

# 'The Terms Amount to Surrender'

By Francis L. Loewenheim

HOUSTON — President Nixon has described the cease-fire terms, first reported by Hanoi radio on Oct. 25 and discussed by Mr. Kissinger at a press conference the following day, as "peace with honor and not peace with surrender" and as ushering in what he has called "a generation of peace."

On the contrary, it seems clear that, stripped of Mr. Kissinger's obfuscating rhetoric, these terms amount to nothing less than a thinly disguised surrender to Communist terrorism and aggression. They are surrender on the installment plan, the most shocking betrayal of its kind since Britain and France, with President Roosevelt's indirect support, agreed to the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia in September, 1938.

If the manner in which the cease-fire agreement first became known was not sufficiently disturbing, it is appalling to note that the American people have still not been told by their Government the specific terms of that agreement, and strangely enough it seems not to have occurred to any journalist or newspaper — including those most anxious to publish the purloined Pentagon Papers — to demand the full and immediate publication of these terms.

The terms of the agreement that have already been disclosed, however,

are bad enough. In the first place, the tens of thousands of North Vietnamese troops, who crossed the so-called "demilitarized zone" set up by the 1954 Geneva Conference, are to be permitted to stay where they are. All American troops and advisers, on the other hand, are to be withdrawn within sixty days

of the signing of the agreement, and so are all South Korean and other allied forces still in South Vietnam. Since the Nixon Administration has issued no maps or statistics, it is not known how large an area or how many people will be left under Communist control, but we may be sure that both are considerable — living proof that aggression does indeed pay.

Next, although South Vietnam remains largely dependent on continued American logistic support, the United States has apparently agreed to send South Vietnam only replacements of weapons previously supplied. What will the United States do if the North Vietnamese and other Communist states including China and Russia illegally resupply the Communist forces remaining behind in South Vietnam? The cease-fire agreement establishes a so-called "Council of National Reconciliation of Concord" for the avowed purpose of conducting "free and democratic" elections. Recalling what happened in East Germany, Poland and various Balkan countries after 1945, do President Nixon and Mr. Kissinger really believe, and expect the Ameri-

can people to believe, that the Vietnamese and North Vietnamese will permit "free and democratic" elections in the areas under their control?

At his press conference Mr. Kissinger suggested that once a cease-fire had gone into effect the United States would "contribute significantly" to the reconstruction of North Vietnam. Such promised assistance — and its likely glowing results — may be compared with the assistance the United States extended to Germany and Japan after 1945. The United States did not, however, extend economic aid to Hitler and to the Japanese Government that gave us Pearl Harbor.

Since the Vietnamese conflict was the result of the determination of successive Congresses and Presidents — Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon — that South Vietnam should be permitted to decide its own destiny, it seems incredible that the United States should, in effect, have agreed to cease-fire terms with the enemies of South Vietnam largely against the wishes of that Government.

If the South Vietnamese Government should now refuse to sign the proposed cease-fire agreement, among other things, on the ground that North Vietnamese troops will continue to occupy parts of its territory, will the United States find ways and means to coerce its ally into signing, will the United States sign alone, or will the United States recognize the justified

objections of the South Vietnamese?

It seems apparent that the cease-fire terms, or what we know of them up to this time, make no provision for what is to be done in the not unlikely event that the cease-fire breaks down. Suppose that, after a respectable interval, Communist-backed subversion, terrorism and open aggression resume against what remains of South Vietnam? In that event, will the United States stand by and watch South Vietnam be destroyed much as the Western democracies watched helplessly as Hitler took over what remained of Czechoslovakia six months after Munich?

Finally, it may be understandable that big-business-oriented newspapers, with visions of a lucrative postwar "China trade" dancing in their heads, should entertain hopes of some sort of peace settlement in Indochina and a relaxation of tensions in Europe and the Pacific. It is more difficult to understand, however, why President Nixon, who coasted to an overwhelming re-election victory, should try to persuade the American people that the nature and objectives of international Communism, whether directed from Moscow and Peking or not, have changed significantly from what they were in 1917 or 1945, 1956 or 1968.

Francis L. Loewenheim is associate professor of history at Rice University.