

Senator Humphrey
Release Monday a.m. papers
6:30 p.m. Sunday
April 22, 1951

"MEET YOUR CONGRESS"

"MacArthur Before the Joint Session of Congress"

Panel:

Senator Robert A. Taft (R. Ohio)
Senator Herbert Lehman (D. New York)
Senator Homer E. Capehart (R. Indiana)
Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D. Minnesota)

Moderator:

Blair Moody.

MR. MOODY: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. This is Blair Moody and "Meet Your Congress" reporting to you again from Washington.

Who is right about American policy in the dangerous, explosive Far East, President Truman or General MacArthur? Would bombing Red bases in Manchuria and giving United States air and naval support to a Chiang Kai-shek invasion of the mainland bring the Korean War to a close or would it turn loose the atomic fury of World War III?

In a few moments four of the most distinguished members of the United States Senate will discuss for you the historic, dramatic, controversial address of General MacArthur before the Congress. I believe they may have something to say also about whether our Joint Chiefs of Staff really agree with the deposed Far Eastern Commander, as he intimated, or whether they support and actually helped to formulate the decisions which brought about MacArthur's dismissal by the President, as General Omar Bradley indicated a few days ago.

But first, since this is in many ways the Senate's own program--I certainly try to make it so--I must divert a moment to note with sadness the passing of one of our greatest statesmen of modern times, Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg.

Much of the pattern of the post-war world and many of the issues debated over these microphones were molded by the remarkable man who was buried Saturday in his old home in Grand Rapids. Arthur Vandenberg was a man who in the last great years of his career put his country and world peace ahead of his party, his personal interests, and even his own life. His health broke two years ago as he fought in the Senate for what he thought was right, and I know I

speak the hearts of both Democrats and Republicans on this program when I say that everyone who knew Vandenberg has suffered an irreparable loss for himself and his country.

And now this evening, as other leaders fight to repel the threat of world communism, we bring four men who feel deeply on the issues whirling about the head of MacArthur. Speaking for the Democrats we have two fighting Liberals, Senator, former four-term Governor of New York, Herbert H. Lehman; and Senator Hubert H. Humphrey of Minnesota. Speaking for the Republicans, we have the Chairman of the G. O. P. Senate Policy Committee, known to many as "Mr. Republican" himself, Senator Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, and with him the man who has been sitting in the Minority Leader's seat during much of the recent debate which has already taken place over the President's action, a farmer and small businessman from Indiana, Senator Homer Capehart. Incidentally, Senator Capehart suggested in his home state a few days ago a Republican presidential ticket in 1952 of Taft and MacArthur.

Now, Senator Lehman, was the President right in dismissing MacArthur? After hearing the General's speech, do you feel world war can best be avoided by following MacArthur's policy or President Truman's?

SENATOR LEHMAN: Blair, we are now embarked on the second great debate of this session of Congress. There are two questions involved here. One concerns the recall of General MacArthur. Of course, obviously he was explicitly and defiantly opposed to the Far Eastern policy of the United States Government. The second question concerns that policy itself, whether the people of the United States are prepared to take the aggressive in risking an all-out war on China, a war without allies, in which we would be at a hopeless disadvantage.

On the first question, it seems obvious to me that the President had no alternative but to act as he did. Civilian authority must never abdicate to the military on policy questions. On the second question, I do not think that our people can be convinced by General MacArthur or anybody else that we should take unilateral action in disregard of our allies in the United Nations and risk--no, practically assure--a general war.

I believe that the majority of the American people, while utterly opposed to appeasement, are still hopeful that an honorable victory and an honorable peace can be obtained without paying the terrible price of another world war. That is why it is so necessary to limit the military action to Korea if that is humanly possible.

General MacArthur's policy minimizes the over-all global problem of which Korea is only one front. His policy, too,

disregards the rugged vastness of China, one-third larger than all of the United States. It ignores the possibility of Soviet intervention if we should attack China, bound to her by a mutual aid pact. It ignores the understandable reluctance of our Western European allies to leave themselves completely exposed if they come to our aid in such a military adventure in the Far East.

