

of South Vietnam, he was placed under house arrest for "re-education" when the communist North captured Saigon in 1975. But later he emerged as the principal economic adviser to the unified government, was allowed to set up an international management and finance company, and eventually became a millionaire again.

"I gambled (by not fleeing Vietnam), and I won," he said. "My message to American business is you can also win."

Still, most U.S. companies are cautious about investing in Vietnam right now. For one thing, we do not have full diplomatic ties with the government. The 19-year American embargo was lifted 15 months ago, and this has led to the opening of diplomatic liaison offices in Hanoi and Washington. But further thawing of relations could be delayed by the American presidential campaign.

There are other concerns, too—trademark and patent protections, an uncertain legal environment, inadequate infrastructure, and rampant corruption among government officials. Bribery is the best way to fast-track an application to do business in Vietnam. But American companies are prohibited by U.S. law from offering money or gifts in return for regulatory favors.

U.S. business interests, with an aggregate outlay of \$525 million per year, rank eighth among Vietnam's foreign investors. Taiwan is No. 1 at \$2.5 billion. Hong Kong, Singapore, South Korea, Japan, Australia and Malaysia rank ahead of us.

All of which frustrates the Vietnamese leaders to no end.

"We want to close the past with America, and build cooperatively with you for a better future," said Communist Party General Secretary Do Muoi during an interview of his Hanoi headquarters, a lifesize bust of Ho Chi Minh casting a shadow in the background.

"Why can't you do that? Why does your government put up roadblocks? This is not helpful to you or to us—and we both know we need each other for economic opportunity."

#### ATTITUDE CALLED WRONG-HEADED

Muoi, considered Vietnam's shrewdest senior official, noted that the United States has been reluctant to normalize ties with Vietnam until more progress is made on accounting for the 1,648 American military listed as missing in action in Vietnam.

To him, and other Vietnamese leaders, this is wrong-headed.

But the question persists: Are there any still any American MIAs living in Vietnam? "No," replied retired Gen. Nguyen Giap. "If there were, we would have turned them over to your government long ago. The war is over. We have no reason to hold anyone against their will."

Furthermore, Muoi said, Vietnam has "co-operated completely" with U.S. officials in searching for the remains of the MIAs, including turning over military records and digging up grave sites.

Vietnam, he said, long ago gave up looking for its 300,000 missing soldiers.

"This is not entirely a humanitarian issue with the United States," the 78-year-old Muoi said. "This is linked to politics—and we are very sad about that."

To underscore his point, he mentions that the United States had thousands of MIAs in Korea and World War II and "no similar conditions were placed on diplomatic relations with Germany and Japan."

Because of the MIA issue, Vietnam has been deliberately downplaying the military side of the war of late. That includes renaming the House of American War Crimes in Saigon to simply the War Museum.

But the reminders of horror have not been toned down. An oversized Life magazine pho-

tograph of the March 16, 1968, My Lai massacre that shocked the conscience of America adorns one wall. Other photos show the deforming effects of U.S. bombs and the defoliant Agent Orange on the women and children of Vietnam.

There are, of course, no similar photos of the hurt and sorrow caused by the North Vietnamese military. To the victor goes the privilege of selecting which images of war's hell go on public display.

American planes, tanks, bombs and other war materials captured or abandoned prominently occupy the museum grounds and viewing rooms.

#### WHY WE LOST THE WAR

Such an impressive collection of modern-day weaponry begs the question of how we could lose a war against a lesser-armed enemy. The answer comes into focus the next day during a trip to the famous Cu Chi tunnels. Communist North Vietnam used narrow passageways—just 3 feet high and across—to wage a relentless guerrilla war that baffled, enraged and ultimately defeated the U.S.-backed South Vietnamese government.

More than 100 miles of the underground network stretch from northwest to Saigon to the Cambodian border and functioned as subterranean Viet Cong villages—with kitchens, dormitories, hospitals and command posts.

They were cleverly defended: Americans small enough to descend into them were often trap-doored to death over pits of razor-sharp poles.

