

The problems of transition to a settlement in Vietnam

By Mark Gayn

The transition from war to peace is never simple. In South Vietnam it has been (how can one best put it?) most unusual.

The United States undertook an airlift second only to that which saved West Berlin a generation earlier. In one 48-hour period in November, some 60 giant U.S. transports brought in 1,400 tons of military matériel. U.S. Air Force emissaries went searching the hangars of friendly nations, from Iran to South Korea, for planes that could be transferred hastily to the government in Saigon. In a few instances, for fear that the ceasefire might occur too soon, war supplies were formally transferred to the South Vietnamese Government while they were still waiting to be put aboard ships in U.S. ports. Through this device no one could, on some future day, accuse the Americans of having breached the draft agreement under which no military hardware could be transferred once the truce was arranged.

It was also a rare day at Saigon's vast Ton Son Nhut airport when arriving planes did not bring in yet another group of uncommunicative American civilians. In mid-November, 5,000 of them were already in South Vietnam, and another 5,000 were being hired under secret contracts to serve as "civilian advisers" to the government in Saigon. One heard also of American companies come to do good, but with no publicity: the Lear Siegler, Inc., whose men will be servicing the F-105s; the Norman Harwell Associates of Texas, which will be helping with the maintenance of what has already been billed as the world's third-largest air force.



Mark Gayn, foreign affairs columnist for the Toronto Star, has for the past six years been stationed in Asia as the Star's roving correspondent. He has covered developments in Vietnam since 1965 and has made visits to China and the Soviet Union. Mr. Gayn is the author of four books on Asia. The views expressed in the accompanying article are those of the author.

Many of the planes delivered to South Vietnam would have to be mothballed, for it is not likely that there would be enough pilots to fly them. And it is not likely that there would be enough pilots to fly them.

But let no one jump to the conclusion that the United States, in its pursuit of peace, has been any less sincere to North Vietnam. The latter, too, has been moving arms south. And it has been insisting adamantly on keeping its troops there — obviously to give protection to the Viet Cong and its political activities spreading across South Vietnam's countryside for tomorrow's tests of strength.

This accumulation of weapons suggested that both Washington and Hanoi expected the conflict to continue. But it would be a different kind of struggle. In 1965-72, it had been a miniature war, much like the conflict in Spain in the thirties. The arrangement that was painfully hammered out in late 1972 made it clear that the three major powers involved in the struggle — China, the Soviet Union and the United States — were not going to let it down and ending direct involvement. The new arrangements would not lead to a continued civil war, or at least a protracted struggle with a great deal of military involvement. But it would no longer mean that thousands of uniformed Americans die in this unproductive land, and it would no longer mean that the relations among the Big Three.

Détente as goal

This change has been the product of a major historic development. About a year ago all three major powers involved in Vietnam began to re-examine their international and national priorities. And each, for its own compelling reasons, decided that the war in Vietnam no longer served its interests. That the old-fashioned cold war was not rewarding, and that what each country desired was a world-wide détente. The coincidence of interest, unprecedented in the past quarter of a century, has made the dominant political fact of our time.

It is useful to recall why each of the three became initially enmeshed in Vietnam. The United States entered the