Above all, General MacArthur appears to have forgotten that the unity of the United Nations is our greatest hope of peace. These are some of the practical problems that must be weighed in the coming weeks. The final decision will be a critical one, not only for the United States but for the future of mankind. Pray God the debate will be brief and without partisan rancor!

MR. MOODY: Thank you very much, Senator Lehman.

Senator Taft, do you believe that General MacArthur's policies practically insure general war?

SENATOR TAFT: No; certainly not. The only thing that brought on a fear of general war was when President Truman started a war in Korea. If you start a war, why then you naturally assume a risk of a third World War. Nothing in the present situation increases the risk of third World War over what President Truman himself incurred when he started the Korean War.

There are really three policies, as I see it. There is the stalemate policy of the Administration. They admit they can't end the war. They simply intend to go on fighting in Korea. Like a football team, every time you get to the 50-yard line you have got to kick, so you can never score; and some day the other side is likely to catch the ball and run for a touchdown. That is No. 1 policy.

No. 2 policy is a policy advocated by General MacArthur, of doing everything possible to win the war in Korea. Nobody is proposing any invasion of Communist China by American soldiers. There isn't anybody undertaking an all-out war against Communist China. The proposal simply is that we do those things which may enable us to win the war in Korea, use Chiang's troops, 600,000 of them on Formosa ready to go; bomb communications, if necessary to win the war. Blockade China was General MacArthur's third thing. That I haven't considered, myself.

The third policy is the appeasement policy, and a stalemate war under this Administration is likely to lead to that third policy, the abandonment of Formosa, the setting up of a Communist Korea or a whole Korea which will be substantially Communist if everybody withdraws from Korea.

The admission of the Chinese Communists to the United Nations and to the Japanese peace treaty. Of course, now the Administration says "Oh, no, we are not going to adopt that policy," but this stalemate war isn't going to go on forever. Either we adopt a more aggressive policy or I think what General MacArthur is clearly afraid of, we adopt an appeasement policy. If we do that, then we abandon, it seems to me, our whole course, our whole position in the Pacific; we likely lose Japan, the Philippines, to the Communists; and that is the policy that the Administration has frequently favored. They did it when they took the "cease fire" proposal last January, which fortunately the Chinese Communists turned down. They did it when Secretary Acheson said Formosa should be turned over to the Chinese Communists. He has taken that back now, but will he go back to his former idea? That is the policy we have to avoid.

A stalemate war for the moment is possible, of course, but it is going to turn one way or the other before we get through. The American people aren't going on indefinitely to see a long list of American casualties with nothing to be accomplished.

MR. MOODY: Thank you very much, Senator Taft.

Senator Humphrey, how do you feel about this?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, I look back in some of the records of the great militarists and I find that the great Clausewitz, who was most eminent in the field of military science, said that war is an instrumentality of national policy, and I think that ought to be remembered, that the actions of armies and navies and air forces are fundamentally directed toward the attainment of a policy. In this particular instance in the Korean crisis, in the Korean war, policy is not being formulated by one nation. Policy is being formulated by the United Nations.

Now, I know that we are bearing the great share of the burden. There isn't any doubt about that. And I am one of those that hopes and prays that our allies will do more, but be that as it may, the fact of the matter is that we as the leaders of the free nations of the world must work with our allies, must work with the United Nations, and must take what we have to work with.

Now I am somewhat surprised at what Senator Taft has said, that President Truman started the war in Korea. If my memory serves me correctly, it was the North Korean Government that started the war in Korea; the North Korean Communist satellite government, a complete prototype of the Soviet Union, that made a major attack upon a free, independent nation of South Korea, and under the terms of the charter of the United Nations, our country and other countries came to the

rescue of South Korea as a matter of stopping international aggression.

