

TE November 19, 1970

A151
FILE SUBJ.
DATE SUB-CAT.
11/70

CR

VIETNAMIZATION IS NOT PEACE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, for some years I have expressed opposition on the floor of the Senate with regard to our involvement in Southeast Asia. Of late, the concern of men like myself has been more muted because the level of violence has been reduced.

Nevertheless, I continue to believe that any policy to expand the area of the war in Indochina or a definite commitment of a residual force in Indochina is not in accord with our best interests.

In this regard, I read an excellent article by Mr. Maynard Parker, who has been the Newsweek bureau chief in Saigon. I thought that his personal assessment on the prospect of peace in Indochina might be of interest to Senators, so I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Newsweek, Nov. 23, 1970]

VIETNAMIZATION IS NOT PEACE

(By Maynard Parker)

Until recently, when he was reassigned to Hong Kong, Maynard Parker was Newsweek's bureau chief in Saigon. After eighteen months of reporting both the political and military aspects of the Vietnamese war, Parker filed this personal assessment on the prospects for peace in Indochina:

Last year, when I stopped in Paris en route to Saigon, the talk was not whether there would be peace, but how soon it would come. Even in Saigon, there was a feeling that peace was a few months away. South Vietnamese politicians gossiped about who might be included in a coalition peace Cabinet, and in the countryside, U.S. advisers discussed which villages would hoist the NLF flag on ceasefire day. But today, no one in Vietnam thinks there will be peace this year or even this decade.

Personally, I am convinced that hundreds—perhaps several thousand—more Americans will die before the U.S. has extricated itself from this war. For in retrospect, it is questionable whether either side went to Paris prepared to negotiate anything but a veiled surrender by the other side. The essential question of the war has always been who will emerge with power in Saigon, and on that question neither side has been willing to make significant concessions. Certainly, the Communists have not. Neither has President Nixon—for fear of placing the Thieu government in an impossible position of military and political inferiority. As President Thieu himself told a group of visitors a few months ago: "I'm too weak to cooperate in an accommodation with the Communists."

Now after a string of military successes, Thieu is telling his countrymen just the opposite—that South Vietnam is too strong to compromise with the other side. Only President Nixon could have broken this impasse by forcing Thieu to make peace. In choosing not to do that in the first days of his term, Mr. Nixon almost by default has opted for a

long war and a continued American involvement under his Vietnamization policy. A diplomat whom I know in Saigon is now offering to bet a case of champagne that there will be 50,000 U.S. troops in Vietnam in 1980. I would not bet against him.

For far from staging a great retreat from Vietnam or Asia, I think Mr. Nixon is in Vietnam to stay. Vietnamization will permit substantial American withdrawals, but it is not a withdrawal strategy. The basic American objective of winning the war has remained unchanged. Deputy Ambassador Samuel Berger, holding forth at a Saigon dinner party, once told me: "The American people are not like the French. They aren't losers; they don't want to go out of here defeated and we're not going to." And that kind of thinking prevails among U.S. officials in Vietnam. While paying lip service to the Paris talks, these officials are rosiely predicting that the war will simply die out—in a way which will amount to a U.S. victory. The enemy, in this view, will eventually fade away, except for what Deputy Ambassador William Colby, one of the architects of the extraordinarily successful U.S. pacification program, calls "a residual level of violence." What is always left out of these predictions, however, is the fact that such a level will require a million-man South Vietnamese army and thousands of American troops.

American officials in Washington hint that the President will have all U.S. troops out of a combat role by next summer. But U.S. military commanders in Saigon are planning to keep at least two U.S. divisions plus supporting units in enclaves—one in the Saigon-Long Binh area and another in the Da Nang-Hue area—for the indefinite future. Mr. Nixon will no doubt call these men security forces instead of combat troops, but whatever the semantics, they will be employed in a combat role as a reaction force to ball the ARVN out of any possible trouble.

