

underbrush of myth, sloganeering and emotional catchwords that will otherwise keep us from reaching any wise solution to our Vietnam problem.

The most persistent myth of all is that the war in Vietnam is a do-or-die struggle with "world communism"—that if we falter in Southeast Asia, the balance of power in the world could shift heavily against us.

Why is this a myth?
What we are concerned with here is the reality of power—the ability of a nation to control or precipitate events beyond its own borders.

Among the Communist nations there are two great concentrations of power, the Soviet Union and Communist China. No American who has read his history will underestimate the hostility of these two power centers to the United States. This hostility is heavily documented by 50 years of words and acts. And today, if you talk to an American ambassador or intelligence agent in any part of the world, he will tell you that the local operatives of the Russians and Chinese, though they may not be on speaking terms, are vying with each other in the damage they can do to American influence and prestige.

POWER CENTERS UNTOUCHED

Any prudent American must therefore want his country to maintain its present margin of superiority—its deterrent capability—over these two hostile power centers, and particularly over the Soviet Union. So why should the United States stop snaiting the Communists in Vietnam?

It takes no special insight to see that, despite all we have done in Vietnam, we have left the two big hostile power centers completely untouched. For 16 years we have been helping the South Vietnamese with money and brains. For the past five years we ourselves have made appalling sacrifices in blood, money, prestige and internal peace and security. Yet for all this, we have yet to singe the whiskers of a single commissar in Moscow or Peking.

During these past five years our first team—the best of our fighting men—has been bogged down in a grinding struggle with what is not even the fourth team of the Communist side.

During these five years two presidents, with all the military and civilian brains at their command, have spent fretful days and sleepless nights, week after week, month after month, year after year, absorbed by this dirty little war. And during all this time the big rascals in Moscow and Peking have been sitting back comfortably and laughing at us.

During those same five years (as we shall see in a moment), the Soviet Union especially has been able to project its power and influence into parts of the world that really weigh heavily in the strategic balance—areas that are much more vital to the United States than South Vietnam. And the United States has suffered a disastrous—yes disastrous—loss of prestige and influence in those areas.

The net effect, then, of the Vietnam war to date on the world power situation has been to enhance the strength of the Communist side and weaken our own.

But suppose that the United States persists in Vietnam. Suppose that we go on fighting for another 10 years until the last little man in black pajamas has been run to earth. Won't that change the world equation?

A STRATEGIC BACKWATER

No, it will not. The centers of power in Moscow and Peking will remain untouched. And our resources will only be squandered further in what is no more than a strategic backwater.

Consequently, if we are really alarmed by the growth of Communist power in the

world, it would make much more sense to put our resources where they can count in the balance. We would do better, for example, to put \$10 billion into an anti-ballistic missile system that would help maintain our deterrent capability over the Soviet Union and Red China than to put another \$160 billion into Vietnam. (We could do even better by putting more money into our cities, schools, hospitals and anti-pollution programs, but we are only concerned at the moment with the power relationships outside our borders). Yet as long as we continue to waste our substance in Vietnam, Congress and the taxpayer will be reluctant to spend adequate amounts on our truly vital needs.

In sum, the continuance of the war in Vietnam is all gain for the Soviet Union and Communist China, all loss for the United States.

But other myths and catchwords persist. We are told, for example, that we cannot end this war in Vietnam short of military victory without losing our "national honor."

Certainly every American should be concerned about the honor of his country, so let us examine this argument.

American aid to Vietnam does not derive from a treaty negotiated between the two governments and solemnly ratified by the Senate. It all stems from a letter sent by President Eisenhower on October 24, 1954, to the late President Ngo Dinh Diem. In that letter President Eisenhower simply promised "assistance" to the government of South Vietnam; in return the United States expected South Vietnam to undertake "needed reforms."

Now, President Eisenhower's pledge of assistance did not mean that Americans would fight in Vietnam. In fact, no fighting men were sent for the next 10 years. The letter simply meant that the United States would send military and civilian advisers, war materials and economic and technical assistance.

On the Vietnamese side neither Mr. Diem nor any of his successors ever took the promised reforms seriously. To this day successive Vietnamese governments have done very little to build a solid base of support among their people.

THE 41,000 AMERICANS KILLED

On the American side, however, Mr. Eisenhower's promise has been fulfilled many thousand times over:

1. Forty-one thousand Americans have given their lives. Another 285,000 have been maimed or scarred. And hundreds of thousands more have interrupted their careers and left their homes and families to fight for a country from which we can never expect any material return or even gratitude.

