WHICH WAY TREASON?

Ricefields, buffaloes, and children: the perennial image of peace in Viet-Nam.
- A pointed absence of American G.I.'s.

Aid to the N.L.F. - why?..the history

Towards the end of July the Monash Labor Club decided to establish a Committee to raise funds for the South Vietnam National Liberation Front. Since then the Committee has been subjected to a constant barrage of attacks from the press, parliament, etc., and we have not in fact started collecting for the fund. We are issuing this pamphlet to set out what has happened in the last few weeks, what the N.L.F. is, why we support it.

For a long time, the Monash Labor Club, in common with other University Labor Clubs has opposed the Vietnam war. We felt that the United States was guilty of aggression and that Australia should not join with them in sending troops to intervene in a civil war. Together with many other sections of the community we fought hard against commitment to the Vietnam war and the sending of conscripts. But we failed and the war still goes on and conscripts are still getting killed.

Gradually we came to realize that it was no use simply condemning the war and demanding that it be stopped. We were logically forced to move from denouncing the United States as an aggressor to supporting the victims of aggression - the Vietnamese people led by the National Liberation Front. For a long time we have been distributing literature which showed that the war was not "aggression from the North" and that the "Viet Cong" were an indigenous Southern Vietnamese nationalist movement whose main aims were social justice, land reform and an end to foreign domination. We had been pointing out to people that the Americans were the aggressors who had sent half a million troops to occupy another country and who were engaged in indiscriminate attacks on the civilian population. After saying this sort of thing for some time we were led to and acknowledge our actual support for the National Liberation Front.

Support for the N.L.F. has been the policy of the Monash Labor Club (and of the Australian Student Labor Federation which represents Labor Clubs at all Australian Universities) for considerable time now but no concrete action was taken to implement it. The Sydney University ALP Club did establish a fund for medical aid to North Vietnam and the N.L.F. more than a year ago. This has been largely ignored since.
Non-issue to issue?

After the last election it seemed that the Vietnam war was rapidly becoming an non-issue. The war was escalating and leading to more Liberal casualties, but it was becoming increasingly restless, confused, and dissatisfied with it, but it seemed as if the peace movement was gaining momentum. The heavy defeat in November and the subsequent election of Mr. Whitlam to leadership of the ALP served to demoralize opponents of the war and we felt that while the problem of the war was not that most Australians actually supported the war but that just there wasn’t interest in it. We couldn’t follow the long complicated arguments about Geneva conferences, de-escalation, etc. People who had previously settled for the Government arguments that the “the Reds must be stopped before they get here” were now becoming increasingly anxious about the progress of the war and we wanted to be sure that this anxiety could be turned into active opposition by making people aware of the issues involved.

Accordingly we decided that the best way to make our opposition to the war felt was to declare our full support for the National Liberation Front and prove that we meant it by collecting funds for them. This was put before a series of five general meetings of the Club with attendances of between 50 and 80 and it was finally decided on Friday, July 21, after a series of meetings with the Club of Club with the Club Committee for Aid to the NLF which would have two funds, the main one for direct financial aid to the NLF (the unspecified fund) and a second one for medical aid to civilians in NLF controlled areas. We realized that this was an unpopular stand to take and we expected a hostile reaction at first but we were surprised at the speed and violence of the counter-attack. By Monday the 24th, the press had been taken in and the Club was virtually defunct.

Students vote to recognise the NLF.

The two spokesmen for the club and the aid committee sent a note to the meeting saying that they would not attend because there had been threats of violence. But the meeting rejected the DLP motion condemning us and instead adopted a series of resolutions supporting the NLF, which, while dissociating the student body from our stand, did not make it clear that the students present had no more right to speak for the University as a whole than we did.