Now also, I am somewhat disturbed when I hear that no invasion is contemplated against China. Now let's just take a look and see whether or not there is an invasion contemplated or not. In so far as an invasion against China, if that was all that was involved in it, if it was just going to be China, I would say that if we were positively sure that it was just going to be a war against China, then possibly the military policy advocated by General MacArthur would be sound. But I would recall that General MacArthur told President Truman at Wake Island at the time of their conference, when the President went to MacArthur, not MacArthur to the President; he told the President then that he was absolutely convinced that the Red Chinese hordes would not pour across the Manchurian border if we went up toward the Yalu River. He also said the boys would be home by Christmas. Now, I submit that those are two military statements and decisions, both of which proved to be false.

Now, the MacArthur thesis today is that any attack upon the Chinese mainland will not precipitate first of all the intervention by the Soviet Union. Secondly, it is his premise that already China has committed her full power in the Korean War. I think that the latter can be openly disputed, because the General says that not over a million troops of the Chinese were now involved in the Korean War, and it is frankly known and it has been pointed out by military analysts one after another that Communist China has from four to five million troops in combat divisions, so that means that less than a third of her entire military power has been committed in Korea.

And secondly, I think it should be carefully noted that the risk that is being taken here is that of precipitating an all-out war with the Soviet Union. Now, there may be a time when that will have to happen, but if that time is going to come, let us try to select the time. Today we do not even have the divisions that we need for Western Europe. We haven't been able to send the four divisions to Western Europe, and I am surprised to note that the very men in the Congress that were somewhat worried about four divisions for Western Europe with our free allies are now the very ones that are totally unconcerned as to what would be the result if we sent logistic forces, supply forces, if we used naval and air forces, on the Chinese Communist mainland. I think this is a risk, and a terrible risk, that may precipitate a war and an untimely war when we are not prepared to fight it, and surely we stand a very good chance of being demolished, at least in the Asiatic area, and being pushed back to our own shores.

MR. MOODY: Thank you, Senator Humphrey. Senator Capehart, do you believe these MacArthur policies will precipitate a world war?

SENATOR CAPEHART: First let me say this, that I would like to give up all my time to Senator Humphrey and Senator Lehman, because I would like to have them continue talking for the next twenty minutes --I see we have about twenty minutes' more time-- and see if they can convince the American people first that we are not at war; second, if they can convince the American people that it isn't already a World War III, because we have some fifteen nations involved in the war in Korea at the moment, because some fifteen nations, if I understand it, have troops there.

I would like to also have them convince the American people why, since Nationalist China are a member of the United Nations--now get that; they are members at the moment of the United Nations--now tell me why a member of the United Nations, as Nationalist China are, why they should not be permitted to fight against the North Koreans and fight against the Chinese Communists. I would like for somebody to answer that question. Why is it perfectly all right for the United States to fight in Korea as members of the United Nations, but all wrong for the Nationalist China to fight in Korea?

Now, what General MacArthur is trying to do and has been trying to do, of course, is to permit Nationalist China, a member of the United Nations, to help him fight the North Koreans and to help him fight the Chinese Communists. Now tell the American people why, why it is all right for one member of the United Nations, let's say Great Britain and France and the United States and Greece and Turkey, to fight North Korea and the Chinese Communists, but all wrong for another member of the United Nations, Formosa, to fight in Korea. Now tell the American people why one member of the United Nations should be prohibited or denied the right to fight in this war.

MR. MOODY: Senator Lehman, do you want to take that?

SENATOR LEHMAN: Yes, I'll be glad to.

In the first place, we are protecting the Nationalist Government in Formosa, because our fleet is there not only to prevent the forces of Chiang Kai-shek attacking the mainland of China, but to prevent the Communists to invade and take over the Island of Formosa. I agree that the loss of Formosa would be a serious one in the world policy, but certainly our fleet is protecting the Island of Formosa against attack by the Communists.

SENATOR TAFT: Senator Lehman, I don't know of anybody who claims today that the Communists can attack Formosa. They haven't any soldiers there. There isn't any threat at the moment. It simply isn't there. What our fleet is doing is keeping Chiang Kai-shek from going over to the mainland.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, how would Chiang Kai-shek get to

the mainland? What would he go over on, canoes, or would he go over on barges?