2. The United States has spent \$100 billion in the war. And it is continuing to spend at the rate of nearly \$25 billion a year.

3. This vast expenditure has aggravated a ruinous inflation that eats up the earning power and savings of every family in America.

4. This same expenditure has deprived our schools, hospitals, welfare services and other programs of the funds they urgently need to meet the growing demands of our own people.

5. Our effort to help Vietnam has caused political and social strains such as this nation has not experienced in more than a century. It has set generation against generation. It has brought two presidents into a constitutional conflict with Congress. It has, indeed, ground up one President and now threatens to grind up another.

What more must we do? Clearly the "national honor" argument is a hollow one, and no responsible American should give it currency.

Still, we are told, if we leave Vietnam without "victory" our allies will never trust us again.

CR

THE WAR IN INDOCHINA

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, recently the Baltimore Sun published a perceptive and eloquent article, written by Wallace Carroll, about the war in Indochina.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

INDOCHINA STRIFE HAS WARPED OUR IDEALS, LET REDS INTO MIDDLE EAST
(By Wallace Carroll)

For 16 years we Americans have been trying to save South Vietnam. Now it is time to save the United States of America.

All wars confuse, and the war in Vietnam has confused our minds and purposes more than most. But if we stand back a moment and ignore the angry clamor at home and abroad, we should be able to establish two useful truths:

1. The United States is not losing the war in Vietnam.

2. What we are losing is something more serious than the loss of any war or territory. It is the soul of America that is being lost in Vietnam.

It is time for us to save the soul of America.

This fixes our purpose. Now what must we do? Let us begin by cutting through the

If we are honest with ourselves, we must admit that withdrawal from Vietnam would make shake our allies in that part of the world—particularly Thailand, Nationalist China and the Philippines.

But alliances must be based on realities, and the leaders of these countries must face the reality that the United States will never again fight anyone's battles the way it has fought the battles of South Vietnam.

Our withdrawal would therefore give the governments of these allies a healthy and needed jolt. It would tell them, in effect, to hitch up their britches, make the kind of reforms that the Vietnamese have failed to make, win the confidence of their people and be solved to fight their own battles against internal and external enemies.

MORE POTENT ALLIES

Given such energetic measures of self-help these governments might then expect advice, military supplies, economic assistance and only such additional help as a touchy Congress would be willing to give under our constitutional procedures.

But there are other more potent allies, notably in Western Europe. There we find the second great power concentration of the non-Communist world. In this power complex, symbolized by the NATO alliance, our obsession with Vietnam and our neglect of Europe have been resented and deplored by the civil and military leaders.

In this area, which is the prime battleground of the Cold War, our withdrawal from Vietnam would bring one spontaneous cheer: "Thank God the Americans have come to their senses."

On balance, then, our alliances would be strengthened and our leadership enhanced by withdrawal from Vietnam.

There remains one of the most hoary and seductive catchwords of the lot—"the falling domino theory." If South Vietnam falls to communism (so the theory goes), Laos, Cambodia, Thailand and Malaysia will inevitably follow.

Let us assume for the sake of argument that this theory is 100 per cent correct—that all these nations will slip into the embrace of their big neighbor, Communist China.

What would be the effect on the world power equation?

Power in the modern world is determined largely by industrial production and technological skills. A rough index to this kind of power is a nation's gross national product—its annual output of goods and services.

The World Bank puts the gross national product of South Vietnam at a little less than \$2 billion. For purposes of comparison, the output of goods and services in the state of North Carolina is about \$19 billion.

(The gross national product of Maryland in 1969 was \$16.3 billion.)

The output of South Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Thailand and Malaysia combined is barely \$11 billion. Compare this with little Belgium, which alone has a gross national product of about \$22 billion.

It follows that if these five Asian countries joined up with China lock, stock and bean-sprouts, the effect on the world balance would be negligible.

As we know too well, the people of these countries can make life miserable for an intruder. But for the rest of this century they will not be able to project power—military, economic or political—beyond their borders in ways that might shape events in the world.

There is one part of the world, however, where the domino theory is working with ominous accuracy—and working relentlessly against us. This area is not a strategic backwater, an economic cipher, like Southeast Asia; it is an area of prime strategic importance in the world power equation.

MIDEAST A KEY AREA

The land, sea and air communications of three continents and the oil pipelines that feed an even wider area traverse the Middle East.

