatewood, eds. The Governors of Arkansas: Essays in Political Biography. Fayetteville, Arkansas: University of Arkansas Press, 1981.

Eisenhower, Dwight D. Mandate for Change, 1953-1956. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1963.

_____. Waging Peace, 1956-1961. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1965.

Fairbank, John King. The United States and China. Fourth Edition. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Fall, Bernard B. Last Reflections on a War. New York: Schocken Books, 1967.

Fitzgerald, Frances. Fire in the Lake: The Vietnamese and the Americans in Vietnam. New York: Random House-Vintage Books, 1972.

Fried, Richard M. Men Against McCarthy. New York: Columbia University Press, 1976.

Feis, Herbert. The Atomic Bomb and the End of World War II. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1966.

Gaddis, John Lewis. The United States and the Origins of the Cold War, 1941-1947. New York: Columbia University Press, 1972.

Galbraith, John Kenneth. Annals of an Abiding Liberal. New York: The New American Library, 1979.

_____. A Life in Our Times. New York: Ballantine, 1981.

Gallagher, Hugh Gregory. Advise and Obstruct: The Role of the United States Senate in Foreign Policy Decisions. New York: 1969.

Gilbert, Felix. The End of the European Era, 1890 to the Present. New York: Norton, 1970.

Graebner, Norman A. The New Isolationism: A Study in Politics and Foreign Policy Since 1950. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1956.

_____. Ideas and Diplomacy: Readings in the Intellectual Tradition of American Foreign Policy. (Edited with commentary by Norman Graebner). New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.

_____. "The Extension of the Cold War to Asia," in The Origins of the Cold War, ed. Thomas G. Paterson. Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath, 1974.

_____, ed. The Cold War: A Conflict of Ideology and Power. Second edition. Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath, 1976.

_____. Cold War Diplomacy: American Foreign Policy, 1945-1975. Second edition. New York: D. Van Nostrand, 1977.

_____. The Age of Global Power: The United States Since 1939. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1979.

Griffith, Robert. The Politics of Fear: Joseph R. McCarthy and the Senate. Lexington, Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky, 1970.

_____, and Athan Theoharis, eds. The Specter: Original Essays on the Cold War and the Origins of McCarthyism. New York: Franklin Watts, 1974.

Halberstam, David. The Best and the Brightest. Greenwich, Connecticut: Fawcett, Crest, 1972.

_____. The Powers That Be. New York: Dell, 1979.

Hamby, Alonzo L. Beyond the New Deal: Harry S. Truman and American Liberalism. New York: Columbia University Press, 1973.

Herlick, Gary. "J.W. Fulbright: Democratic Senator from Arkansas," in Ralph Nader Congress Project: Citizens Look at Congress, ed. Ralph Nader. Washington: Grossman, 1972.

Hays, Brooks. A Southern Moderate Speaks. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1959.

_____. Politics Is My Parish. Foreward by Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1981.

Herring, George C. America's Longest War: The United States and Vietnam, 1950-1975. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1979.

Horowitz, David. The Free World Colossus: A Critique of American Foreign Policy in the Cold War. New York: Hill and Wang, 1965.

Howe, Russell Warren, and Sarah Trott. "J. William Fulbright: Reflections on a Troubled World," Saturday Review, January 11, 1975.

Hull, Cordell. The Memoirs of Cordell Hull: Volume II. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1948.

Hyman, Sidney. "Fulbright--The Wedding of Arkansas and the World," The New Republic, May 14, 1962.

Johnson, Haynes, and Bernard M. Gwertzman. Fulbright the Dissenter. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1968.

Johnson, Lyndon B. The Vantage Point: Perspectives on the Presidency, 1963-1969. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston, 1971.

Johnson, Walter, ed. The Papers of Adlai E. Stevenson, Volume VIII: Ambassador to the United Nations, 1961-1965. Boston: 1969.

Johnson, Walter, and Francis J. Colligan. The Fulbright Program: A History. Forward by J. William Fulbright. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1965.

