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INTERNATIONAL SPACE LAW AND OUTER SPACE

I am pleased and honored to have been invited to speak before you today. The International Astronautical Federation has since its foundation in 1950 provided a valuable international forum for the review of outer space problems and for the stimulation of action in governmental and international public bodies. I hope it will continue to provide this valuable service. In view of the uncharted nature of much of the work in aeronautics, the contribution of private thinking and analysis can be of immense importance to the future development of man's efforts in outer space.

The stirring era in which we live is witness to the extension of man's activity into a medium entirely new to him. In the realm of space exploration man is faced with technical and scientific demands of unparalleled difficulty. At the same time, he is given a priceless opportunity — a chance to establish new relations with his fellow man in a new environment, relatively free from the limiting influence of precedent.

Starting with a clean slate, man should so plan his activities in outer space as to preclude the possibility of the armed conflicts and controversies which have characterized his history on this planet. He can promote a new atmosphere, based on scientific cooperation and the rule of law, which might serve as an example for his earth-bound relations with his fellow man. As Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge stated in an address to the 14th General Assembly:

"International cooperation in the exploration of outer space offers an avenue along which nations may approach mutual understanding and peace. Working together on the great challenges of explorations beyond the confines of earth can create a new perspective, in which national boundaries and national rivalries recede in importance."

Certainly we can agree that the incentives for international cooperation in outer space are many and very substantial. Tremendous expense is involved in space exploration. Geographically widespread and yet tightly coordinated observation stations are required. Coordination of operations is imperative if we are to avoid mutual interference and minimize the danger of accident and damage as traffic in outer space increases in intensity. All these factors urge the importance of international cooperation.

And there is another grim argument for cooperation: Scientific progress has inevitably made possible the use of outer space for new and more dangerous means of waging war. This fact requires that maximum cooperative efforts be made among the nations to guard against the use of
outer space for aggressive purposes. Recognizing the great dangers lurking in such use, the United States over three years ago proposed a study of means to reserve outer space for peaceful purposes only. Today the United States stands prepared to enter upon such a study separately from the overall problem of disarmament. A concrete proposal in this direction has been made by the five Western powers to the Geneva Conference of the 10-Nation Committee on Disarmament. These nations have urged the banning of weapons of mass destruction in orbit or stationed in outer space.

I hope very much that outer space can be reserved as a great area for peace. It would be a tragic thing indeed if the wars and national rivalries which have too often characterized relations among the nations here on earth were to be projected into outer space.

It is gratifying to note that the strong incentives for international cooperation in outer space which I have mentioned have not been without effect. Even in the initial stages of space exploration, such cooperation has made an important contribution in the tracking of earth satellites and the assembly of scientific data. Wide recognition of the desirability of mutual assistance in this new field is reflected in the intelligent and significant cooperation of states, organizations, and individuals during the International Geophysical Year (1957-58). It is also reflected in the continuation of these activities under the aegis of the Committee for Space Research of the International Council of Scientific Unions.

A special, and important example of international cooperation, is furnished by the transmission by the United States to the USSR of a number of tape recordings of the data received from Sputniks I, II and III.

As the pace of outer space activities increases, there will grow, in addition to the need for cooperation, a need for regulation and control of such activities in order to minimize conflicts of interests and operations. This involves the establishment of broad principles and specific regulatory measures to meet operational requirements.

Because of the very newness of the field of outer space exploration, the context and nature of many potential problems are not yet clear. I therefore believe that it is premature, at this time, to attempt to draw up a comprehensive legal code to cover all contingencies in outer space. It is, after all, a cardinal rule that the development of international law must follow the dictates of concrete need. We do not know enough about the difficulties that may be encountered in outer space to foresee the precise nature of the entire range of regulatory measures which may one day be necessary.

There are, however, certain problems which can be identified at present and studied with regard to possible regulatory and control measures. In this task the United Nations Ad Hoc Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space has played an appropriately leading role. The report of this committee, published last year, made preliminary identification of a number of areas which call for international coordination and control on a priority
These are some of the imponderables with which we are faced in the formulation of legislation and procedures governing man's activities in outer space. The factors which must be taken into consideration are exceedingly complex, and the technical and scientific information as yet available concerning many aspects of such activities is far from complete. These facts underline the need for considerable caution in drawing up legal provisions relating to outer space activities.