SENATOR TAFT: He would go over on barges. The whole question is the control of the air. He can get there. The question is the control of the air. If we give them enough airplanes--

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Whose airplanes?

SENATOR TAFT: Our airplanes.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, now--

SENATOR TAFT: Get them there. The Russians are giving airplanes to the Chinese Communists. Why don't we give airplanes to the Chinese Nationalists? What is the sense--

SENATOR CAPEHART: Why don't we give him the airplanes so that he can put on his own battle?

MR. MOODY: Let's permit these gentlemen to tell us why one member of the United Nations should not be permitted to fight in this war. Senator Humphrey?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I will be delighted; first of all, because the Chinese Nationalist Government in Formosa wants to attack on the Chinese mainland. That is its one desire, and that is exactly what General MacArthur talked about.

SENATOR CAPEHART: I am for it. I am for it. Why not?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Just a minute, now. I know that. You weren't for four divisions for Europe. Senator Taft--

SENATOR CAPEHART: Yes, I was. I supported four divisions for Europe from January the first.

MR. MOODY: Please, Senators--gentlemen--

SENATOR CAPEHART: I want the American people to know the answers to why one member of the United Nations should fight in this war and another member not.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: If you will just keep your blood pressure down you will get the answer.

SENATOR CAPEHART: I am perfectly willing to keep quiet and let you tell the American people the reasons.

MR. MOODY: Go ahead.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: The matter of silence will be determined by my silence and not by additional words. Now just let me say this: The whole policy involved here is this, that if the Chiang Kai-shek Nationalist forces are to go to the Chinese mainland they are not going to go by swimming the channel. They are not going to go by canoes or by bicycles or barges. They will have to be transported, as General MacArthur said, by American ships supported by American air power, and supplied by American equipment and American logistic forces. This simply means the risk of precipitating an all-out war on the Asiatic mainland, which is exactly what the Kremlin wants. There you have the major military bases of the Soviet Union along the Siberian-Manchurian border, at Vladivostok. There you have the great industrial power of the Soviet Union which she has been building up for the last fifteen years.

I am amazed; I am amazed to see men of the United States Senate who were worried about precipitating action in Europe by sending four divisions to our allies in Europe, worried that we might irritate the Russians, who are willing to stick their head in a trap that the bear, the Russian bear, is setting in the Chinese area by committing American troops, too few troops if you please--we already have too few troops in Korea--into a major attack on the Chinese mainland, and thereby precipitating a third World War.

SENATOR TAFT: That is a complete misrepresentation by Senator Humphrey of what we propose. We do not propose the invasion of China by a single American troop, not one. Vladivostok is 2500 miles away, and so is Russia, from any place that Chiang Kai-shek's troops could land. There is no cause for war in China if we permit the legitimate government of China, recognized by us and the United Nations, to try to recover the land which they themselves are entitled to under our rules. Surely there isn't any logic--there was a reason when the Chinese Communists hadn't come into Korea. Then, of course, we precipitated their coming into Korea. Now they have come into Korea. Now we are at war with Communist China. Certainly we ought not to invade China because it is an impossible military undertaking, as General MacArthur said yesterday. Everybody recognizes it would take a million troops. But why we shouldn't permit raids by Chiang Kai-shek, and diversion, take some of these Chinese armies away from Korea--it may make the whole difference to the lives of thousands of American boys if we can create a diversion that will take over the full attack which is now threatened against the American troops in Korea, which twice has pushed them almost into the ocean by the attack that has been made upon them.

MR. MOODY: Senator Lehman?

SENATOR CAPEHART: Yes, I would like to have Senator Lehman

answer the question as to why the Nationalists in China, members of the United Nations, should not be permitted to assist the United States and other members of the United Nations in this area.

MR. MOODY: Senator Lehman?

SENATOR LEHMAN: When General MacArthur yesterday urged that Chiang Kai-shek be allowed to send some of his troops to the mainland, he was mighty careful to say that he would require logistic support. Now, what does logistic support mean? It means transport; it means ferrying the troops across; it means the support and protection of the United States Navy.

SENATOR CAPEHART: Will the Senator yield a moment?

