

Troops Called Wary

Chicago
71 Case Tribune

Atrocities Magnified, Say 2 Who Saw Action in Viet Nam

WASHINGTON, June 6 (AP)—Two Viet Nam veterans said today American troops have been more wary of war crimes and atrocities in Viet Nam than in any other war in the nation's history.

They accused other veterans against the war of giving the impression that large numbers of troops "butchered babies and butchered women."

Presented as Policy
"They present aberrations as general policy," said John O'Neill, head of the newly

formed Viet Nam Veterans for a Just Peace.

O'Neill appeared on CBS' Face the Nation with Anthony MacDonald, director of Foreign Affairs for the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Both served as lieutenants in Navy units in Viet Nam, O'Neill in the same Coastal Division as John Kerry, a leader of Viet Nam Veterans Against the War.

"Americans have restricted themselves in this war more

than in any other conflict in our history," MacDonald said. "Americans have put their lives on the line, sometimes refusing to return fire to protect other lives."

O'Neill said his organization now has at least 5,000 members in 26 states and was formed after Kerry's appearance before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in April. In the treasury, he said, is \$11.47.

After Kerry's appearance, he said, "there was virtually a flood of tearful phone calls" from members of their old unit who disagreed with Kerry's statement.

No Answer to Challenge

O'Neill has challenged Kerry to debate on the war and what most veterans think about it, but he said during the questioning he's been unable to get an answer to his suggestion. "We've been chasing Kerry around the country," he said.

MacDonald said focusing on individual atrocities in Vietnam such as the My Lai massacre is like blaming all citizens of Washington for the crimes committed there.

Joseph Alsop

6-22-73

Week Post

Revising 'Cold War Revisionism'

Besides the Watergate horror, we have another scandal simmering nastily along in our national midst. It is more obscure. It involves no public men. But it has far-reaching importance for the national future.

In brief, the history departments of most American universities have been gradually captured by the viewpoint known as "cold war revisionism." Cold war revisionism rests upon three basic propositions. First, the cold war was needless. Second, Josef Stalin was blameless. And third, the cold war was started by President Harry Truman, for all sorts of evil American purposes.

The principal cold war revisionists are a group of American academics. Most of them have made a very good thing out of their chosen specialty. William Appleman Williams, D. F. Fleming, David Horowitz, Gar Alperowitz, Gabriel Kolko, Diane Shaver Clemens and Lloyd C. Gardner are all names to conjure with, in every American university with the smallest pretensions to intellectual modishness.

Their respective works add up to the version of America's world role from the Yalta Conference onward, that every parent must now expect to have

"One could paraphrase this: 'To hell with the facts, unless I can make them mean what I want them to mean!'"

peddled to sons and daughters of college age. Worse still, these works' historical truthfulness has only been most timidly challenged—when challenged at all—by all the other American academics who ought to know better. This has been the basic situation since the appearance of W. A. Williams' "Tragedy of American Diplomacy" in 1959.

Now, however, Robert James Maddox of the University of Pennsylvania has broken the comfortable rule that no nice professor squeals on other professors. In a short, cool but shocking book, "The New Left and Origins of the Cold War" Maddox has proved the cold war revisionists guilty of every crime against scholarship that historians can commit.

One of the seven revisionists, David Horowitz, is even shown to have indulged in what amounts to massive plagiarism in his "Free World Colossus: A Critique of American Foreign Policy in the Cold War." Over all, Maddox "applied . . . the simplest and most appropriate test. How did these writers use the evidence available to them?

"The results (of the test) are devastating . . . he reports (their) books filled with systematic omissions, unwarranted insinuations, misstatements of fact, gross misconstruction and misrepresentation and quotations wrenched out of context."

This summation comes from a courageous review of Maddox's book in "The New York Times," by still another eminent American academic, Prof. Francis Loewenheim of Rice University. Williams, Fleming, Alperowitz

and the rest were further permitted to answer Maddox and Loewenheim by The Times. The charges against them were grimly factual in all cases. Their answers, however, were remarkably short on facts and long in self-righteousness. Williams wrote, with an almost audible sniff:

"The mental quality we call literal-mindedness, and the analytical technique we know as the chronological ordering of raw data, have their place, but that place is at the beginning—by no means at the end—of historical understanding."