It seems to me that this policy entails enormous risks. It is not just that there will be an undeniable physical danger to the U.S. troops left behind in the enclaves. The Vietnamese Communists are not simply going to fade away—not as long as they are respected in the south as the heirs of Vietnam's nationalistic traditions and not as long as the Chinese continue to supply them. And as the war drags on, it will become more dangerous for the United States in certain respects. Not only do we risk an ever-higher penalty in terms of lost prestige for any eventual defeat, but there is the danger of the war spreading even further. Cambodia has already been drawn into the general conflagration. And further escalation—a thrust across the Latotian panchandle or even limited bombing of North Vietnam—should not be ruled out, particularly if Mr. Nixon wins a second term and feels freer than he does now of the constraints of public opinion.

What then is an alternative solution? The only answer possible at this late date seems to be for the U.S. to announce a deadline for the withdrawal of all U.S. troops. I do not suggest that the U.S. should accept the NLF's timetable or even those put forth by various Congressional critics of the Administration. Rather, the Administration should choose a deadline such as Christmas 1972 or even Christmas 1973—a deadline which would shock the South Vietnamese into the realization that the Americans really are leaving the country.

I do not think it fair to suggest, as Ambassador Bunker has often done, that by pulling out in such a fashion the United States would be welsing on its commitment to the Vietnamese and that Washington's word would no longer be worth anything to its allies. The U.S. commitment to Vietnam was never meant to be open-ended. The United States has stopped the enemy from taking over; it has introduced Viet-

namization to enable the South Vietnamese to defend themselves; and it has introduced a semi-democratic, constitutional government in the process.

Nor do I agree that setting such a deadline would mean abandoning the South Vietnamese to disaster. The military situation in South Vietnam has now progressed to the point where a military take-over by the Communists is no longer a real possibility—not at least in the next two or three years. If the South Vietnamese, with a million-man army and with one of the world's largest air forces, cannot defend themselves within a year or two years' time, then there is very little reason to think they ever will be ready to stand alone.

DUTIES OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, recently Vice President AGNEW has been criticized by a few newspaper columnists and some of our colleagues for an alleged failure to perform properly his duties as Presiding Officer of the Senate. This criticism came during the course of the recent political campaign and can be dismissed as a part of that campaign. Nevertheless, I have checked to see whether that criticism was, in any way, warranted.

The duties and responsibilities of the Vice President as Presiding Officer of the Senate are quite clear. In his definitive work entitled "The American Vice Presidency: New Look," Prof. Irving G. Williams enumerates 15 responsibilities which, under the Rules of the Senate, are assigned to the Vice President as Presiding Officer. He also lists two additional prerogatives which are not rules of the Senate but have passed to the Vice President through custom and usage. These are the distribution of introduced measures to the proper committees and the power to make committee appointments and fill vacancies therein if the Senate—or Congress—has not otherwise determined.

It is significant that Professor Williams says of these responsibilities:

These are all the typical functions and prerogatives of chairmen of assemblies, and for most purposes, it matters little whether the Vice President is in the chair or not, since any competent Senator can (and periodically does) fulfill the presiding officer's duties.

In fact, Professor Williams points out that:

The Founding Fathers never intended to immobilize the second officer in the chair of the Senate, for they empowered that body to choose "a President pro tempore, in the absence of the Vice President . . ."

I am sure that Senators will agree with Professor Williams' assessment that the Senate can and does and always has been able to function under normal, routine conditions without the presence of the Vice President. Since his function in the Senate is so readily transferable, the question is then raised whether the Vice President is bound, either by the Constitution or historical precedent, to spend the major portion of his time on the affairs of the Senate.

Unfortunately, the Constitution is not entirely clear in regard to the role of the Vice President. While it assigns specific functions in the legislative branch to the

Vice President under article I, section 3, nowhere does it specifically assign or forbid him functions in the executive branch.

However, in 1950, Congress, under 64 Statute 419, 3 USC 301-303, specifically empowered the President to delegate to officials of the executive branch functions which had been invested in him by law, if the law did not expressly forbid such delegation. Thus, there is no bar, either from a constitutional or statutory view, against the President transferring duties in the executive branch to the Vice President.