Burrowed three stories deep into rock-like soil, the tunnels were the most bombed, gassed and defoliated section of Vietnam. Yet they withstood the heavy assault and serve as a monument to man over machine.

Gen Giap, the mastermind of the communist victories over the French and the Americans, said it was far more than tunnel soldiers that resulted in America's defeat in the only war it has ever lost. Resiliency, a history of nationalism and the will to win at any cost were the real keys to victory, he said.

"Our weapons were not as good as yours," the 84-year-old general said in an interview. "But your human factor was not as good as ours. We had a popular patriotic cause; you had confusion over why you were in Vietnam. We had patience; you wanted instant victory."

Now Vietnam is counting on that same purposeful spirit and unswerving focus to win its economic struggle. But no one really expects significant progress until the government invests billions of dollars in highways, bridges, railroads, commercial port facilities—and public education.

Five decades of war have left Vietnam with a large unskilled labor force and growing illiteracy. The population is exploding and the school system is ill-equipped to respond. Even health care is a touch-and-go matter.

As the deputy minister of education, Tran Xuan Nhi, put it: "We are learning the lessons of the free market, and one of those is the need to train and educate our people so we can build our country into an industrialized society. The future will belong to the educated."

Like Miss Saigon 1995, who is driven by a passion "to study and learn so I can make more money and buy the things I want. OK?"

#### TIES THAT BIND US TO VIETNAM

Fifteen months ago, President Clinton lifted the trade embargo against Vietnam. Now he should establish full diplomatic relations with this important Southeast Asia country.

Twenty years have passed since the Vietnam war ended. It is time to replace bitterness and recrimination with peace and reconciliation.

Private visits and business relationships are pushing the process along. Just this week, a Massachusetts trade delegation led by Lt. Gov. Paul Cellucci is talking business in Vietnam—business that can create local jobs. And the U.S. already has opened a diplomatic liaison office in Hanoi.

The next logical step is to exchange ambassadors, and there's little to be gained by waiting. The sooner we open an embassy, the better we'll be positioned to expand trade, investment and influence in this vibrant nation of 75 million.

Vietnam is a young, eager and changing society which harbors no grudge against the United States despite our decade-long involvement in their civil war. That's over, as far as most Vietnamese are concerned. And that's the word from the top: "We want to close the past with America, and build cooperatively with you for a better future," Communist Party General Secretary Do Muoi recently told a group of visiting American editors.

The welcome mat is out and the timing is fortuitous. Vietnam has launched a radical economic development program that relaxes restrictions on free enterprise and encourages state industries to be profitable. Political change will surely follow.

Vietnam, moreover, wants and needs American know-how and investment in order to modernize and raise living standards. This is a process in which the United States, with its sizable Vietnamese population and experience in the region, should want to participate. But we need to get going to make the most of the opportunity. American business ranks only eighth among foreign investors there. Establishing full diplomatic ties would give U.S. companies greater support and confidence in doing business with Vietnam. It also would put us in a better position to influence Vietnam's policies.

Normalizing relations does not mean abandoning our efforts to get as full an accounting as possible from Vietnam about Americans still listed as missing from the war years. And, in fact, the Vietnamese are trying to help us do that. They have no real reason to detain Americans against their will or withhold information about MIAs.

Congressman Bill Richardson, D-N.M., for one, is convinced that's the case. He recently returned from Vietnam with more than 100 pages of material relating to American MIAs, and found no traces of alleged underground prisons or other places of detainment. He thinks it's time to normalize relations. So does U.S. Secretary of State Warren Christopher.

So President Clinton should act now—and avoid the risk of making recognition a political football in next year's election campaign. Hesitating can only work against our interests in the region, leaving other countries to gain from Vietnam's budding economy at our expense.

#### GEORGE SELDES

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, George Seldes, who died Sunday in Vermont at the age of 104, was literally, a Witness to a Century—the title of his autobiography.

A true investigative reporter who refused to accept the subtle pressures imposed upon journalists by publishers, editors, and advertisers—he was uncompromising in reporting what he saw and heard, and printed those observations in his own independent publication—In Fact.