Despite this complexity, however, the accelerating rate of outer space exploration renders indispensable the early consideration of regulatory measures in certain specific areas, as I have indicated earlier. With the growth of customary practice and the accumulation of laws and agreements dealing with particular subjects, a system of laws governing human relations in outer space will gradually be filled out.

In the growth of such a system, the international community will wish to see its basic policy aims, as affirmed in such documents as the United Nations Charter, reflected in the body of outer space law. These aims include the reservation of outer space for peaceful purposes, the encouragement of international cooperation and the encouragement of scientific research, particularly in the interest of achieving practical benefits to increase human welfare.

The hope of cooperation in outer space was put eloquently not long ago by Dr. T. Keith Glennan, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, when he said:

"Out of the efforts of the dedicated and inspired men of all nations may yet come that common understanding and mutual trust that will break the lockstep of suspicion and distrust that divides the world into separate camps today."

Faced with the tremendous opportunities presented by outer space, we owe it to ourselves and to all posterity to rise to the occasion and meet the challenge with statesmanship and breadth of vision.
KOREAN WAR ATROCITIES

JANUARY 11 (legislative day, JANUARY 7), 1954.—Ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

Mr. POTTER, from the Committee on Government Operations, submitted the following:

REPORT

MADE THROUGH ITS PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS BY ITS SUBCOMMITTEE ON KOREAN WAR ATROCITIES

INTRODUCTION

On June 25, 1950, the North Korean Peoples' Army, without warning, attacked the Free Republic of South Korea.

During the ensuing 3 years of warfare, the Communist enemy committed a series of war crimes against American and United Nations personnel which constituted one of the most heinous and barbaric epochs of recorded history. When the American people became aware war atrocities had been committed against American troops, thousands of letters were sent to Members of Congress by parents, wives, and relatives of servicemen, requesting an immediate investigation.

Accordingly, on October 6, 1953, Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, chairman of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, appointed a special subcommittee, chaired by Senator Charles E. Potter, to inquire into the nature and extent of Communist war crimes committed in Korea.

The purpose of the investigation was to bring to the attention of the world in general and to the American people in particular, the type of vicious and barbaric enemy we have been fighting in Korea, to expose their horrible acts committed against our troops, and to foster appropriate legislation.

The War Crimes Division in Korea has already opened more than 1,800 cases of crimes committed by the enemy involving many thousands of victims, including American, South Korean, British, Turkish, and Belgian troops, as well as many civilians.1 The sub-
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committee limited its inquiry to atrocities committed against American personnel. When it became apparent numerous cases involving American servicemen were under current investigation, exclusive of hundreds of cases completely documented by evidence, the subcommittee decided to further limit its investigation to illustrative types of war atrocities.

A total of 29 witnesses appeared before the subcommittee in public hearings on December 2, 3, and 4, 1953. Of this number, 23 were American servicemen who were either survivors or eyewitnesses of Communist war crimes. The remaining witnesses were former Army field commanders in Korea and officials of the War Crimes Division. Corroborative evidence consisting of affidavits, statements, photographs, and other official records from the files of the United States Army, Judge Advocate General’s Division, and from the official records of the War Crimes Division in Korea, was also received.

I. HISTORY AND OPERATION OF WAR CRIMES DIVISION IN KOREA

First reports of war crimes committed by the North Korean armies in Korea against captured United Nations military personnel began to filter into General Headquarters, United Nations Command, early in July of 1950. When the facts were disclosed, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, Commander in Chief, United Nations Command, set up the machinery for the investigation of war crimes committed by Communist aggressors.

Initial responsibility was assigned to the Army Staff Judge Advocate of the Far East Command. On July 27, 1950, field commanders were advised as to the procedures to be followed. In early October 1950, the immediate responsibility for war-crimes investigations was transferred to the Commanding General, Eighth Army; on September 1, 1952, responsibility was transferred to the Commanding General, Korean Communication Zone, where it presently rests.

The purpose in establishing the War Crimes Division was to avoid the difficulties experienced after World War II, when little effort was made to investigate the commission of a war crime until some time after the war had ended.