This region now leads the world in oil production. The output of countries bordering on the Persian Gulf alone is 10 million barrels a day compared with 2.8 million barrels in the United States.

This oil is wealth and power. The U.S. forces in Southeast Asia run on Persian Gulf oil. So do the U.S. and NATO forces in Western Europe. For the latter reason, the Persian Gulf has been called the eastern flank of the NATO alliance.

In addition, Western Europe gets three-fourths of its non-military oil supplies from the gulf. And Persian Gulf oil flows eastward to fuel the economy of Japan, the second leading industrial power of the non-Communist world, as well as Australia, New Zealand and most of the countries of South Asia.

It follows that any serious interruption of the oil flow from this region could cause economic disruption from London to Tokyo and hamper the military operations of the United States and its allies from Britain to the Sea of Japan.

With this background, let us see what has happened since the United States decided that everything must be sacrificed to Vietnam. The map shows how the dominoes have fallen.

Start with Iraq on the eastern bank of the Arab world. Iraq is rich in oil and it leads to the still richer oil-producing sheikdoms of the Persian Gulf. (Bear in mind that for more than a century, czars and commissars have schemed to gain access to the gulf.) Iraq, like most of other Arab countries, has broken diplomatic relations with the United States. Its government is fanatically anti-American and up to its neck in Soviet advisers. Its armed forces are equipped and trained by the Soviet Union.

To the west, commanding an important stretch of the eastern Mediterranean, is Syria. Same story here. The government is saturated with Soviet influence, the armed forces equipped and trained by the Russians.

IN HOCK TO RUSSIA

Now jump to the United Arab Republic on the southern shore of the Mediterranean. Here is a country in hock to the Soviet Union. There are now said to be as many as 10,000 Soviet "advisers" in that country. Among them are more than 100 Soviet fighter pilots.

Next to the west is Libya. Only a year ago its government was pro-Western. Now a new military dictatorship, like those in other Arab countries, is flirting ominously with Egypt and the Russians. The British have been forced out of their bases at Tobruk and El Adem; the United States is being forced to withdraw from Wheelus Air Force Base, our last remaining military installation in the Middle East.

Farther to the west (skipping Tunisia, which remains friendly to the U.S.) is Algeria. Its government is so close to the Soviet Union that it permitted only Russian accounts of the invasion of Czechoslovakia to be published in 1969. The armed forces are trained and equipped by the Russians.

Let us pause here in our map-reading long enough to make a point. If anyone thinks these vast Soviet investments in the United Arab Republic and other Arab countries are aimed against Israel, he should have his head examined. They are aimed against us—against us and our allies.

For more than a hundred years the British kept the Russians out of the Mediterranean. Only five years ago this vast sea was an American lake. Now most of the eastern and southern littoral are dyed a deep pink. A

Soviet fleet sails the blue waters, urging for us to join and French naval bases that are denied to the American Navy.

The Russians are well on their way to achieving their strategic objective: to make it impossible for American sea and air power to operate in this area and to destroy American political influence as well.

Now look at the Red Sea, the link between the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean when the Suez Canal is open. The Red Sea is becoming a very red sea indeed. On the western shore are the United Arab Republic and the Sudan. The latter, like the United Arab Republic, has a pro-Soviet government and Soviet-trained armed forces. On the eastern shore, commanding the narrow entrance to the Red Sea from the Indian Ocean, are the South Yemen Republic and Yemen. Both are armed by the Russians and are overrun with Soviet advisers.

Just to sew things up, the Soviets have equipped and trained the armed forces of Somalia, which stands on the peninsula where Africa juts out to form the Gulf of Aden.

There remains the Persian Gulf itself. For more than a century, the British, who were masters there, would not let a Russian poke his nose into these sheikdoms. But now the British are leaving—their small air, ground and naval forces will be entirely out of the gulf next year.

"COURTESY CALLS"

Already the Russians have sent warships on "courtesy calls" to the gulf ports.

When the Suez Canal is again open, Soviet vessels from the Black Sea will be able to sail down the Red Sea to Aden, the old British base which the obliging South Yemen government has made available to them. From Aden they will be able to patrol the Persian Gulf at will.

All of this Soviet maneuvering, from the Persian Gulf to the Straits of Gibraltar, snakes up the boldest power play of the entire Cold War (which has not come to an end, by the way, no matter what some of our eminent scholars may say).

If this power play succeeds—and it is far on its way to success—the Soviet Union will be able at a given moment to slow down industry from Western Europe to Japan and put a crimp in the military operations of the United States and its NATO partners.