One could paraphrase this, as follows: "To hell with the facts, unless I can make them mean what I want them to mean!" These fairly dramatic exchanges then led this reporter to read Prof. Maddox's book—which all should do who care about the American record. The cold print of the book, always factual, always specific, always scrupulous in the use of sources, is even more devastating than Prof. Loewenheim's summation.

It may be inquired, of course, why all this has the smallest political interest, in the midst of the Watergate horror and with Leonid Brezhnev in the country to talk with President Nixon. The answer is that nothing could possibly have greater political interest, at any rate for the long pull.

Every nation's decisions about the hard problems that history continuously presents, are always based upon that nation's historical memories. It is perfectly possible, too, for national memories to be perverted by the suc-

"In his short, cool but shocking book, Maddox has proved the cold war revisionists guilty of every crime against scholarship that historians can commit."

cessful propagation of large, persuasive-seeming historical falsehoods. Thus decision-making is also dangerously perverted. A root cause of World War II was just this kind of thing in Britain and France.

Our cold war revisionists have been successfully propagating an enormous historical falsehood, in just the manner described above. The falsehood has already percolated very far into the current American decision-making process, in the Senate and elsewhere. It was time for someone to blow the whistle, as Prof. Maddox has done.

© 1973, Los Angeles Times

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Two Soldiers Report

5-18-95 WP

Marcus Raskin's May 9 letter—which was a response to former CIA director William Colby's April 27 op-ed column, "Vietnam After McNamara"—has at least one misstatement of fact. Mr. Raskin erroneously states that "hundreds of American helicopters" were destroyed during the Lam Son 719 campaign into Laos during February-April 1971.

I was privileged to command the American helicopter force that supported Lam Son 719, and I directed the study and analysis of its helicopter support. Herein, I report the correct figures of American helicopters lost to hostile action during that operation.

During an average day of Lam Son 719, more than 600 American helicopters supported the Republic of Vietnam ground forces fighting communist forces in Laos and in adjacent areas of the Republic of Vietnam. The U.S. Army's after-action analysis shows that 107 helicopters were lost to hostile action during Lam Son 719. These losses occurred during 353,287 sorties and 134,861 flying hours. That is a far cry from Mr. Raskin's "hundreds of American helicopters" destroyed.

Indeed, operating against the bulk of North Vietnam's regular army divisions supported by an daunting array of anti-aircraft weapons, American helicopters proved themselves remarkably tough and difficult to destroy, and American aviators reached new heights of skill, determination, courage, selflessness and devotion to duty.

SIDNEY B. BERRY
Arlington

The writer is a retired Army lieutenant general.

In his May 5 news story "Japanese Leader Makes Near Apology for World War II Aggression in China," Steven Mufson quotes uncritically "a group of 600 Chinese intellectuals" who wrote: "It has been 50 years since we won the victory in the anti-Japanese war." In fact, the Chinese Communist army did not fight the Japanese in China during the war. Mao Zedong saved his army to fight Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist Party after World War II.

I served in China the last two years of that war under Gen. Claire Chennault in the 14th Air Force. I served in the 1st Bombardment Group, Chinese American Composite Wing, as the commander of the American cadre that trained and led the Nationalist Chinese crews flying B-25s in combat against the Japanese.

Most historians agree that the Japanese Empire was defeated in World War II by the combined forces of all our allies, and that victory was accomplished primarily outside mainland China. I agree with Mr. Mufson that there was a great tragedy committed against the Chinese people by the Japanese military, and this should be faced by the Japanese. But it will not do for the Chinese Communists now to revise history to say that they won "the anti-Japanese war."

AUSTIN J. RUSSELL
Alexandria

The writer is a retired Air Force lieutenant general.