In order to define and clarify the limits of the investigations in Korea, war crimes were defined as those acts committed by enemy nations, or those persons acting for them, which constitute violations of the laws and customs of war, and general application and acceptance, including contravention of treaties and conventions dealing with the conduct of war, as well as outrageous acts against persons or property committed in connection with military operations.

The War Crimes Division in Korea is organized into several branches, the more important sections from an operational standpoint being the Case Analysis Branch, the Investigations Branch, and the Historical Branch, the latter containing statistical and order-of-battle sections. The Investigations Branch utilizes field teams conducting on-the-spot investigations. Thousands of enemy prisoners of war, as well as friendly personnel, have been interviewed.
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Korean War Atrocities

during which interrogations every effort was made to discover contributing and corroborating evidence to establish the facts surrounding the reported war crimes. Investigators collect evidence consisting of affidavits, photographs, statements of participants and perpetrators, and locate bodies of victims, effecting their identification wherever and whenever possible. The Case Analysis Branch, composed of attorneys, reviews, and analyzes the cases, keeping them under continual scrutiny to detect what gaps, if any, exist in the evidentiary chain. The documented case against the subject involved is then referred to the Command Staff Judge Advocate, Headquarters, Armed Forces, Far East, for possible prosecution.

With the signing of the Korean armistice the War Crimes Division in Korea did not terminate its operations, but it is continuing to develop additional evidence as a result of interrogations of repatriated prisoners under operations Big Switch.

II. Types of War Atrocities Committed Against American Prisoners

The evidence before the subcommittee conclusively proves that American prisoners of war who were not deliberately murdered at the time of capture or shortly after capture, were beaten, wounded, starved, and tortured; molested, displayed, and humiliated before the civilian populace and/or forced to march long distances without benefit of adequate food, water, shelter, clothing, or medical care to Communist prison camps, and there to experience further acts of human indignities.

Communist massacres and the wholesale extermination of their victims is a calculated part of Communist psychological warfare. The atrocities perpetrated in Korea against the United Nations troops by Chinese and North Korean Communists are not unique in Communist history, nor can they be explained away on the grounds that inhumanity is often associated with so-called civilized warfare.

The House Select Committee to Conduct an Investigation of the Facts, Evidence, and Circumstances of the Katyn Forest Massacre in its final report (Union Calendar No. 792, H. R. No. 2505,) stated in conclusions, page 11:

This committee began its investigation last year, and as the committee's work progressed, information, documents, and evidence was submitted from all parts of the world. It was at this same time that reports reached the committee of similar atrocities and violations of international law being perpetrated in Korea. This committee noted the striking similarity between crimes committed against the Poles at Katyn and those being inflicted on American and other United Nation troops in Korea. Communist tactics being used in Korea are identical to those followed at Katyn. Thus this committee believes that Congress should undertake an immediate investigation of the Korean war atrocities in order that the evidence can be collected and the truth revealed to the American people and the free peoples of the world.

The Communist forces in Korea flagrantly violated virtually every provision of the Geneva Convention of 1929, as well as article 6 of the

General Allen. They were right in the tunnel. Then I heard a cry from another source, of an American, so we came down the hill, and there we came across the most gruesome sight I have ever witnessed. That was in sort of a sunken road, a pile of American dead. I should estimate that in that pile there were 60 men. In the pile were men who were not dead, who were wounded. We, incidentally, found a very shallow grave, it must have contained at least 60 bodies, the other side of the road, down maybe 50 yards from that place.

(C) TAEGYON MASSACRE

On September 27, 1950, approximately 60 American prisoners who had been confined in Taegyion prison were taken into the prison yard in groups of 14, with their hands wired together. These men were forced to sit hunched in hastily dug ditches and then were shot by North Korean troops at point blank range, with American M-1 rifles, using armor-piercing ammunition. Of the 2 seriously wounded survivors, only I lived to recount the gruesome details. Unnumbered civilians estimated at between 5,000 and 7,000, as well as soldiers of the Republic of Korea, were also slaughtered at Taegyion between September 23 and September 27, 1950.11

Sgt. Carey H. Weinl, formerly with the 23rd Infantry Regiment, 2d Division, Korea, and the sole survivor of the infamous Taegyion massacre, testified:

Sergeant Weinl. *** Toward the last they was in a hurry to leave Taegyion, to evacuate Taegyion, so they took approximately the last three groups pretty close together. I witnessed the group right in front of me shot ***. After they was shot they took the corpses and sat down in the ditch and shot. Senator Potter. What happened to you when you were shot?