On the remaining question of historical precedents, it should be noted that John Adams, the first Vice President, played perhaps a larger role in the affairs of the Senate than any of his predecessors. This was due in large part to the smaller membership of the Senate and the necessity for often casting the deciding vote. As the Senate increased in membership and rules and procedures were established, the leadership role of the first Vice President declined, and it has not been reasserted by any of his predecessors.

Indeed, since John Adams, the office of the Vice President has been in a state of relative flux. The posture of the Vice President in each succeeding administration has seemed to depend more on the inclinations and abilities of the individual President and Vice President rather than on any formalized rules.

In our century, students of government generally mark the administration of Franklin Roosevelt as the beginning of an activist role for the Vice President in the executive branch which has continued through today. Roosevelt delegated significant powers to his Vice Presidents, particularly in 1941, when Vice President Wallace was given broad authority to develop and coordinate economic defense policy.

In 1949, a further extension of the Vice President's functions in the executive branch was accomplished when Congress, at the request of President Truman, made the Vice President a statutory member of the National Security Council.

This trend toward activism was solidified during the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration when Vice President Nixon was assigned a wide-ranging role in both domestic and foreign affairs. He presided at Cabinet meetings and meetings of the National Security Council in the absence of the President, served as Chairman of the President's Committee on Government Contracts, handled numerous political chores for the President and traveled extensively abroad as a foreign policy spokesman for the administration.

In light of Mr. Nixon's own activist role in the Vice-Presidency, it is hardly surprising that he would encourage his own Vice President to undertake a similar role in this administration.

Mr. President, I would suggest that this trend is in the national interest and should be encouraged by Congress, rather than disparaged. It would be folly for the Senate to attempt to shackle the

Vice President to a mechanical function as its Presiding Officer; the more so when there is no constitutional basis for such action and the historical trend is in exactly the opposite direction.

It is somewhat ironic that the delegates to the Constitutional Convention of 1787 were concerned that the Vice President's role as Presiding Officers of the Senate would endanger the separation of powers. After almost two centuries those fears have proved groundless—but they do point out that questions of this sort are not to be taken lightly.

Today, the strains of national leadership are such that the Vice President's experience and expertise can be used to better advantage in the executive branch. It is of critical importance to our Nation that he be fully prepared to assume the burdens of the Presidency at any time. If we are to deliberate on the functions of the Vice President, let the debate center on our national interest—not partisan politics.

Many Senators will not agree with the Vice President's political activities. Under our system of government, they have the privilege and the responsibility to disagree publicly with the Vice President on that basis. However, as I have tried to show today, there is no justification for heavy-handed political attacks on the Vice President based upon a tenuous responsibility to the Senate.

I trust that the Vice President of the United States will always be welcome in this Chamber. He has a legitimate and useful function here. But when he is called by other responsibilities, he should not be the subject of criticism by Senators or by unknowledgeable or unfriendly members of the news media.

MOST VALUABLE PLAYER AWARD BY NATIONAL LEAGUE TO JOHNNY BENCH, CINCINNATI REDS

Mr. BELLMON. Mr. President, baseball's highest honor was awarded yesterday to an outstanding young Oklahoman when the National League's most valuable player award for 1970 was presented to Johnny Bench, of Binger, Okla. The award recognizes the great record the 22-year-old catcher has compiled with the Cincinnati Reds.

His accomplishments during his brief career in professional baseball are no less than spectacular. He was rookie of the year in 1968, the major league's No. 1 catcher in 1969, and this year he led the majors in home runs with 45 and runs batted in with 148 while leading Cincinnati to the National League pennant. Johnny's record was impressive enough to win 22 of the 24 first-place votes in the balloting by the Baseball Writers Association of America.

As an Oklahoman, I share the pride that all citizens of our State feel when a native son is so honored. But the selection of Johnny Bench for this award has an even greater significance for me and for all Americans.

