

words by woods

New York City and
Washington, D.C.
September, 1967

No. 14

US IMPERIALISM, A MENACE TO ALL -

But also, a Much Threatened Thing

No small country, no weak country, is safe in Latin America, Asia, Africa.

No large country enjoys its independence. In Europe, Britain and West Germany must carry their arms burdens within the US complex, gear their finances and industry to ours to qualify as junior partners. France and Italy, ready with large communist parties, would be overrun with US forces if revolutions were initiated. In Asia, Japan (armed against its wishes) has no more independence than West Germany and its revolutionists no more chance than the French.

The financial and industrial threads that tied India within the British Commonwealth are now in strong hands, held by US finance-capital. Israel is enveloped in conflict with Arabian oil countries, objectives of imperialism.

Independent countries, Canada and Australia, are dominated by alien capital, US capital.

At home, Negroes resist domination and now have a vision. Unorganized workers (including migratory) below the level of skilled labor in trade unions, are impoverished and frustrated. In Britain the Trade Union Congress represents nine million trade unionists; in the United States with four times the population the AFL-CIO is only twice as large as Britain's organization.

Abroad, heroic Vietnam and the incredible Cuba resist US invasion and domination and blaze a trail for others to follow.

Anti-imperialists throughout the world must stand together, that is the conclusion reached wherever imperialism is resisted or studied. The Israeli-Arab war or Negro revolts must not divide the movement here as the Nazi-Soviet pact split the left when World War II was beginning.

The New Politics conference caught the spirit when the white majority granted to the Black Caucus (with its 13 reservations) equal representation on committees

and equal voting power.

But Arnoni in his Minority of One special issue on the Arab-Israel conflict can be really divisive. We recommend Social Questions Bulletin, August-September 1967 issue for a balanced view of that situation. (The Methodist Federation for Social Action, Inc., 11 Forest Boulevard, Ardsley, N.Y., 10502.)

The Voice of Vietnam

North Vietnam has spoken clearly, but the American press distorts the truth by continuing to hold the enemy responsible for the continuation of the war because it refuses to give a quid pro quo for a proffered halt in bombing -- an offer which may be renewed by President-elect Thieu and perhaps separately through the United Nations.

The mimeographed weekly Vietnam Information Bulletin (Vietnam News Agency, Rangoon) in ~~an~~ issue No. 12/67, March 31st, 1967, gave the full text of President Ho Chi Minh's reply on February 15 to President Johnson:

Vietnam is thousands of miles away from the United States. The Vietnamese people have never done any harm to the United States. But contrary to ~~the~~ pledges made by its representatives at the 1954 Geneva Conference, the U.S. government has ceaselessly intervened in Vietnam, it has unleashed and intensified the war of aggression in South Vietnam with a view to prolonging the partition of Vietnam and turning South Vietnam into a neo-colony and a military base of the United States. For over two years now, the U.S. government has, with its air and naval forces, carried the war to the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, an independent and sovereign country.

The U.S. government has committed war crimes, against peace and against mankind. In South Vietnam, half a million U.S. and satellite troops have resorted to the most inhuman weapons and the most barbarous methods of warfare, such as napalm, toxic chemicals and gases, to massacre our compatriots, destroy crops, and raze villages to the ground. In North Vietnam, thousands of U.S. aircraft have dropped hundreds of thousands of tons of bombs, destroying towns, villages, factories, roads, bridges, dykes, dams, and even churches, pagodas, hospitals, schools. In your message, you apparently deplored the sufferings and destruction in Vietnam. May I ask you: Who has perpetrated these monstrous crimes? It is the U.S. and satellite troops. The U.S. government is entirely responsible for the extremely serious situation in Vietnam.

The U.S. war of aggression against the Vietnamese people constitutes a challenge to the countries of the socialist camp, a threat to the national independence movement, and a serious danger to peace in Asia and the world.

The Vietnamese people deeply love independence, freedom and peace. But in the face of U.S. aggression, they have risen up, united as one man, fearless of sacrifices and hardships! They are determined to carry on their resistance until they have won genuine independence and freedom and true peace. Our just

cause enjoys strong sympathy and support from the peoples of the whole world including broad sections of the American people.

The U.S. government has unleashed the war of aggression in Vietnam. It must cease this aggression. That is the only way to the restoration of peace. The U.S. government must stop definitively and unconditionally its bombing raids and all other acts of war against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, withdraw from South Vietnam all U.S. and satellite troops, recognize the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation, and let the Vietnamese people settle themselves their own affairs. Such is the basic content of the four point stand of the government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, which embodies the essential principles and provisions of the 1954 Geneva Agreements on Vietnam. It is the basis of a correct political solution to the Vietnam problem. (Emphasis by JBCW)

In your message, you suggested direct talks between the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the United States. If the U.S. government really wants these talks, it must first of all stop unconditionally its bombing raids and all other acts of war against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. It is only after the unconditional cessation of the U.S. bombing raids and all other acts of war against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam that the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the United States could enter into talks and discuss questions concerning the two sides.