Sergeant Weinl. *** I leaned over against the next man, pretending I was done for ***. In firing, they hit my hand ***.

Senator Potter. How were you sitting in the ditch?

Sergeant Weinl. *** They was aiming at my head. I have a scar on my neck, on my collarbone, and another I hit my hand ***. They hit me 3 times.

Senator Potter. And you played dead?

Sergeant Weinl. Yes, sir. After they thought everybody was dead, they started burying us *** I came close to getting panicky about that time, but somehow or other I figured as long as I had some breath, there was hope ***.

Senator Potter. In other words, you were buried alive?

Sergeant Weinl. That is right, sir. ***

Sergeant Weinl. I might add in that whole group that I was with, there was not a man that begged for mercy and there was not a man that cracked under the deal.

Mr. O'Donnell. *** Sergeant, how long were you buried alive?

Sergeant Weinl. That is hard to say, sir. As I say, I was shot around 5 o'clock in the morning, and I stayed in the ditch until that evening, until what time it was dark. I would say approximately 3 hours, 8 or 7 hours.

(D) THE BAMBOO SPEAR CASE

In late December 1950, five American airmen in a truck convoy were ambushed by North Korean forces. Their bodies, discovered shortly after by a South Korean patrol, showed that the flesh had been punctured in as many as 20 different areas with heated, sharpened bamboo sticks. The torture was so fiendish that no one perforation was sufficient to cause death by itself.12
V. TREATMENT IN COMMUNIST PRISON CAMPS

Evidence before this subcommittee indicated that the inhuman treatment given American prisoners in Communist prisoners-of-war camps was a sequel to the brutalities and indignities suffered by the prisoners on death marches. The prisoners at these camps were survivors of marches and were necessarily in poor physical condition.

The deliberate plan of savage and barbaric handling of these men was a continuation of the policy which existed on all the marches, and violated virtually every provision of the Geneva Convention of 1929. They were denied adequate nourishment, water, clothing, and shelter. Not only were they denied medical care but they were subjected to experimental monkey-gland operations. Housing conditions were horrible, resulting in widespread disease.²⁸

The prisoners were not permitted to practice their religion and on numerous occasions were beaten, humiliated, and punished. Political questioning and forced Communist indoctrination was constant, and the men were subjected to physical abuse and other punishment when they refused to be receptive to the Communist propaganda. The American newspapers available for reading purposes were the Daily Worker published in New York and the People's Daily World published in San Francisco, copies of which were in the prisoner-of-war camps within 2 months after the date of publication. The Communists utilized prisoners on numerous occasions for propaganda purposes and took posed pictures purporting to show the comfortable life being led by the prisoners, an obvious distortion of truth and fact.²⁹

Officers were segregated from the enlisted men and could therefore not exercise any internal control, and were subjected to the same harsh treatment. Prisoners-of-war camps were not properly marked, resulting in bombing by United Nations aircraft. Letters of prisoners were not mailed by their captors, and Red Cross aid was in no way permitted. American prisoners died by the thousands at the rate of 15 to 20 per day. One witness testified that during a 7- to 8-month period, 1,500 prisoners died of beri-beri, dysentery, pellagra, and other diseases as a result of malnutrition at camp No. 5 at Pyoktong.³⁰ Another witness testified that during a 3-month period at camp No. 1 at Changsong, 500 Americans died.³¹ The Chinese and North Korean Communists maintained no record of American dead.³² The exact number of known American dead has not as yet been determined, as interrogations of “Little Switch” and “Big Switch” returnees are still being conducted, but it is known that the figure will be in the thousands.

Treatment improved somewhat when the peace talks at Panmunjom commenced, as the Chinese Communists adopted their so-called


"The Only Good Communist is a Dead One"
Sign at Protest in Des Moines, Iowa, September 23, 1959

O'Halloran, Thomas J., “Crowd gathered on street to see Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev in Des Moines, Iowa; man holds sign reading ‘The only good communist is a dead one,’” 23 September 1959. Courtesy of Library of Congress
Inextricably intertwined with foreign policy is the problem of national defense and scientific developments in the missiles and weapons fields. Our continuing effort to prevent further spread of communism and to prevent that "ism" from sweeping over even our own country, will succeed only so long as we maintain a military establishment of sufficient strength and force to repel attack and to inflict counter devastation on any nation so foolhardy as to attack us. George Washington used these words to express the thought: "To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving the peace." With the capabilities now existing for a surprise attacker to inflict havoc on his quarry, the words are even truer today than they were when spoken by Washington.