For one thing, this honor is a tribute to youth, because Johnny Bench is the youngest player ever to win a Most Valu-

able Player Award. In these times when so many adults tend to look down on young people, Johnny Bench has given Americans something to look up to.

In another way, this honor is a tribute to America's smaller communities. Johnny's home town is Binger, Okla., population 719. Located in Caddo County in the heart of Oklahoma's peanut-raising country. Johnny started playing baseball on the sandlots of Binger and the nearby county seat, Anadarko.

Some of you may recall that another of our all-time baseball greats, Mickey Mantle, also grew up in a small town, the community of Commerce in northeastern Oklahoma. Mantle won the Most Valuable Player Award three times.

Two other Oklahomans also have won the MVP, and both were also from small towns. Pittsburgh outfielder Paul Waner of Harrah won in 1927 and New York Giant pitcher Carl Hubbell of Meeker won in 1933.

Rural America has made many great contributions to the continuing development of this Nation. Some of the finest people anywhere live in our smaller cities and towns. We must not allow these communities to disappear from the American scene.

The honor accorded Johnny Bench is well deserved. It is a tribute to the man, to the country, and to the State in which he grew up, and to the great sport of baseball.

INAUGURAL OF SISTER M. ANNE JOHN, O.P., AS PRESIDENT OF CALDWELL COLLEGE

Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. President, it was my privilege to attend the inaugural of Sister M. Anne John, O.P., as president of Caldwell College of New Jersey on September 27, 1970.

She is a very talented and dedicated young woman, and her talents and dedication were made evident in her inaugural address "Liberal Arts and Liberation."

Because her words bear reading and study by young women, I ask unanimous consent that her address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIBERAL ARTS AND LIBERATION

(Address by Sister M. Anne John, O.P.)

It is with great trepidation that I stand here today sealed to an office that asks the impossible. Can any college president look out at an audience and expect to have answers for all the questions coming through to him on E.S.P. waves? This time last year, I might have stood here expecting to find answers. Today I know better, for I have been a year in the position of seeking and not finding. And yet, I know now, a little more, what it is I am seeking.

This summer a young man asked me, when he heard of today's inauguration, if last year had been a dry run. I laughed at the time, but the more I thought about it, the truer it seemed. But then, too, maybe the Board was trying to find out if I would survive the strain. Actually, I am glad to have a year behind me before I try to explain my thoughts and ideas on higher education and particularly Caldwell College's place in that rare air.

The theme of this address is liberal arts and liberation, chosen because it seems to me that liberation is the whole purpose of education, and education with a liberal arts foundation is the means by which liberation can be achieved.

In this day of agitation for the liberation of women, when I choose to speak on that subject, naturally, you'll want to know if I'm a liberationist. Of course I am! However, I must go on record as objecting strongly to the extreme methods used by certain segments of the female population in advancing their cause. I fear that for every step forward bulldozed through by the extremists, they actually cause the movement to fall back two steps. And yet, I am definitely for women's liberation. This is a women's college; and Caldwell College is dedicated to the liberation of the minds of women. What higher form of liberation can I espouse?

We seek liberation from ignorance, from superstition, liberation from mass-hypnosis, from mass-hysteria, liberation from misconceptions, from stereotyping, liberation from confinement in thought, from pre-digested ideas, liberation from the fear of being different, from the fear of probing the unknown. We seek to afford such freedom through a liberal arts education which, if it is what it proclaims to be, must liberate the mind to think, to probe, to compare, to challenge, and to find reasons in the purity of knowledge which discovers truth through honest seeking.

To seek truth today can be a hazardous quest. It can be so much easier to settle for expediency or relevancy. But today I do not think we can settle for less than the quest for absolute truth. If we settle for the pragmatic answer we have only gone half way and if we permit our students to seek answers for the immediate, how do we prepare them for the future?