The Vietnamese people will never submit to force, they will never accept talks under the threat of bombs.

Our cause is absolutely just. It is to be hoped that the U.S. government will act in accordance with reason.

Johnson's message delivered on February 10 had proposed bilateral discussions and had included the following:

"I am prepared to order a cessation of bombing against your country and the stopping of further augmentation of U.S. forces in South Vietnam as soon as I am assured that infiltration into South Vietnam by land and sea has stopped."

Whether or not Johnson must now seek peace or pretend to do so, the clear position of Hanoi and the National Liberation Front (Vietcong) has not been changed by the September election in which Communists and neutralists were disqualified. The NLF recognizes the election as a fraud and eight of ten losing candidates challenge the procedures. We await a credible analysis.

Why the United States Fights

President Eisenhower said the United States needed the tin and tungsten, which for him was reason enough to violate South Vietnam and US pledges to the 1954 Geneva Conference.

More recently Rusk said "It's going to be useful for some time to come for

-4-

American power to be able to control every wave of the Pacific, if necessary."

(And of course the Mediterranean!)

Other reasons for taking over South Vietnam are quite irrelevant, except as propaganda, unless the existence of China is to be listed as the reason.

There are New York Times columnists who profess not to understand why China feels we are unfriendly. Has not the United States done all it can for China? Who has relieved China of the burden of UN membership? Who saves China the cost of administering her Taiwan? Who has surrounded China with military bases so that no one else can invade her? Who provokes China to war so that she may test her military strength and her civil defense apparatus?

Can Victory be Snatched from Defeat?

Suffering defeat in Vietnam the Administration has problems: How to **save** the Occidental face. How to get reelected. How to get tin and tungsten and added military bases against China. How to occupy the country and integrate it financially and industrially into "our national interests" -- how to make South Vietnam another South Korea.

The Economist, London, believes the economic drain is not too much for the United States to bear, that atrocities are comparable to those of other wars; the United States should continue its noble course, with patience and persistence.

However, the critical state of the Establishment's Pentagon-McNamara-Johnson war is now being aired in the Wall Street Journal, the New York Times, the Washington Post and other newspapers. Enough is enough, they say. General Gavin by resigning from the Democratic party's advisory council in Massachusetts split the party significantly, but "Dr. Johnson" is a great healer. "Brainwashed" Romney would end the bipartisan consensus. Fulbright wishes the Senate hadn't issued that Tonkin blank check, payable as often as presented. Lord Russell has publicized the war crimes. Hanoi is grateful, but as both know, the war itself is the real war crime.

Johnson does not know whether more escalation and possible war with China

-5-

will reflect the Democrats or whether only peace will satisfy the voters in 1968. It is ominous that Rusk advises China not to enter the war.

The press has consistently tried to keep the truth about the nature of this war of aggression from the American people so that now the question arises: Who will explain what must be done for peace? How can a war of aggression billed as a holy war be ended short of bombing the wicked ones back to the Stone Age? How can the United States abandon its righteous crusade?

If the Vietnamese should stage another Dien Bien Phu, or if China enters the war in force there will be another answer to another question.

In the meantime, how can the Administration stem world protests, quiet discontent at home and at the same time get what it wants in South Vietnam?

If anyone doubts that the United States intends to stay in Vietnam after the war, as it has in South Korea, for instance, read Department of State - Agency for International Development circulars offering interviews in New York City, September 11 through 16, 1967: In summary:

Salaries - for Vietnam \$4,700 to \$19,000 per year - Plus 25% hardship bonus (Vietnam), furnished quarters, and other benefits:

Area development officers (and assistants), provincial agricultural advisers, vocational education advisers, registered nurses, personnel officers, construction engineers, diesel plant operators/mechanics, general services officers, hospital administrative advisers, public administration specialists (management analysis, budget & finance, training), public administration advisers, secretaries, management staff assistants, provincial administrative assistants, supply assistants.

For "Vietnam and other Free World Countries" there are requested: Auditors, public safety advisers. A supplemental circular for auditors states: Salary range \$6,500 - \$15,000 a year, plus 25% hardship bonus (Vietnam), housing allowance, and other benefits. There must be "willingness to serve a minimum of 18 months abroad (without families if Vietnam)."

"A.I.D. Is An Equal Opportunity Employer." (Released for newspapers Sept. 10)

Will the Vietnamese accept South Korea status?

The Ghettos

Will it be easier in the ghettos?

An article in Science (11 August 1967) by a member of its staff, Robert J. Samuelson, throws some light on the "riots" or rebellions in the cities. He leans heavily on a recently completed "large-scale opinion study within the 46.5 square-