The Middle East is the worst example of what has happened to American interests since we made Vietnam the be-all and end-all of our foreign and domestic policies. There are other regions, notably Western Europe, where American interests have also suffered from similar neglect. But let us move now to the home front. And again let us confine our discussion to one area—the effects of the war in Vietnam on the soul and character of this nation.

We can begin with some ancient wisdom from the Bible. The second book of Chronicles tells the story of Amaziah, a young king of Judah whose reign promised well until he set off on a foreign war. In a battle with the Edomites, Amaziah's army killed 10,000 of the enemy and took 10,000 prisoners. By Amaziah's orders these prisoners were hurled over a cliff to their death. Then the young king brought home with him the gods of his enemies and set them up and worshipped them. This was the beginning of the end of Amaziah.

NO REAL PEACE

We Americans have fought three wars in less than 30 years and we have known no real peace in between. And from each of these wars we have brought back the gods of our enemies—the gods of violence and terror. We were repelled, of course, by the bestial cruelty of Hitler's Nazis, the Japanese militarists and the North Korean Communists. But as we

June 4, 1970

fought fire with fire we learned ways of war that would have appalled the soldiers of the Eighteenth, Nineteenth and early Twentieth Centuries.

All of these new and hideous forms of violence and cruelty were brought out of our arsenal in Vietnam.

Heaven knows we Americans did not introduce cruelty to Southeast Asia. Here, in fact, we met an enemy who was—if possible—even more fiendish than the Nazis. But again we let his gods become our gods—his standards our standards.

We ordered our American boys, who had been brought up to believe in justice and mercy and love of their fellowmen, to sow the land with napalm, a hellish kind of liquid fire that spared no one, no matter how innocent or unoffending.

We set up "free fire zones" and ordered our troops to shoot anything that moved. We set fire to the thatched villages of the miserable people we had come to save. If we did not torture and butcher prisoners ourselves, we stood and watched while our allies did it for us. We dabbled in the hideous arts of assassination. We sprayed the fields and forests with chemicals that wipe out the livelihoods of no one knows how many people and left side effects that may continue for generations.

A few weeks ago we saw on our television sets an American soldier known as "Killer." And why was he called "Killer"? Because he loved to kill "Gooks." How many "Killers" will come home from Vietnam, and what will happen when they re-enter the lifestream of the nation?

The horrible truth is that we have done things in Vietnam that would have made General Sherman retch.

"TREMBLE FOR MY COUNTRY"

"Indeed," wrote Thomas Jefferson in the days of America's innocence, "Indeed, I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just."

But nobody trembled for America this time. Nobody, that is, except our young people.

When we talk about young people, let us shunt aside the Jerry Rubins, Abbie Hoffmans, Mark Rudds and all the other scruffy hoodlums who have tried to capture and pervert the idealism of a generation.

The young we have in mind are the millions of sober, serious, hard-working students who have not been hurling rocks or burning down libraries. Anyone who has talked to these idealistic young men and women in recent years must have been struck by the kind of sadness that hangs over them like the mist on an upland meadow. These young people are sad with the sadness of impending doom.

They have seen the United States—this country they were taught to love—go to war with every kind of violence and savagery against the people of a far-away land. They have become conscious of what this violence and savagery have been doing to the American character. And they have become increasingly fearful that the "American system" has gone off the tracks and is lurching headlong toward doomsday.

For their entire generation they can see only a fiery end in the ultimate madness of a nuclear war.

For more than five years these students—the serious and idealistic ones—have been trying to tell their elders of their fears. They started out quietly, seeking to show us that the war in Vietnam was wrong—morally wrong and wrong in every other way because it could only end in futility. They tried to tell us that the war was destroying the soul of America—that, like any moral wrong, it was hurting the perpetrators more than it was hurting the victims.

But nobody would listen—nobody, that is, but a few senators, like Eugene McCarthy and Robert Kennedy.

The young rallied to these leaders and tried to make their point through the open and legitimate ways of our political system. They left the campuses and went to work for the candidates who were willing to stand for an end to the war.

VIETNAM OF VIOLENCE

In this effort of political persuasion they were largely unsuccessful, and the leader who might have won for them became a victim of violence (like his brother before him).

Still, the young did not give up. After a time they resumed their rallies, their petitions, their letter-writing to the politicians, their debates and discussions. But as the nation continued, unheeding, on its course, something ugly happened.

It was the supreme irony of the student peace movement that many of the students who were revolted by the violence in Vietnam began to condone violence at home—anything that would make "the system" listen.