This is why it was necessary for Congress this year to appropriate roughly $4.0 billion for defense, more than ever before prodigious for our national defenses in time of peace. The sum is huge; but so is the need. I do not believe any sincere and patriotic American could say he would prefer the risk of living in a wholly communist world to spending the billions.

More so than ever before, any future war -- if the world ever should be so unfortunate as to undergo another major war -- will be decided by the ability of trained minds to develop and produce new weapons. Any future world war will be fought largely with weapons and instruments which only a few short years ago would have been regarded as sheer figments of over-active imaginations -- guided missiles, hydrogen explosives, space craft.
Contrary to the scare talk of , we are holding our own in the race to perfect and develop new weapons. Each of our military services has missiles in operation, and the process of perfecting them to even better performance is continuing. Russia has concentrated its energies on ICBM's -- Inter-continental Ballistic Missiles -- because she has no advanced bases near our shores, as we have advance bases relatively near to Russia proper from which we could launch shorter-range missiles if necessary. But in the overall, we are not trailing; we have enough of an arsenal in being to deter the masters of the Kremlin from undertaking an attack which they know would bring retaliatory devastation on their homeland.

The Army has three Surface-to-surface missiles, as well as two Nike surface-to-air missiles intended to protect American cities against air attack. The Navy has air-to-air, surface-to-surface, and surface-to-air missiles. The Air Force has its own air-to-air and surface-to-surface operational missiles.

An area in which the United States is maintaining a definite advantage is in nuclear powered submarines, capable of launching missiles from their decks. Development of the Polaris IRBM, designed to be launched from an atomic submarine and able to travel 1,500 miles, is proceeding at top speed. Neither Russia nor any other nation in the world can match our atomic powered submarine fleet.

The Congress this year took official cognizance of the successful leap into space by man-made earth satellites. It enacted legislation providing the top-level organization, necessary funds and facilities,
for a new civilian space agency to take charge of the nation's aeronautical and space activities. Responsibility for military phases of the space program remain in the Department of Defense, where a new Advanced Research Projects Agency will direct military research in space technology and weapons of the future.

A new independent agency, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, has been established, Under civilian direction will plan, direct and conduct aeronautical and space activities; will arrange for the scientific community to aid in measurements and observation of space vehicles, and will disseminate widely their information and findings. Several other lesser steps were taken to provide for the peaceful exploration and use of Outer Space.

In the field of atomic energy, the 85th Congress ratified participation by the United States in the newly-established International Atomic Energy Agency which was a direct outgrowth of President Eisenhower's "atoms for Peace" program. It also enacted legislation to permit the United States to share atomic information with its allies, subject to certain restrictions dictated by the needs of national security.

Maintenance of an adequate defense capability is an expensive proposition in this day of atomic and hydrogen missiles, space and the other Buck Rogers items which must be included in a full-blown modern arsenal. But in today's world, with international communism ever on the alert for any sign of weakness in anti-communist nations, it is not only expensive, it is vital.
MR. PRESIDENT, MR. SPEAKER, AND DISTINGUISHED MEMBERS OF THE CONGRESS

I stand on this rostrum with a sense of deep humility and great pride - humility in the wake of those great American architects of our history who have stood here before me, pride in the reflection that this forum of legislative debate represents human liberty in the purest form yet devised. Here are centered the hopes and aspirations and faith of the entire human race.

I do not stand here as advocate for any partisan cause for the issues are fundamental and reach quite beyond the realm of partisan consideration. They must be resolved on the highest plane of national interest if our course is to prove sound and our future protected. I trust, therefore, that you will do me the justice of receiving that which I have to say as solely expressing the considered viewpoint of a fellow American. I address you with neither rancor nor bitterness in the fading twilight of life with but one purpose in mind - to serve my country.