Izzy Stone called Seldes the "granddaddy" of investigative reporters—high

praise from another great independent journalist of our century.

My visits and frequent correspondence with George rank among the highlights of my Senate career. He never intruded, but did on occasion offer some very good advice to this senator—and most times, I was smart enough to recognize good counsel when I heard it. I had the great pleasure of joining him at his 100th birthday party in Vermont—an event that became a public celebration of his life.

Here was a man who interviewed William Jennings Bryan, Theodore Roosevelt, Eddie Rickenbacker, Generals Pershing, Patton, and MacArthur; a personal observer of Lenin and Mussolini and a confidant of Picasso, Ernest Hemingway, and Sinclair Lewis.

One of the great lives of our century has passed—but George Seldes left behind a recorded history to guide our understanding of the turbulent time.

I attach an editorial that appeared in the July 8, 1995 edition of *The Burlington Free Press*, and a column written by Colman McCarthy that appeared in the July 11 edition of *The Washington Post*.

They capture the spirit and dogged pursuit of truth that marked George Seldes' lasting contribution to journalism and the history of our age. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the *Burlington Free Press*, July 8, 1995]

#### A CONTRARY VOICE

George Seldes, who died Sunday at 104, was a journalist and harsh critic of mainstream journalists who might be best remembered by Vermont newspaper editors and reporters from an appearance before the Vermont and New Hampshire Press Associations in the late 1980s.

Except for a slowed step and a bit of a stoop, nothing in Seldes' appearance betrayed his exceptional age, nor hints of any mellowing on matters he found important—beginning and invariably ending with a journalist's responsibility to tell it straight.

What bothered this long-time resident of Hartland Four Corners most during his 86 years of covering historic events was not so much what got into newspapers of his day but what didn't—especially immediately preceding and following World War II. Errors of omission.

It was a time when some journalists doubled as government informers for U.S. intelligence agencies as a gesture of patriotism; when the Washington Press Corps kept many elected officials' personal foibles and peccadillos a secret; and powerful publishers ran newspapers more like personal fiefdoms in pursuit of selective causes than purveyors of the larger truth.

Like I.F. Stone, Seldes figured if mainstream newspapers wouldn't print what he wrote for fear of riling advertisers or powerful news sources, he would print it in his own publication. In *Fact*, it was called, and it took on, among many powerful interests, the tobacco industry and its ability to keep damaging health data out of newspapers—a consequence, Seldes was never shy about charging, or newspapers' heavy reliance on cigarette advertising.

In some cases, he was acting on tips from mainstream reporters who knew their own papers would never print what they'd dug up. They would leak the news to Seldes who would print it. In other cases, *In Fact* became a more reliable source of news for mainstream newspapers than their own sources—the ultimate flattery for any newspaper person, and ultimate indictment of those who missed the news.

In his later years, Seldes was always careful to note improvements in the objectivity of today's newspapers—while holding firm to the belief that when newspapers forget their responsibility to truth, they risk retreat into those bad old days.

Nor was his burr-under-the-saddle style without fault—his muckraking, make-waves narrowness of vision caused him to miss some of the bigger picture, too; a heavy dose of Seldes at this prime could be hard for any average reader with broader interests to take.

What seemed most striking about his comments at that appearance in Hanover, N.H. however—just as it does now—is the diminished capacity of contrary voices like his to be heard today in the din of the modern information age.

Today, so many loud, contrary voices compete for listeners' ears, with so many public outlets for spreading their views, the problem is no longer an absence of facts, in some cases it's too many facts—and too few people taking the time to make sense of them.

More big-picture wisdom and few disconnected facts in every type of media today would go a long way—a need that's grown wider with George Seldes' passing.

[From the *Washington Post*, July 11, 1995]

GEORGE SELDES: GIANT OF JOURNALISM

(By Colman McCarthy)

As a traveling companion, George Seldes didn't believe in letting you rest. In the spring of 1982 when he was 91 and in New York to collect a George Polk Award for a lifetime of contribution to journalism, I took the Fifth Avenue bus with him for a 30-block ride between the ceremony and his nephew's apartment. We would have taken a cab but he preferred the bus: a better way to get the feel of the city and its people.