On Monday there was a general meeting of the Labor Club. Our opponents within the club had announced that the original resolution had only been carried by a small section of the club and did not have the support of the general membership and accordingly there were hordes of ca-cameramen and reporters waiting outside the meeting. Signs were put all over the University asking members to restore recognition to the club and at the meeting and voting to rescind support for the NLF. There was a vote of 150 (more than 100 of those present were members of the anti-Francis James clubs at Monash put together and more than the number of students who attended the last general meeting of students called by the SRC). After an hour’s debate the meeting rejected a motion of 150 (more than 100 of those present were members of the anti-Francis James clubs at Monash put together and more than the number of students who attended the last general meeting of students called by the SRC). After an hour’s debate the meeting rejected a motion of rescission by 50 votes to 39 and resolved by 100 votes to 39 to rescind support for the Aid Committee. About 15 to 20 members resigned with the intention of forming a new club but we also received 20 to 30 new applications for membership and with 250 members we are still the largest political organization at any Australian University.

Since the Monash committee was announced, a committee for medical aid has been established at Melbourne University and an unspecified fund has been set up in Canberra. We have also been informed of plans for committees in Newcastle and La Trobe University. We have also had more than $500 from the unspecified fund to the NLF mission in Cambodia. At this stage we are appealing for organizations and individuals to contribute to our work.

Before setting out our views on the nature of the NLF and its reasons for supporting it we would like to answer two criticisms that are sometimes made.

1. It is suggested that while the NLF may be legitimate, it is wrong for us to send aid to an enemy against whom Australian troops are fighting.

We disagree with this; in fact we would say that it is precisely because Australia is involved that we are justified in sending aid to the people who are being oppressed and denied their rights by the policies of the National Liberation Front. It is precisely for a reason that is sometimes misinterpreted as justifying the policies of the National Liberation Front. It is precisely for this reason that we are justified in supporting the NLF.

2. There is some preliminary mumb-lings about ratbag students and the Government decided to support Senator McManus. The Government had no option but to do so.

We disagree; it is precisely because the National Liberation Front is doing so much to advance the cause of peace and freedom that we are justified in supporting it.

Money is sent.

That is all. The story of the day (28/8/67) was that we have received more than $1000 from the medical fund to the British Committee which forwards aid to the Liberation Front. The money was sent via M. Francis James in Sydney—the Editor of the Anglican. We are sending some preliminary mumb-lings about ratbag students and the Government decided to support Senator McManus. The Government had no option but to do so.

We disagree; it is precisely because the National Liberation Front is doing so much to advance the cause of peace and freedom that we are justified in supporting it.

Money is sent.

That is all. The story of the day (28/8/67) was that we have received more than $1000 from the medical fund to the British Committee which forwards aid to the Liberation Front. The money was sent via M. Francis James in Sydney—the Editor of the Anglican. We are sending some preliminary mumb-lings about ratbag students and the Government decided to support Senator McManus. The Government had no option but to do so.

We disagree; it is precisely because the National Liberation Front is doing so much to advance the cause of peace and freedom that we are justified in supporting it.
The Viet Cong are often referred to in our newspapers, and by government spokesmen, as "terrorists". The term has no precise meaning, and is always used by entrenched power groups to disparage the opposition. In "Aggression from the North", for example, Appendix I lists acts of "terrorism", but does not say to whom they presumably are different from "Attacks" or "Sabotage", which are listed separately. At other times, phrases such as "acts of terrorism" are used to describe any Viet Cong activity. According to the writer of this booklet, "By 1968 the use of terror by the Viet Cong increased appreciably. It was particularly in the case of the Viet Cong in the countryside that Vietnam's history of peasant uprising had to be acknowledged."

In small schools, children like these m'Nog kids learn their ABC's; written scripts for the tribal peoples have been invented by the NFL.

In the area. This account warrants some detailed treatment, for it counters the arguments that the Viet Cong rule only by terror. The explanation given by Warner is much more credible:

To begin with, XB was not a Communist village, or even a village that sympathized with the Communists. On the contrary...

Note that the "good work" was predominantly military and administrative—hardly likely by itself to win much support. As one authority on revolutionary warfare has written: "The government is systematically eliminated from the countryside by the Viet Cong. They are the only ones who have studied and observed these movements."

The real government, with law, and order, and responsible people, was the Viet Cong.