The issues are global and so interlocked that to consider the problems of one sector, oblivious to those of another, is but to court disaster for the whole. While Asia is commonly referred to as the gateway to Europe, it is no less true that Europe is the gateway to Asia. And the broad influence of the one cannot fail to have its impact upon the other.

There are those who claim our strength is inadequate to protect on both fronts - that we cannot divide our effort. I can think of no greater expression of defeatism. If a potential enemy can divide his strength on two fronts it is for us to counter his effort. The Communist threat is a global one. Its successful advance
in one sector threatens the destruction of every other sector. You cannot appease or otherwise surrender to Communism in Asia without simultaneously undermining our efforts to halt its advance in Europe.

Beyond pointing out these simple truisms, I shall confine my discussion to the general areas of Asia. Before one may objectively assess the situation now existing there, he must comprehend something of Asia’s past and the revolutionary changes which have marked her course up to the present. Long exploited by the so-called Colonial Powers, with little opportunity to achieve any degree of social justice, individual dignity or a higher standard of life such as guided our own noble administration of the Philippines, the peoples of Asia found their opportunity in the war just past to throw off the shackles of colonialism and now see the dawn of new opportunity, a heretofore unfelt dignity and the self-respect of political freedom. Mustering half of the earth’s population and 60% of its natural resources, these peoples are rapidly consolidating a new force, both moral and material, with which to raise the living standard and erect adaptations of the design of modern progress to their own distinct cultural environments. Whether one adheres to the concept of colonization or not, this is the direction of Asian progress and it may not be stopped. It is a corollary to the shift of the world economic frontiers, as the whole epicenter of world affairs rotates back toward the area whence it started. In this situation it becomes vital that our own country orient its policies in consonance with this basic evolutionary condition rather than pursue a course blind to the reality that the colonial era
without the slightest slackening in their forward progress. I sent
all four of our occupation divisions to the Korean battlefront
without the slightest qualms as to the effect of the resulting power
vacuum upon Japan. The results fully justified my faith. I know of
no nation more serene, orderly and industrious - nor in which
higher hopes can be entertained for future constructive service in
the advance of the human race.

Of our former ward, the Philippines, we can look forward in
certainty that the existing unrest will be corrected and a strong
and healthy nation will grow in the longer aftermath of war's
terrible destructiveness. We must be patient and understanding
and never fail them, as in our hour of need they did not fail us.
In a Christian nation, the Philippines stand as a mighty bulwark of
Christianity in the Far East, and its capacity for high moral
leadership in Asia is unlimited.

On Formosa, the government of the Republic of China has had
the opportunity to refute by action much of the malicious gossip
which so undermined the strength of its leadership on the Chinese
mainland. The Formosan people are receiving a just and enlightened
administration with majority representation on the organs of
government, and politically, economically and socially they appear
to be advancing along sound and constructive lines.

With this brief insight into the surrounding areas, I now
turn to the Korean conflict. While I was not consulted prior to
the President's decision to intervene in support of the Republic
of Korea, that decision, from a military standpoint, proved a sound
one as we hurled back the invader and decimated his forces. Our victory was complete and our objectives within reach when Red China intervened with numerically superior ground forces. This created a new war and an entirely new situation - a situation not contemplated when our forces were committed against the North Korean invaders - a situation which called for new decisions in the diplomatic sphere to permit the realistic adjustment of military strategy. Such decisions have not been forthcoming. While no man in his right mind would advocate sending our ground forces into continental China and such was never given a thought, the new situation did urgently demand a drastic revision of strategic planning if our political aim was to defeat this new enemy as we had defeated the old.

Apart from the military need as I saw it, to neutralize the sanctuary protection given the enemy north of the Yalu, I felt that military necessity in the conduct of the war made mandatory:

1. The intensification of our economic blockade against China;
2. The imposition of a naval blockade against the China coast;
3. Removal of restrictions on air reconnaissance of China's coastal areas and of Manchuria;
4. Removal of restrictions on the forces of the Republic of China on Formosa with logistical support to contribute to their effective operations against the common enemy.

For entertaining these views, all professionally designed to support our forces committed to Korea and bring hostilities to an end with the least possible delay and at a saving of countless American and
Allied lives, I have been severely criticized in lay circles, principally abroad, despite my understanding that from a military standpoint the above views have been fully shared in past by practically every military leader concerned with the Korean campaign, including our own Joint Chiefs of Staff.

