

# THE SOCIAL CREDITOR

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 55, No. 5

AUGUST, 1975

15p Monthly

### Vietnam and The Global Conspiracy

*We continue the transcript of the Australian Broadcasting Commission's Documentary broadcast within hours after the fall of Saigon on April 30, 1975, and we repeat that this transcript was made with some difficulty from a tape recording. It contains some uncertain spellings of place names, and some identification of speakers may be incorrect, and there are some unavoidable omissions.*

President Johnson's reply to the alleged North Vietnamese attack on the American destroyers was to order the destruction by bombing of the gunboats' bases. Only two men, both Senators, spoke out against the resolution which was to become known as the Tonkin Gulf Resolution. One of the opponents, Senator Wayne Morse of Oregon claimed that President Johnson had declared war in violation of the United States Congress:

"Article 1 Section 8 of the Constitution specifically provides that only Congress has the power to declare war; no President has the right to send American boys to their death on a battle field in the absence of a Declaration of War. One thing I do know and that is we're going to be bogged down in South-East Asia for years to come if we follow this course of action and we're going to kill thousands of American boys until finally—let me say the American people are going to say what the French people finally said—they've had enough."

Well those prophetic words were spoken in 1964. But American involvement in Indo-China and the crusade against what they saw as the creeping menace of communism goes right back to the fall of China to the Communists in 1949, when the Americans first began to finance the French effort against the Vietminh. As early as 1950 the then President Truman gave substantial arms and aid to the French—at the same time as the Americans themselves entered the war in Korea. This policy was continued and accelerated when Eisenhower gained the presidency in 1952; but two years later when the tide turned against the French in Vietnam Eisenhower declined to send troops and air support for the French—even though that line was being strongly pushed by almost all his top advisers including his Vice President—Richard Nixon. Even so American involvement in Vietnam slowly and steadily increased over the years and began to quicken when John F. Kennedy was elected as President of the United States; although this tendency was not apparent in his Inaugural Speech, particularly when he spoke to the young people of America:

[President Kennedy] "Since this country was founded, each generation of Americans has been summoned to give

testimony to its National loyalty. The graves of young Americans who answered the call to service surround the globe—now the trumpet summons us again. Now it is a call to bear arms—though arms we need; now it is a call to battle—though in battle we are. But a call to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle, year in and year out, rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation—a struggle against the common enemies of man; tyranny, poverty, disease and war itself. Will you join in that historic effort?" [Cheers.]

But if President Kennedy was sincere in his call for a battle against war itself he had no help from South Vietnam's president Ngo Dinh Diem. He refused point blank to hold the elections foreshadowed by the Geneva Peace Conference, aimed at re-unifying Vietnam, and he set out to obliterate the Vietminh's support in the South, with the aid of concentration camps, re-education centres and straight-out murder. At the same time he systematically alienated himself from the powerful Buddhist Sects, and the Peasants. More and more Diem was proving to be a serious embarrassment for his allies. The Americans tried to persuade him to introduce reforms which he agreed to implement but only in a half-hearted fashion. Always in the background were his secret police, headed by his brother, ever ready to force his totalitarian, and often brutal, rule. But even the secret police could not prevent the revolt by his own Army in November, 1963, and his murder in an armoured car, while allegedly trying to escape. The A.B.C.'s Peter Barnett was one of the last Western Newsmen to talk to Diem before that fateful day:

[Peter Barnett] "No one looked less like a President. He was about 5 ft. 2 in. in height and seemed as wide. He wore white ducksuits and white shoes. And he was extremely shy. He was also the most compulsive talker I have ever known. I had two interviews with him—they lasted a total of 9 hours. He talked non-stop—chain-smoking cheap cigarettes and drinking warm tea. Although President Diem was a Catholic, he was more the Confucian mandarin with his own form of divine right of Kings. He had the focal concept that Americans existed for *his* convenience, not the reverse. His greatest problem was isolation from reality, caused mainly by the influence of younger brother Nhu—head of the secret police and the beautiful Dragon Lady, Madame Nhu. I interviewed her twice, as well. She dressed superbly in flowing Oudia with massive jade and diamond jewellery. She was charming, but she was deadly, and no-one feared her more than her bachelor brother-in-law, the President, who couldn't cope with her subtlety and temper. Diem lived in a cloud world of his own. He believed his forces could overpower the growing effectiveness of the Viet Cong. He believed he was beloved by his people, but instead he alienated the