Once a state of civil war existed, those who occupied administrative or authoritative positions in the government must surely have known that they were marked men. Indeed, often the village headman had a semi-military position, and was protected by a squad of soldiers. The killing of soldiers is not called "terrorism" when our side does it.

Similarly, the kidnappings which figure prominently in the U.S. statistics of terrorism were not usually done for any purpose except the indoctrination of the prisoner in the aims and philosophy of the NLF. It is really ludicrous that the White Paper includes "Forced Propaganda Sessions" among its statistics of terrorism! Many of the men kidnapped were later returned unhurt, and would, naturally, claim that they have been forcibly abducted.

In the NLF Manifesto proclaimed in 1960, the following objectives are discussed:

(a) To rid the country of the U.S.-controlled military dictatorship and the U.S. military presence.

(b) To institute a largely liberal and democratic government incorporating the essential democratic freedoms of press, of opinion, of the North, of movement, of trade unionism and of religious worship.

(c) To release all political prisoners, to wipe out illiteracy and to pursue a policy of peace and neutrality.

(d) To reduce land rent; implement agrarian reform with the aim of providing land to the tillers; guaranteeing the property rights of farmers.

(e) To resume normal relations between the zones of North and South and, through a process of negotiation, bring about their reunification by peaceful stages.

Although this programme contains striking differences from the 1960 constitution of the D.R.V.N. and also from the 1945 constitution, the most important difference is the NLF's preference for peasant proprietors of land in the South, a feature which requires state ownership of land.

Cont. page 4.
Negotiation is NO answer

The U.S. response to this was that one cannot negotiate with "criminals".

And this is Johnson's attitude to the body that has an overwhelming weight of evidence to show that the repatriation of the majority of the people of South Vietnam.

Most observers on Vietnam urge that settlement should be based on the principles of the Geneva Agreements for 1954 and that they have been so often misrepresented, here they are:

1. Cessation of hostilities and disengagement of military forces.
2. Vietnam is one country, and political arrangements must be made for its re-unification.
3. Pending the re-unification, the respective military zones shall not build up their armaments nor form military alliances.

The one thing that stops settlement on these principles is the size of the U.S. military machine in Vietnam.

The elections were obstructed and the United States set up a regime in the South under control of American officials and advisors. They selected former police spies of the French occupation, who were hated and despised by the population. Ngo Dinh Diem, a wealthy Catholic landowner from the North, was installed. The elections agreed upon in the negotiations of 1954 at Genoa were not held. U.S. officers and troops began to pour into South Vietnam in what came to be known as America's "secret war". Hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese were killed. Over seven million people were placed in forced-labour camps characterized by barbed-wire, torture and starvation.

It should be abundantly clear that the very presence of the "United States" troops in Vietnam means the continuation of forced, officially negotiated settlements. To ask the Vietnamese now after twelve years of torment to negotiate about a solution is to insult them.

Words can be misleading. The peace movement through the advocacy of negotiations in Vietnam has hardened the cause it purports to promote. We must side with the Vietnamese who defend every inch of their land, every drop of their water, every breath of their air. The continuation of the war in Vietnam will depend on our capacity to speak and act clearly, alerting others to its origins and massive force. When people in the North oppose their own person effectively, and only then will the war end.

It is clear that the call for negotiations has been launched in response to Uncle Sam's needs. Vietnam's future victory is the southern retreat to the north. He cannot continue to destroy the north into surrender so he resorts to trickery seeking to perpetuate the domination of the south by claiming that the war is unwinnable and both sides make concessions—he will conceed a pause in bombing and the Viet Minh side their right to sovereignty, independence and freedom.