Along the jostling way, Seldes threw at me a half-dozen story ideas, mingled with sidebars of his opinions, plus advice on how not merely to gather facts but to cull the useless from the useful, and then a string of mirthful recollections from his newspapering days going back eight decades. If we were the boys on the bus, George Seldes was some boy.

He died on July 2, in his 104th year and only a half-decade or so after retiring from a reporting career that began in 1909 with the *Pittsburgh Leader*.

It's well within the bounds of accuracy to say of Seldes—and this isn't the kind of gassy praise that's the customary sendoff for the deceased—that for much of the 20th century he stood as a giant and a pillar of journalism, a reporter's reporter. He had the subverse notion that investigating the press—the money-saving schemings of the publishers of his day, editors cowering before advertisers, reporters fraternizing with the pashas they write about—should be as vital a beat as skeptically covering politicians.

At the Polk ceremony, the citation of the awards committee succinctly summarized the spirit of intellectual independence Seldes committed himself to: "By mutual agreement, George Seldes belonged not to the journalism establishment, nor was he tethered to any political philosophy. With a gimlet eye ever fixed upon transgressors, he soared above the conventions of his time—a lone eagle, unafraid and indestructible. He is 91 now and still a pretty tough bird."

Seldes lived in Hartland Four Corners, Vt. Until recently, he was self-sufficient at home and ever delighted to receive such pilgrims as Ralph Nader, Morton Mintz and Rick Goldsmith, a California filmmaker who is completing a documentary on Seldes's life. The film will include references to I.F. Stone, who credited Seldes' newsletter "*In Fact*"—which had 176,000 subscribers for a time in the 1940's—as the model for his own carefully researched *I.F. Stone's Weekly*.

The titles of some of Seldes's books give a hint of the fires that burned within him: "*You Can't Print That: The Truth Behind the News*" (1928), "*Never Tired of Protesting*" (1986), "*Tell the Truth and Run*" (1953), "*Lords of the Press*" (1935). In the 1980s, he wrote his memoir "*Witness to a Century*" and edited "*The Great Thoughts*," the latter a thick and rich collection of ideas Seldes had gathered throughout a lifetime of reading and listening.

"Sometimes in isolated phrase or paragraph," he said of his selections from *Abelard* to *Zwingli* and from *Ability* to *Zen*, "will work on the reader's imagination more forcefully than it might when buried in a possibly difficult text. Each time a quotation in this book makes a reader think in a new way, I shall have achieved my aim."

As a reporter and press critic, Seldes was more than an iconoclastic outsider, as worthy and rare as that calling is. His news-gathering and analysis were ethics-based. Omitting the news is as vile a sin as slanting the news, he believed. Too many papers avoid stories that might upset the powerful or the majority, while printing news on safe subjects and editorializing to bloodless conclusions.

In "freedom of the Press," Seldes recalled how he was compromised while covering World War I: "The journals back home that printed our stories boasted that their correspondents had been at the fighting front. I now realize that we were told tonight but buncombe, that we were shown nothing of the realities of the war, that we were, in short, merely part of the Allied propaganda machine whose purpose was to sustain morale at all costs and help drag unwilling America into the slaughter. . . . We all more or less lied about the war."

If so, that was to be the last time Seldes shied from getting the whole story. For the rest of his long life, his reporting on what were often no-no subjects—workers' rights, public health and safety, press sellouts, corporate and government lies—was the essence of truth-telling. Like his life, the telling had fullness.

#### ACDA ANNUAL REPORT IS INFORMATIVE, CLEAR-HEADED EFFORT

Mr. PELL. Mr. President. Yesterday, the President transmitted to the Senate the annual report for 1994 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. In addition to detailing the Agency's many activities during 1994, the report includes a major section on the adherence by the United States to its arms control obligations and the compliance of other nations with their arms control obligations.

This compliance report, which was provided in both classified and unclassified versions, is the most detailed annual compilation of arms control issues available to us. It has been required of the agency for a number of years, and it is particularly thorough and detailed in this year's iteration. I believe that