Buddhists, dramatically underscored by self-immolation. He was detested also by the students, and finally by the Armed Services themselves. In the closing days I was received by him; as we talked, I tried to convey the unpopularity of his régime, that his world was crumbling. But he only smiled confidently—'Monsieur,' he commented, 'you have been intoxicated by the enemy.' As our interview ended I stood watching him walking alone down a long Palace corridor. Yet there was much to admire in him—courage, energy, dedication, and an utter lack of corruption. But, three weeks later, following the *coup*, a gun-happy Army Major shot him."

Well there is evidence to show that the Americans knew that the *coup* was being planned and that it was likely that Diem would be murdered. What they couldn't know was that just three weeks later it would be their own President who would fall victim to an assassin's bullet.

[Commentator] "The President's car is now going past me. The limousine is now travelling at a very high rate of speed—Secret Service men are standing up in the limousine. They are armed with sub-machine guns and it appears as though someone in the limousine might have been hit by the gunfire. The Presidential car is coming up now and we know it's the Presidential car. We can see Mrs. Kennedy in her pink suit. There's a Secret Service man spreadeagled on the top of the car and we understand Governor and Mrs. Connally are in the car with President and Mrs. Kennedy. We can't see who has been hit—if anybody has been hit—but apparently something is wrong. Something is terribly wrong . . ."

At the time of Kennedy's death there were between fourteen and sixteen thousand American troops in Vietnam. That number was to grow substantially after his Vice-President Lyndon Johnson took over. There was a hint of what was to come in President Johnson's first major speech on his succession to the presidency in November 1973.

[Johnson] "Under John Kennedy's leadership this Nation has demonstrated that it has the courage to seek peace, and it has the fortitude to arrest war. We have proved that we are a good and reliable friend to those who seek peace and freedom. We have shown that we can also be a formidable foe, to those who reject the paths of peace, and those who seek to impose upon us, or our allies, the yokes of tyranny. This Nation will keep its commitments from South Vietnam to West Berlin [prolonged acclamation]. We will be unceasing in the search for peace, resourceful in our search for areas of agreement even with those with whom we differ, and generous and loyal to those who join with us in common cause."

It wasn't long before President Johnson found cause to escalate the war. The incident was the apparent firing on United States warships by North Vietnamese gunboats. At the time most of President Johnson's colleagues took the facts as presented by Johnson, at face value. It was Senator William Fullbright who pushed the famous Tonkin Gulf Resolution through Congress. But questions about the truth of the President's version of that event kept appearing with dogged regularity. So much so, it was one of the things that turned Senator Fullbright, himself, against President Johnson and the conduct of the whole American war effort in Vietnam. The first time the two came face to face on a public debate on the Tonkin Gulf issue, was on

a television programme in 1970 when Johnson, now an embittered ex-President, had this to say:

[Johnson] "We have said from the very beginning that all of us believe that Hitler's aggression almost destroyed the World. And we believe that Communist aggression will destroy it if somebody doesn't stand up to it. So we all go in, and the South-East Asia Resolution which they misnamed—they called it the Tonkin Gulf Resolution—it was a shame somebody didn't think of calling it the Fullbright Resolution, like Fullbright Scholars thing because Senator Fullbright introduced it; with his knowledge, his approval, his consent. He passed it. He brought it forward 82 to 1—don't tell me a Rhodes Scholar didn't understand everything in that resolution because we said to him at the White House, and every other member of that Committee, that the President of the United States is not about to commit forces and undertake actions to deter aggression in South Vietnam, to prevent this Communist conspiracy, unless, and until, the American people through their Congress, sign on to go in. If the President's going in, as he may be required to do, he wants the Congress to go in right beside him."