American sources give 480,000 tons of bombs and bullets expended in 1955 and 337,000 tons of bombs plus 500,000 tons of bullets in 1956. (U.S. News and World Report, Jan. 2, 1957) This is more than twice the total used in the entire three years of the Korean War, given as 448,000 tons. (Herald Tribune, 10/10/66)
This war will end in victory! The idea that war is "unwinnable"—meaning unwinnable for both sides—is a euphemistic way of saying that it is unwinnable for the U.S.—or that the U.S. is, in fact, in the process of losing. As President Nguyen Huy Tho of the NLF says—"Final victory is not conceived as wiping out all Americans on South Vietnamese soil, still less, imposing a total military defeat on the U.S. It means that the NLF leadership is confident that it can smash every offensive the U.S. and its satellite forces mount, that it can defeat every military and political maneuver, that it can impose heavy losses on enemy troops on a sharply rising scale, that it can continue to defend and enlarge the territory and population under its control; that in the end the U.S. will see that there is no alternative but to pack up and go home. And isn't this essentially what is now being reported—that the "turning point" of a few months ago was never there?"

In this conglomeriation of mythical, much-talked-of turning points and in the vacuum of government talk on military realities, the truth about negotiations should be exposed by open and widespread support for the Vietnames and their National Front for Liberation.


Dear Senator Fulbright,

Don't let Gen. Westmoreland and President Johnson erode your will to dissent with the argument that all the soldiers "over there" staunchly support the war. They don't. Most of them are apathetic and I am by no means the only one who is vehemently opposed to it.

Gen. Ky's government has virtually no popular support; most of his top aides sport French decorations on their uniforms. The Vietnamese people identify us with the hated French imperialists because we support the regime. By occupying and devastating Vietnam we have gained few friends.

The President must know the VC are a largely indigenous group who have the legitimate gripe against the many "miracle-working" governments of South Vietnam and that in our bombings of North Vietnam we have committed outrages for which we once condemned the Nazis. With admiration.

Americans—the terrorists.

Dear Senator Fulbright: I went to Vietnam a hard-charging Marine 2d Lt., sure I had an

Abridged from Letters put into the Congress Record of 16/6/1967.

swerved the plea of a victimized people. That belief lasted about two weeks. Instead of fighting Communist aggressors I found that 90% of the time our military actions were directed against the people of South Vietnam. We are engaged in a war in Vietnam to pound a people into submission to a government that has little or no popular support.

Much has been written about the terror tactics used by the Viet Cong. The real terrorists in Vietnam are the Americans and their allies. I don't deny that some of the accusations against the VC are true but from my own experience the terror and havoc that we spread makes the VC look like a Girl Scout picnic.

Can you imagine what an isolated village looks like after it has been hit by over 500 750-pound bombs in a matter of seconds? Women, children, old men, cattle and everything else is struck down without even knowing from where their destruction originated. This particular village ceased to exist because it was in a VC-dominated area. Intelligence reports said it might have been used as a North Vietnamese regiment headquarters. We never found any dead soldiers but as

Monday, while at the province chief's house the large party enjoyed good food and loud music, in the next valley over the ridge the 500-pounders fell steadily. Then this war was a different sort of music—B-52 style. I wondered then if we could ever put these people back together as fast as we are blowing them apart.

In the past few months as an advisor to the VN Coastal Force, I have seen too often the real casualties of this conflict—the farmers and their families in the villages. By air strike, artillery, and the villagers were killed and burned out by our friendly Korean mercenaries. Of course, I do share in the frustration that I have stayed in the service of my own free will and was sent to Vietnam again to brutalize these poor people.

The people—the real casualties.

Dear Senator Fulbright: I have been meaning to write this letter to you for a long while. This evening the pressures are too great to be ignored. Last evening I listened to a VOA (Voice of America) broadcast on "Vietnam War Dissent in the U.S." The essential theme was that those who protest the war were either Communists or cranks. And coupled with this was a sly reminder that we have our share of lunatics who wish a wider war and that the crack in dissent is just a policy. Not one word about responsible, reasoned objections—we couldn't admit that. Following the VOA broadcast I tuned into Radio Peking in a subconscious desire of the usual insanities about the "glorious thought of Chairman Mao." I sounded somewhat different—because I realized how these two distortions were in their joint disregard of truth while pursuing doctrine. I am horrified that my government is unable to admit any possibility of "error".

But this is really a small point. This evening it is fairly quiet but
We have included below extracts from speeches given in 1965 by Nguyen Huu Tho, President of the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation.