Kearns, Doris. Lyndon Johnson and the American Dream. New York: Signet, 1976.

Kennan, George F. American Diplomacy, 1900-1950. New York: Mentor, 1951.

_____. Russia and the West Under Lenin and Stalin. New York: Mentor, 1961.

_____. "A Fresh Look at Our China Policy," The New York Times Magazine, November 22, 1964.

Kissinger, Henry A. White House Years. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1979.

_____. Years of Upheaval. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1982.

Kolko, Gabriel. The Roots of American Foreign Policy: An Analysis of Power and Purpose. Boston: Beacon Press, 1969.

LaFeber, Walter. America, Russia, and the Cold War, 1945-1971. Second edition. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1972.

Lippmann, Walter. The Public Philosophy. New York: Mentor 1955.

McCallum, R.B. Public Opinion and the Last Peace. London: Oxford University Press, 1944.

Martin, John Bartlow. Adlai Stevenson and the World: The Life of Adlai E. Stevenson. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1978.

Paterson, Thomas G. On Every Front: The Making of the Cold War. New York: Norton, 1979.

_____, ed. The Origins of the Cold War. Second edition. Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath, 1974.

Reedy, George E. The Twilight of the Presidency. New York: Mentor, 1970.

Richardson, Elmo. The Presidency of Dwight D. Eisenhower. Lawrence: The Regents Press of Kansas, 1979.

Rovere, Richard. Senator Joe McCarthy. New York: Harper and Row, 1959.

Schlesinger, Arthur M., Jr. The Age of Roosevelt: Volume II, The Coming of the New Deal; Volume III, The Politics of Upheaval. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1958-1960.

_____. A Thousand Days: John F. Kennedy in the White House. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965.

_____. The Imperial Presidency. New York: Popular Library, 1974.

_____. Robert Kennedy and His Times. New York: Ballantine, 1978.

Seib, Charles, and Alan Otten. "Fulbright: Arkansas Paradox," Harper's, June, 1956.

Sheehan, Neil, et al., eds. The Pentagon Papers. (Based on investigative reporting by Neil Sheehan, written by Neil Sheehan, Hedrick Smith, E.W. Kenworthy, and Fox Butterfield.) New York: Bantam, 1971.

Smith, Beverly. "Egghead From the Ozarks," Saturday Evening Post, May 2, 1959.

Smith, Gaddis. American Diplomacy During the Second World War, 1941-1945. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1965.

Snow, Edgar. Red China Today. New York: Random House-Vintage Books, 1970.

Spanier, John W. The Truman-MacArthur Controversy and the Korean War. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1959.

Steel, Ronald. Pax Americana. New York: The Viking Press, 1970.

_____. Walter Lippmann and the American Century. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1980.

Stone, I.F. "Fulbright of Arkansas: Part 1," December 29, 1966, The New York Review of Books, Volume VII, Number 11.

_____. "Fulbright: From Hawk to Dove, Part 2," January 12, 1967, The New York Review of Books, Volume VII, Number 12.

_____. "Fulbright: The Timid Opposition, Part 3," January 26, 1967, The New York Review of Books, Volume VIII, Number 1.

Tweraser, Kurt. "The Advice and Dissent of Senator Fulbright: A Longitudinal Analysis of His Images of International Politics and His Political Role Conceptions," Ph.D. dissertation, American University, Washington, D.C., 1971.

_____. Changing Patterns of Political Beliefs: The Foreign Policy Operational Codes of J. William Fulbright, 1943-1967. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1974.

Williams, William Appleman. The Tragedy of American Diplomacy. Second revised edition. New York: Delta, 1972.

Woodward, C. Vann. The Burden of Southern History. Revised edition. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1968.

_____. The Strange Career of Jim Crow. Third revised edition. New York: Oxford University Press, 1974.

Yergin, Daniel. "Fulbright's Last Frustration," The New York Times Magazine, November 24, 1974.