[Fullbright] "The events as they related them of August 4th 1964 were not true—our ships—it was not an unprovoked, deliberate attack; in fact there was no attack at all. So it was—they represented to us that our ships had been attacked, on the high seas 60 miles from land and without provocation. And wrapped the flag around us and everybody of course, as you know in the House—there's some very cautious people in the House—unanimously approved it because their emotions were all aroused by this dastardly attack which was all phony and false. And the rationale for the Resolution was—given to us—that if we passed this quickly and unanimously if possible—it will be a warning to the North Vietnamese and they will no longer infiltrate, they will quit. It will scare them off. We will bloody their nose and they will stop. I suppose in Texas politics, if you do that then people stop. It just doesn't work that way in Vietnam."

And back to 1964. There was three months between the passing of the Tonkin Gulf Resolution and the Presidential Elections. On the Republican side, Senator Barry Goldwater was a hawk on Vietnam and made no bones about it:

[Goldwater] "The major supply lines would have to be interdicted where they leave Red China. Either that or we have a war dragged out and dragged out. A defensive war is never won. Defoliation of the forest by a low-yield atomic weapon could well be done—when you remove the foliage you remove the cover."

But Johnson who was to have a landslide victory in the elections and under whose administration the commitment of troops in Vietnam was to spiral up in massive proportions was campaigning on a peace ticket.

[Johnson] "Weapons do not make peace. Men make peace, and peace comes not through strength alone but through wisdom, and patience, and restraint."

After the elections in 1964 it seemed that peace was a possibility. Goldwater, the hawk, had been defeated and in Vietnam itself—the Viet Cong, pleased with the death of Diem—had offered peace talks with the Vietnamese Government, and the French President, De Gaulle, said he would mediate. And from another side, Prince Sihanouk's

Government in Cambodia had invited South Vietnam to join his country in a neutral confederation. But neutrality was not what the Americans wanted. To them, that was just another name for Communism, and in early 1965 the first United States ground forces—not to be technically known as Advisers—entered Vietnam by way of Danang. They were there supposedly to guard United States bases; but it wasn't long before they came into direct conflict with the Viet Cong. One of the first engagements was near the little hamlet of Cam Ney.

[Live report: sounds of battle] "We're on the outskirts of the village of Cam Ney with elements of the First Battalion Ninth Marine and we were walking into this village when—you can hear what happened . . . This is what the war in Vietnam is all about. From the old to the very young. Fire was coming from here and now we walk into the village and we can see no young people at all. Fire was coming from automatic weapons from all of these villages. . . . The people who are left are like this woman here—the very old. . . . It first appeared that the Marine's had been sniped at and that a few houses were made to pay. Shortly after an officer told me he had orders to go in and level the string of hamlets that surrounds Cam Ney village. All around the common paddy-fields that feed these hamlets, a ring of fire. A hundred and fifty homes were levelled in retaliation for a burst of gunfire. The women and the old men who remain will never forget that August afternoon. . . ."

In the few months after Cam Ney the number of troops in South Vietnam went up to around twenty-three thousand but this was just a drop in the bucket. By mid-June of the following year that number had multiplied by 11 times, up to two hundred and sixty-seven thousand men. It was of course in 1965 that Sir Robert Menzies committed Australian troops to fight in Vietnam and sent in the First Battalion Royal Australian Regiment. In 1965 our commitment was small but like the Americans the numbers increased steeply in 1966. The number of Australian, New Zealand and South Korean troops rocketed from 2,300 to 29,000; and the total allied strength in South Vietnam reached about 910,000, outnumbering the known North Vietnamese and Viet Cong in South Vietnam by a ratio of 3 to 1. But this was a time too when the full force of the war began to directly affect the people of South Vietnam. A time when students in Saigon began to protest publicly for the first time and Buddhist Priests drew world attention to their displeasure at the way their people were being treated by dousing themselves with petrol and burning alive in the market places of Saigon. It was also a time of daily bombing sorties on cities in North Vietnam. But thousands of miles away, the Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, was telling the American people that public protests of this kind were not interfering with the Government's crusade to smash the Communist menace from North Vietnam:

[Rusk] "There have been some problems resulting from the temporary stoppage of the port facilities in Danang but the main effort goes on and I can say this morning that yesterday I was told that there were thirty operations in process out there, battalion size or larger, and twenty of those were South Vietnamese. That's then about the figure that has been consistent throughout the past several weeks

and months. Now I think that one thing that has happened is that during this period of demonstration I suspect that the Viet Cong has been lying low for a little while. They've been a little harder to find and there has been less fighting while they've watched this process to see what its outcome might be."