You are entitled, of course, as we are, to treat some of what is quoted with due scepticism. Some of the phraseology is rather hard to adapt to, as it is at times the over-riding sentiments. But so also are those of Churchill's World War Two speeches, if read now. Nevertheless we think it is important to hear what "the other side" has to say.

Nguyen Huu Tho did not himself participate in the anti-French war. He was a lawyer in Saigon, son of a civil servant in the French Colonial Administration and was far from being branded a leftist. However he made the "mistake" of leading a group of Saigon intellectuals in their protest against the arrival of three American warships in Saigon in 1950. The ships arrival was meant as an expression of solidarity with the French in their war efforts. They did not stay long, but Tho was imprisoned for his protestations for some two years until Viet Minh forces freed him.

When the Geneva Agreements were signed he resumed his law practice in Saigon.

RIFLE FIRE

But just 12 days after the ceasefire agreements were signed in July 1954, the Viet Minh celebrated their victory in Saigon. Coupled with the celebrations were resolutions passed at the celebration demonstrations calling for immediate release of political and military prisoners, as provided for in the agreements. As Tho says, "The reply (from the authorities) came in a volley of rifle fire. Several people were wounded and a pregnant woman was shot through the stomach. That this, the final demonstration, in peace and freedom, as we thought, should be brutally suppressed, acted as a cold douche on the most ardent spirits. The same day we set up a Committee of Defense of Peace and the Geneva Agreements, and I was elected president. The Committee aimed at acting as a sort of watchdog to see the Agreements were strictly applied and to bring to the notice of the International Control Commission (comprised of India as chairman, Poland and Canada) any violations of the Agreements. Within a couple of months we started getting delegations from the provinces begging us to set up similar committees all over the countryside. We started organising them when, on August the 11th, 1954, four months after the signing of the Geneva Agreements, the police suddenly swooped down, dissolved our committees and arrested a number of leading members, including myself. We had no idea at that time, but in forming the various branches we had created the embryo of the National Front for Liberation set up more than six years later."

So the repression, the terror campaigns, and the reprisals policies began to be felt all over the countryside. Resistance to Diem's repression became overt after 1957. The sporadic resistance finally came under central leadership with the formation of the NLF in December, 1960.

On the occasion of the 5th founding anniversary of the NLF, Nguyen Huu Tho explains the raison d'etre of the NLF, its history (in brief) and something of its nature, and its military successes.

"Celebrating the 5th founding anniversary of the NLF, the entire South Vietnamese people and the National Front for Liberation wish to convey heartfelt and warm greetings to their brothers and friends in all continents. We sincerely thank the socialist countries, the peoples in Asia, Africa and Latin America, the progressive people in the United States and other countries, for their sympathy and great international support and assistance accorded to our self-liberation struggle.

"Following the victorious August Revolution in 1945 and the success of the 9-year War of Resistance against the French colonists and the American Interventionists, the people in the South should have enjoyed together with their compatriots throughout the country a life in peace and achieve their basic national rights, namely independence, unity, sovereignty and territorial integrity.

"But the U.S. imperialists and their henchmen have slashed the Geneva Agreements, carried out downright suppression and drowned in blood and fire all the patriotic forces of the South Vietnamese people fighting for independence, democracy and peaceful reunification of the Fatherland.

"Left with no alternative, the South Vietnamese people had to rise up to struggle for their own right to live, their own happiness and freedom. During the years of hard and fierce political struggle against the enemy, our compatriots with their bare hands fought the enemy, the armed forces of the U.S. imperialists and their henchmen, and achieved greater and greater victories."

"Since then, the Front has become a focal point to unite all patriotic forces in South Vietnam, the organizer and leader of all successors of our Southern compatriots in their fights against U.S. Imperialism and colonial exploitation. Since then, too, the victory of our people has become bigger and bigger with every passing year and the defeat of the opponent more and more serious."

"Looking back at the path travelled by us in the last five years, the victories of our people and our compatriots is all the greater, the more so since the young generation, the future of our nation, is but compared to our victorious recorded in our anti-U.S. cause for national salvation.