I called for reinforcements, but was informed that reinforcements were not available. I made clear that if not permitted to destroy the enemy build-up bases north of the Yalu; if not permitted to utilize the friendly Chinese force of some six hundred thousand men on Formosa; if not permitted to blockade the China coast to prevent the Chinese Reds from getting succor from without; and if there were to be no hope of major reinforcements, the position of the command from the military standpoint forbade victory. We could hold in Korea by constant maneuver and at an approximate area where our supply line advantages were in balance with the supply line disadvantages of the enemy, but we could hope at best for only an indecisive campaign, with its terrible and constant attrition upon our forces if the enemy utilized his full military potential. I have constantly called for the new political decisions essential to a solution. Efforts have been made to distort my position. It has been said that I was in effect a warmonger. Nothing could be further from the truth. I know war as few other men now living know it, and nothing to me is more revolting. I have long advocated its complete abolition as its very destructiveness on both friend and foe has rendered it useless as a means of settling international disputes. Indeed, on the 2nd of September 1945, just following the surrender of the Japanese nation on the battleship
MISSOURI, I formally cautioned as follows:

"Men since the beginning of time have sought peace. Various methods through the ages have been attempted to devise an international process to prevent or settle disputes between nations. From the very start, workable methods were found insofar as individual citizens were concerned, but the mechanics of an instrumentality of larger international scope have never been successful. Military alliances, balances of power, Leagues of Nations, all in turn failed, leaving the only path to be by way of the crucible of war. The utter destructiveness of war now blots out this alternative. We have had our last chance. If we will not devise some greater and more equitable system, Armageddon will be at our door. The problem basically is theological and involves a spiritual rerudescence and improvement of human character that will synchronize with our almost matchless advances in science, art, literature and all material and cultural developments of the past two thousand years. It must be of the spirit if we are to save the flesh."

But once war is forced upon us, there is no other alternative than to apply every available means to bring it to a swift end. War's very object is victory - not prolonged indecision. In war, indeed, there can be no substitute for victory.
There are some who for varying reasons would appease Red China. They are blind to history's clear lesson. For history teaches with unmistakable emphasis that appeasement but begets new and bloodier war. It points to no single instance where the end has justified that means — where appeasement has led to more than a sham peace. Like blackmail, it lays the basis for new and successively greater demands, until, as in blackmail, violence becomes the only other alternative. Why, my soldiers asked of me, surrender military advantages to an enemy in the field? I could not answer. Some may say to avoid spread of the conflict into an all-out war with China; others, to avoid Soviet intervention. Neither explanation seems valid. For China is already engaging with the maximum power it can commit and the Soviet will not necessarily mesh its actions with our moves. Like a cobra, any new enemy will more likely strike whenever it feels that the relativity in military or other potential is in its favor on a world-wide basis.

The tragedy of Korea is further heightened by the fact that as military action is confined to its territorial limits, it condemns that nation, which it is our purpose to save, to suffer the devastating impact of full naval and air bombardment, while the enemy's sanctuaries are fully protected from such attack and devastation. Of the nations of the world, Korea alone, up to now,
is the sole one which has risked its all against Communism. The magnificence of the courage and fortitude of the Korean people defies description. They have chosen to risk death rather than slavery. Their last words to me were "Don't scuttle the Pacific."

I have just left your fighting sons in Korea. They have met all tests there and I can report to you without reservation they are splendid in every way. It was my constant effort to preserve them and end this savage conflict honorably and with the least loss of time and a minimum sacrifice of life. Its growing bloodshed has caused me the deepest anguish and anxiety. Those gallant men will remain often in my thoughts and in my prayers always.

I am closing my fifty-two years of military service. When I joined the Army even before the turn of the century, it was the fulfillment of all my boyish hopes and dreams. The world has turned over many times since I took the oath on the plain at West Point and the hopes and dreams have long since vanished. But I still remember the refrain of one of the most popular barrack ballads of that day which proclaimed most proudly that:

"Old soldiers never die - they just fade away."

And like the old soldier of that ballad, I now close my military career and just fade away - an old soldier who tried to do his duty as God gave him the light to see that duty.

Good-bye.
People Picketing the Use of Tax Dollars for the Development of Nuclear Weapons, March 15, 1950
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