But the Viet Cong did not lie low for very long. And as the war escalated in 1966 and 1967 so too did the protests. All over America students were taking to the streets and mass burnings of Army draft-cards on University Campuses became a regular ritual. Almost every day American television was showing films of angry crowds and demonstrations which culminated in the famous march on the Pentagon in late 1967. In the minds of the people there began to be confusion about what the war was really about. Which side was right, and if the sacrifice was really worth it. And this was typified by a bizarre debate on television between Dean Rusk and Senator Fullbright, about whose side God was on.

[Fullbright] "I said the characteristic is both arrogance and self-righteousness which means that every country has always believed that God was on their side when they waged a war and that they were there for good reasons. I never heard of a country that didn't think that, did you?"

[Rusk] "I don't believe we brought God into our current military operations."

[Fullbright] "I didn't say we had. I know of no exceptions. I remember in World War I—the Germans had inscribed on their belt buckles 'Gott mit uns'—and we had the same thought in our minds that God was with us—didn't we? I am only making this from a point of view of other nations—that they might not think that we are as pure and holy in our purposes as we do and this is a fact of life, that we have to take into consideration and be very careful about, I think."

For the United States 1968 was a year of gloom. The year when dreams died for Lyndon Johnson, for Martin Luther King and Robert Kennedy, Eugene McCarthy and Hubert Humphrey, for thousands of American men fighting in Vietnam and for the five hundred citizens of the village of My Lai. A journalist of the *New York Times* wrote in that year that "Lyndon Johnson came into office seeking a great society and found instead an ugly little war that consumed him. On one side of him the 1968 Tet offensive in which the Viet Cong dramatically reappeared on the streets of Saigon, pushing their way into the United States Embassy itself. And on the other side, political trouble at home, as the popular Senator Eugene McCarthy chose that time to defy Johnson and make his run for the Presidency."

[McCarthy] "I am hopeful that this challenge which I am making, which I hope will be supported by other members of the Senate and other politicians, may alleviate at least in some degree the sense of political helplessness, and restore in many people a belief in the processes of American politics and of American Government. As to those nations traditionally accepted as being part of the Western World, I think that we would probably be honoured by most of them if we were to somehow work out a withdrawal or a dis-engagement in Vietnam."

While Richard Nixon decisively won the pre-selection for the Republican Party, McCarthy, swept along by a new brand of fighting doves, almost over-ran the President,

who just three and a half years earlier had been elected by the largest majority in history. He lost but by only 230 votes and it was a signal to the Kennedy family that Lyndon Johnson was not a sure thing. Four days later the Kennedy's second son, Robert, made his play:

[Kennedy] "I run to seek new policies. Policies to end the bloodshed in Vietnam, and in our cities. Policies to close the gap that now exists between Black and White, between rich and poor, between young and old. I run for the Presidency because it is now unmistakably clear that we can change these disastrous, divisive policies only by changing the men, who are now making them."

Fifteen days later, as Lyndon Johnson concluded a comprehensive report to the people on the Vietnam Policy, he looked over to Lady Bird Johnson and then, stunned the nation. [Johnson] "It is true, that a house divided against itself, is a house that cannot stand. There is division in the American house now and, believing this as I do, I have concluded that I should not permit the President to become involved in the partisan divisions that are developing in this political year. Accordingly, I shall not seek, and I will not accept, the nomination of my party for another term as your President."

(To be continued)

## The Way of Love

Such is the title that the distinguished Sir John Glubb gives to his book together with the sub-title, "Lessons From a Long Life." In this work he shows how his belief in God and in a straightforward Christianity has helped him. His chapter headed "Personalities or Pearl Buttons" stresses the value of quality rather than quantity regarding people: "The 'gross national product' of young human beings is reckoned by numerical output, not by quality . . . Colleges and universities in Western countries find themselves under constant pressure to increase their output of graduates." He stresses moral character and contrasts cleverness and wisdom, and calls standardised compulsory education by the state "the most dangerous of all tendencies." For the organiser wishes all children to leave school with the same ideas and opinions "as like one another as pearl buttons on a card." Yet those who try to destroy human individualism are flouting the Creator's will and such efforts "must inevitably end in catastrophe."