Caldwell is a liberal arts college committed and dedicated to the education of women, but it is more than that—Caldwell is a Catholic college and education for us has a dual purpose. We must prepare the student to take her place in the modern city and in the "City of God". Our college was founded to educate young women who wish a liberal education in a women's college and in a Catholic framework. While I am president, I shall do all in my power to see that Caldwell College remains a women's college, a Catholic college, and a college of excellence.

I firmly believe that Caldwell should remain a women's college because higher education owes the student the right to decide what type of college she would attend. If we all go co-ed what choice does the student have? I also firmly believe that a women's college offers the student an atmosphere for study she can find nowhere else, it offers her an opportunity to express herself without concern about what the men in the class might think of her ideas. The only man she has to impress is her professor. A women's college challenges the student to accept leadership. She must formulate her own ideas, she must learn to express an opinion, she must learn to stand up to authority when she has cause to do so, and do it all herself. If such practice does not create women leaders we will never create them.

Caldwell will also remain a Catholic College. The American tradition in higher education is one of church-related colleges. In the early history the purpose was ministerial; in the nineteenth century the purpose was missionary work and proselytizing; in the twentieth century many lost their identities because they had lost their purpose. Caldwell has never been a college for the ministry, the missioner nor for the purpose of seeking converts. Caldwell was and is a college where religion is recognized as an integral part

of life and it is studied both in its historical aspects and in its theological aspects with a strengthening of faith through knowledge. One can come to Caldwell and never take a course in Catholicism but one cannot avoid the Catholic atmosphere on the campus.

Caldwell will also continue on its course of excellence. We do not pretend to offer everything here that you will find at other colleges. We do not intend to try to be all things to all men—or should I say women. We do intend to remain an undergraduate college, building on our strengths, strengthening our weaknesses, and offering the best undergraduate programs in our power. We may never be known for our break-through in research, but we shall continue to be known for break-throughs into the minds of young people who are searching. We can not do less in this age of information explosions.

If higher education can hold its students to dealing with information explosions it will, in the 1970's, have brought its students through dangerous times. That the world of higher education is in turmoil, no one denies, that we still will face more of the same we must realize for the signs of the past are still with us.

Why have so many students turned to violence, why have so many learned to mouth cliches, why have so many been led by so few? Is it because we have taught them to follow-the-leader without thinking? Is it because we have not taught them to question and probe for honest answers? Or on the other hand, have we decided that just because they are young, they have all the answers? Can we as educators capitulate and forget that we owe them our knowledge, guidance, and in some instances our authority? If we abrogate our responsibility can we expect our students to honor theirs?

Somewhere, we have failed them! I look at a generation who professes love as a prime motive—and throws rocks; I look at a generation who hates war—but incites riot; at a generation who fears a military machine—but who burns down our hope of a civilian officer corps. I fear this lack of thought, this drive to do before setting sights or logically concluding the end results. But lately I have glimpsed an exorcism of this aberration in the intelligent body of students. And while I don't doubt the extremists will continue their vile acts I seem to sense a regrouping toward sanity and reason among most of our students.

I have great faith and trust in these young people for I look at my own student body and see the potential bottled up, waiting to be released, straining to make tomorrow better than yesterday. They still come to us seeking knowledge, seeking help in the development of minds stretching toward new horizons. Can we object when they tell us what they want; can we object when they seek a change of curriculum to make a course more pertinent to their needs rather than to ours? Can we train them to think and then object because they do?

We must prepare these young people for a technological society and yet what they learn today may be obsolete tomorrow. We must also prepare them for a civilized world and so, we will teach them to take what happened yesterday and build on it for the future. This is the aim of a liberal arts education.

The liberation which such an education provides is the freedom from domination by the past, but the recognition of the past as a foundation for the future. Such an education may teach "How" something is done but it will surely teach "Why" something is done. We are educating our students to take their place in a cultural milieu not just in a technological society. We must educate them to become creative concerned citizens of a world which definitely needs their "know-how" but *desperately* needs to "know-why".