

Propaganda

- 1 -

Now let's take a look at our extensive resort to propaganda as a weapon in the Vietnam war. Every ten days or so, the Administration arranges for a prominent figure from the United States to turn up in Saigon. The rash of resultant headlines is intended to encourage the people of South Vietnam to allegiance to the Thieu-Ky-Khiem government and, at the same time, to convince the American public that we are making significant military progress in Vietnam.

These publicity gimmicks have backfired more than once. Vice President Agnew's pep talks to the troops may have succeeded in bolstering their morale and that of the folks back home. Vietnam, South and North, as well as the rest of the world must have concluded, however, that there is serious unrest among our soldiers.

Many of the interviews and speeches of people in Washington are intended for home consumption. They endeavor to justify our cause and induce domestic support of the war. When this propaganda appears in the press of the world outside, west as well as east, it takes on a different meaning. The Hanoi government closely monitors the news media, and carefully studies the complete texts of statements by Americans in high places.

Speaking of propaganda, I would be interested to know how many of you have actually read Sir Robert Thompson's No Exit from Vietnam? This is the 200-page report to which President Nixon pointed not long ago

Propaganda

- 2 -

as endorsing our course in Vietnam. Thompson qualifies neither as a military expert nor as a specialist in foreign affairs. Counter-insurgency of the cloak-and-dagger variety seems to be his forte.

Thompson devotes his first 190 pages to a catalogue of the grievous mistakes and errors we have made in Vietnam. In his opinion, we have been 100% wrong. In his last ten pages, he takes the stand that there must be no exit from Vietnam, but that we must remain there for years and years, as in Korea.

As an antidote to Thompson and others of his "long haul low cost strategy" school, I would recommend the reading of several studies written by journalists and scholars whose thinking is not colored by the need to make war for pay. Harrison Salisbury's series of 16 or 17 articles that appeared in the New York Times early in 1967 give an objective view of conditions in North Vietnam. There is much to be learned from the report of two trips to Hanoi in 1967 and 1968 in the book Mission to Hanoi by Harry Ashmore, Pulitzer Prize winner, and the late ^{Bill}~~Harry~~ Baggs, Editor of the Miami News during the years when it won three Pulitzer prizes. Professors Kahin and Lewis of Cornell provide a valuable history of our involvement in their volume on The United States in Viet Nam.

There also is ample food for thought in A New Foreign Policy for the United States, by Professor Hans Morgenthau of The University of Chicago. He reminds us that those who have made our policies in Vietnam have not always been wise or honest, and that the policies themselves do

Propaganda

- 3 -

not serve the best interests of the United States. As he observes, our professed war aim, to stop communism in Vietnam, has become an empty slogan. I, for one, can readily subscribe to Morgenthau's suggestion that the United States, instead of embarking on costly and futile military interventions abroad, concentrate its efforts on creating a society at home which can serve as a model for other nations to imitate and adopt.