In his summary, Sir John calls the return of the Old Testament to a veneration equal to that enjoyed by the preaching of Christ "one of the most ironical freaks of history," for Christ himself has declared its moral teaching to be superseded. Further, God has given us Free Will, but "organisation, propaganda, indoctrination and regimentation sometimes seem to be fighting against God, whose service is perfect freedom." He ends with Bonar's hymn, "Beloved, let us love. . ."

The economist E. F. Schumacher also bases his thought on Christianity, especially on the Beatitudes, in *Small is Beautiful*, in which he rounds on the saying of Keynes that "Avarice and usury and precaution must be our gods for a little longer still." Indeed the author rejects as "bad, vicious, life-destroying type of metaphysics" the nineteenth century ideas of Marx, Freud, etc. Instead he concentrates on our resources, on man and on nature, emphasising the

need for wisdom and for the end of greed and envy as motives. He has little to say, I'm afraid, in all this, of the leading role of finance and nothing about any flaws in the monetary system.

However, he makes his case that "small is beautiful" and that his book studies economics "as if people mattered," for he opposes the gigantic Plan of Dr. Mansholt, vice-president of the E.E.C., and as against Dr. Kaldor he recommends technology with a human face and has no use for the "forward stampede." He commends the Scott-Bader Commonwealth, the Soil Association and the Intermediate Technology Development Group.

The spirit of Keynes also runs into opposition from the Committee of Catholics and Anglicans Against the Common Market, for they object to the monetary policy of the E.E.C. because it is "an attempt to make workable the usurious system of debt creation upon which the modern monetary system is immorally based; a system completely contrary to Christian thinking." (*Catholic Herald*, May 30, 1975.) Also, one adds, contrary to Christian thinking is the idea of a world tyrant or cabal towards which the E.E.C. makes an obvious advance.

Another advocate of the religion of love and reconciliation, Father Arthur Lewis, warns of a "ruthless Communism as dehumanised as it is godless, backed by financial interests which for the most part are quite concealed from view." But he does not find support from church leaders and attacks the United Society for the Propagation of the Gospel's missionary magazine *Network* as a "leftist political broadsheet." In Rhodesia, "the Communists and the High Financiers behind them" have prevented reconciliation. But the work of the Rhodesian Christian Group grows, and the Secretary of the Christian League of South Africa is to tour Rhodesia (*Newsletter*, May, 1975).

Those who substitute hatred for love as main motive have control of considerable publicity, and Father Lewis holds that *Network* is "polluting the parish churches of Britain with a parody of Christianity which is to a substantial extent Marxist in origin. . ." (*Propagation of the Gospel?*) And the Archbishop of Portland, when commenting on the flood of revolutionary propaganda that issues from the U.S. Catholic Conference asks, "Who manipulates the bishops?" (*Open Eye*, May, 1975). The Way of Love has the better advocates.

—H.S.

## THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which was founded in 1933 by Clifford Hugh Douglas.

The Social Credit Secretariat is a non-party, non-class organisation neither connected with nor supporting any political party, Social Credit or otherwise.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: Home and abroad, post free: One year £2.60. Six months £1.30, Airmail one year £3.50.

Offices—  
Business: 245 Cann Hail Road, Leytonstone, London, E.11 3NL.  
Tel. 01-534 7295

Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, 2 Park Village East, London, NW1 7PX.  
Tel. 01-387 3893

IN AUSTRALIA—  
Business: Box 2318V, G.P.O., Melbourne, Victoria 3001  
Editorial: Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001 (Editorial Head Office)

THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

Personnel—Chairman: Dr. B. W. Monahan, 4 Torres Street, Red Hill, Canberra, Australia 2603. Deputy Chairman: British Isles: Dr. Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, 2 Park Village East, London, NW1 7PX. Telephone: 01-387 3893. General Deputy Chairman and Secretary, H. A. Scoular, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001