SENATOR LEHMAN: No. It means the support and protection of our Air Force. It would mean diverting our Navy and our Air Force from other parts of the eastern area in which they are busily engaged and in which they are doing splendid work, and finally it would mean inevitably that we would have to assure the victory of Chiang Kai-shek by the use of our own forces, our own resources, and it would inevitably lead us into a general all-out war on the mainland of China, a war which I believe without allies we could not possibly win.

MR. MOODY: Senator Capehart?

SENATOR CAPEHART: Are we to understand from the able Senator that our own troops swam over to Korea, that the British swam over to Korea? How did the British get over there? How did the Americans get over there? Of course they had to be transported, by air and by sea. Naturally they have to be transported. How did they get there? Why do you put up the argument that you don't want a member of the United Nations, which Nationalist China is, to fight, simply because somebody has to transport them over to the scene of battle? How else would they get there?

SENATOR LEHMAN: Of course there is no doubt about it; of course they could only get there through the transport, through ferrying of the United States.

SENATOR CAPEHART: Let me talk a bit. You have been taking up all the time. How did our troops get to Korea? How did the British get to Korea, except by boat? How did the Turks get there? How did other members of the United Nations get into Korea?

SENATOR TAFT: It didn't bring the Russians in, did it?

SENATOR CAPEHART: No, it didn't bring the Russians into the war. Wait a minute; let me finish. You still haven't answered

the question as to why the Nationalist Government of China, a member of the United Nations, are denied the right to fight in this war. Of course I know the answer to it, and I shall take a minute to give it to you. The answer, of course, is that the British are opposed to it, the French are opposed to it.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: That is a good answer.

SENATOR CAPEHART: And the Communists of China are opposed to it. The answer, of course, is that our allies are not fundamentally opposed to Communism.

MR. MOODY: Senator Humphrey?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Let's just take a look at these very flamboyant and almost, may I say, irresponsible statements that our allies are not opposed to Communism.

SENATOR CAPEHART: I said fundamentally opposed, and I stand on it.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: They are not only fundamentally opposed; they have given living demonstration of their ability not only to be opposed to Communism but of the fact that they have resisted from within and without. The French are fighting Communism in Indo-China; the British are fighting Communism in Malaya; the French have resisted Communism at home and the British have resisted it at home.

Now let me just make this one point: It has been aptly pointed out that had the Chinese Nationalist troops been used on the Chinese mainland, as the Senator from Indiana says, our allies would have a very dim view of it, and believe me, we had better need some allies and have some allies at this time. What allies do we have in Asia at the present time?

SENATOR CAPEHART: You have answered your own question. We have none. We're doing all the fighting.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: We have allies in Western Europe.

Now the Senator from Ohio says, and I agree with him, that if it were simply a diversionary attack that the Chiang Kai-shek troops were going to make in China, if that is all that it was, more power to him. But I submit to the Senator from Ohio, and I want him to give me an answer: MacArthur said that if we move to the Yalu River, as he told the President as a matter of public record in the press of this country and the memoranda of that whole conference that he was convinced, positively convinced, that the Chinese Red troops would not come in. Did they come in or didn't they come in? Indeed they came in. Now, is the Senator from Ohio willing to take the risk?

of an all-out World War III? On the one hand he says Truman started war in Korea; on the other hand he says, "Now let's take the war into China." We are not even able--

SENATOR CAPEHART: Let's divide up the time here, Mr. Moderator, because it is unfair here to give the opposition all the time.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: The Senator from Indiana said he wanted us to have the time, earlier.

SENATOR CAPEHART: I want you to answer the question. You are not answering the question.

MR. MOODY: Senator Humphrey, then Senator Taft.

SENATOR CAPEHART: You are not answering the question as to why you deny one member of the United Nations the right to help us in Korea.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: It isn't a matter of helping us in Korea. This is a matter of diversionary action on the Chinese mainland, and I say we should deny them that because I do not want World War III, and apparently the Senator from Indiana is willing to take that risk.