And this violence of the young brought the inevitable reaction. The killing of students on university campuses and the assault of an organized mob on a peace march in New York City were ominous enough. But even more disturbing was the cry of exultation over these bloody events that went up across the nation and the clamor for more student blood from supposedly civilized Americans.

If we of the older generation can overlook the students' excesses for a moment and try to be honest with ourselves, we will have to admit that these young people were right about the war when we were wrong.

These young men and women saw the folly and futility of this war and they sensed that it was poisoning the bloodstream of the nation. They saw the futility of the war long before President Johnson (who recognized it only tacitly and reluctantly in March, 1968) and well before President Nixon (who conceded it even later).

But if we still refuse to give these young people their due, let us imagine that their reaction to the war had taken the opposite course.

Suppose that when the recruiters for the napalm company came to the campus, the students had vied for those well-paid jobs in the chemical industry.

Suppose that they had shouted at their rallies: "Pour it on. Burn the mothers, scorch the children, destroy the villages, slaughter the prisoners, drop the atom bomb!"

If we had raised such a generation of fiends, would we be better pleased with them? And would the future of our country be the brighter for it?

Every consideration of internal health as well as the standing of the United States in the world thus points to the unmistakable lesson: We must get out of Vietnam.

We must get out, out, out! We must get out fast, fast, fast.

President Nixon has started the withdrawal of our fighting men. For that he should get full credit. The aim of every conscientious citizen should be to keep him on this course and to get him to move faster.

There are many citizens, no doubt, who distrust Mr. Nixon. But they might remember this: He is the only President we have, and he is by far the best President we can possibly have until January, 1973.

We should therefore rally round him when he does the right thing and let him know our displeasure when he goes off course. If he speeds withdrawals, we should applaud him. If he goes astray, as he did in Cambodia, we should let him know that we do not like it.

DISREGARD DEMAGOGUES

And when the super-patriots and jingos start abusing him with cries of "Treason" and "Betrayal" we should let him know that

the same people of this country, who are still a majority, are right behind him. As a matter of fact, the same people can try a little fingerism of their own: Do we stand for Vietnam First or America First?

We should also support and applaud those political leaders of either party who work to speed the end of this dirty war.

We can do all this in the healthy ways open to the people of a democracy—by letters to the President himself and to other political leaders; by visits to senators and congressmen; by petitions, and by orderly rallies and demonstrations.

Finally, every conscientious citizen should close his ears to the demagogues and ranters who would try to divide us, generation against generation, black against white, region against region.

With the nation proceeding on this course toward peace, we should come down hard on the practitioners of violence. The essence of statesmanship is to identify a source trouble, correct it, then punish those who still try to exploit it. Anyone who troubles the peace of our cities, campuses or countryside should be met with the awesome severity of the law.

There remains a hard, practical question: How soon can we "decently" get out of Vietnam?

ANOTHER 10 YEARS

A high official of the State Department recently told a Senate committee that some U.S. forces would have to stay there for another 10 years.

Of all the foolish assumptions that have been made since this bloody mess began, this one is the most outrageous.

We now realize that we should never have put an army into Vietnam.

We know that as long as we keep an army there we shall risk new Cambodias, new temptations to bomb hither and thither, new massacres, new deceptions.

And we know that as long as Americans keep dying in Vietnam the home front will never be at peace.

This is a prospect that we cannot tolerate. We have done our best to save Vietnam. Now it is time to save America.

Melvin R. Laird, Secretary of Defense, has said that American units will no longer be needed in ground combat after the middle of 1971. Why can't we do better than that and aim to get all American units out of Vietnam by that date?

If that should prove to be logistically impossible, we must set the end of 1971 as the absolute deadline for every unit to be out.

By that time 17 years will have passed since we started out to help the Vietnamese to help themselves. If the Vietnamese cannot stand on their own feet after 17 years of our tutelage, it means either that they lack the will to learn or that we lack the skill to teach.

Yes, it is time to come home. It is time to bind up the nation's wounds. And it is time for the best of our youth and the best of their elders to sit down together and agree on what they want this America of ours to be.

For when this nation is again at peace with itself nothing in the world will be impossible.

THE NEWS MEDIA

Mr. DOLE, Mr. President, the news media in the United States has long been recognized as an important force for molding public opinion. And in recent months, this power has been under much discussion in the Nation.

Fortunately, in our country we have a number of sources of information aside from the news media. Often we may learn