SENATOR CAPEHART: No.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: He is willing to have war, and to have it all out, with the Soviet Union.

MR. MOODY: Let's hear Senator Taft now.

SENATOR TAFT: The President took the risk of World War III when he moved our troops into Korea. General MacArthur's statement that he didn't think the Chinese Communists would come in, that is a political question. That is something the State Department intelligence ought to have known, not MacArthur. That is a political question, whether the Chinese Communists would come in.

Now we have a political question to decide, and I say that a diversionary action by Chiang Kai-shek in South China wouldn't interest the Russians, to begin with. What could he do? You have one hundred thousand, one hundred fifty thousand, guerillas in South China. You have all South China in a state of revolt against the Communists because they have confiscated their land. Every report is they are there. If Chiang Kai-shek can link up with them he produces a diversionary army which will at least take two or three Red Chinese armies down there to try to beat them.

He will probably have to retire. I don't say he can hold it. I will say this, though: It is a way in which we can win the war in Korea, and that is what we have to do before we get through. What is the purpose of war except to win a war?

The President apparently takes the position--what were his words? He said, in effect, that if we don't notice the Chinese are there, maybe they will go away from Korea. He says, if we inflict sufficient casualties, that may discourage the Chinese Communists from continuing their attack. Why, it's almost pitiful. The President's program is just to go on letting our boys be killed and accomplishing nothing--just sit there in Korea and tie their hands so they can't win the war in Korea.

If the Senator can suggest any other method of winning the war except by bombing Chinese communications, by sending Chiang Kashesk's troops in, I would like to know what they are.

MR. MOODY: Senator Lehman, first.

SENATOR LEHMAN: I want to say that Senator Capehart spilled the beans. He is perfectly frankly for a declaration of war on China, which would mean an all-out world war.

SENATOR CAPEHART: Senator, that isn't true and you know it isn't true.

SENATOR LEHMAN: You said that same thing three months ago in a debate with me on the Forum of the Air.

SENATOR CAPEHART: I said nothing of the sort, Senator. You know I said nothing of the sort, and you know--now wait a minute. You know I am not for declaring war.

Let me tell you what I did say in a debate with you, and I repeat it again, and that was that any time any nation's troops kill American boys, I am for going and getting them and killing them, and I stand on it, and I say to you that no nation can maintain its self-respect or live that permits a thing of that sort to go on. That is what I said, and I stand on it.

Now wait a minute. Let me talk just a minute. I am going to say something else to you, and the American people are back of me on it, and that is that anybody, or any nation, that are sympathetic with Communist China today, and I take it from your debate here today you and Senator Humphrey are--

SENATOR HUMPHREY: That is absolutely villification.

SENATOR CAPEHART: --because you are not for going over there and fighting and you are even for keeping the Nationalist Government from fighting them; that you are not opposed to the Communist Government in China; I say you are not fundamentally opposed to it.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: The Senator is a prevaricator and deliberately indulging in falsehood and character assassination. This is an outrage.

MR. MOODY: Senator Lehman!

SENATOR LEHMAN: I say to you, Senator Capehart, that is a libelous statement.

SENATOR CAPEHART: It is no more libelous than what you said a moment ago about me.

SENATOR LEHMAN: It is a libelous statement.

SENATOR CAPEHART: It is not libelous, and I stand on it and I will continue to stand on it. If you want to do something about it, it is perfectly agreeable with me.

SENATOR LEHMAN: Now I am going to read from the printed record what you said. I asked you, Senator Capehart, whether as a member of the Senate you would vote for a declaration of war against Red China.

"Senator Capehart" (this is your reply). "I believe the question is whether I would vote for a declaration of war against Red China. Let me say this in the first place. I would never have been in Korea. I want to say this, that I certainly would vote for a declaration of war against China."

Your statement is absolutely libelous. I have fought more strenuously against Communism than you ever--

MR. MOODY. I'm sorry; our time is up, and our thanks tonight go to Senators Capehart of Indiana, Lehman of New York, Taft of Ohio, and Humphrey of Minnesota. This is Blair Moody, signing off now in Washington.



Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org