GREETS

"The great successes we have won are:

"The front of great unity against U.S. aggression and for national salvation of the entire South Vietnamese people is now steadier and broader than ever. The front has spread all over under its banner of patriotism and justice more than ten million people of all walks of life, of all ages, strata, religious communities, workers, peasants, labouring urban people, retailers,-handicraftsmen, youth, pupils, students, intellectuals, women, men, industrialists and tradesmen, patriotic personalities, minority nationals in the Western Plateaux, Khmer nationals, Catholic and Protestant, Dao and Hoa Hao believers. Hundreds of thousands of overseas Vietnamese, though living for foreign lands, have been turning their thought toward the Front, to its banner of justice and national salvation."

"In order to meet the pressing people's self-liberation struggle, requirements of the entire South Vietnamese National Front for Liberation came into being on December 20, 1960, with the aim of uniting the people of all strata, nationalities, religious communities and political parties and all patriotic personalities in the struggle to drive out the U.S. aggressors from the country and overthrow the puppet administration — their lackeys — who are ruthless, who lack their sacred national rights, achieve independence, democracy, peace and neutrality in South Vietnam with a view to reunifying the Fatherland.

"The great successes we have won are:

"The Front of great unity against aggression and for national salvation of the entire South Vietnamese people is now steadier and broader than ever. The front has spread all over under its banner of patriotism and justice more than ten million people of all walks of life, of all ages, strata, religious communities, workers, peasants, labouring urban people, retailers, handicraftsmen, youth, pupils, students, intellectuals, women, men, industrialists and tradesmen, patriotic personalities, minority nationals in the Western Plateaux, Khmer nationals, Catholic and Protestant, Dao and Hoa Hao believers. Hundreds of thousands of overseas Vietnamese, though living for foreign lands, have been turning their thought toward the Front, to its banner of justice and national salvation."

"In order to meet the pressing people's self-liberation struggle, requirements of the entire South Vietnamese National Front for Liberation came into being on December 20, 1960, with the aim of uniting the people of all strata, nationalities, religious communities and political parties and all patriotic personalities in the struggle to drive out the U.S. aggressors from the country and overthrow the puppet administration — their lackeys — who are ruthless, who lack back their sacred national rights, achieve independence, democracy, peace and neutrality in South Vietnam with a view to reunifying the Fatherland.

"Since then, the Front has become a focal point to unite all patriotic forces in South Vietnam, the organizer and leader of all successors of our Southern compatriots in their fights against U.S. Imperialism and colonial exploitation. Since then, too, the victory of our people has become bigger and bigger with every passing year and the defeat of the opponent more and more serious."

"Looking back at the path travelled by us in the last five years, the victories of our people and our compatriots is all the greater, the more so since the young generation, the future of our nation, is but compared to our victorious recorded in our anti-U.S. cause for national salvation.

SUCCESES

The great successes we have won are:

"The front of great unity against aggression and for national salvation of the entire South Vietnamese people is now steadier and broader than ever. The front has spread all over under its banner of patriotism and justice more than ten million people of all walks of life, of all ages, strata, religious communities, workers, peasants, labouring urban people, retailers, handicraftsmen, youth, pupils, students, intellectuals, women, men, industrialists and tradesmen, patriotic personalities, minority nationals in the Western Plateaux, Khmer nationals, Catholic and Protestant, Dao and Hoa Hao believers. Hundreds of thousands of overseas Vietnamese, though living for foreign lands, have been turning their thought toward the Front, to its banner of justice and national salvation."

Cont. page 7
The ten million people in the areas are boosting production, improving living conditions, building fighting villages of hamlets, developing the guerrilla warfare and its support in the areas, public health, and making active contribution in manpower and material resources to the national salvation movement. There remains vast political, material and moral potential of the South Vietnam revolution in the liberated zone. That is the rich human and material potential of the South Vietnam people's fighting in solidarity within the Front in an invincible strength in their fight for liberation.

2. The large liberated area under the control of the Front stretching from the Ben Hai river bank to the vast Western plateau and the rich delta region of Nam Bo (South Vietnam proper) is covering more than four-fifths of South Vietnam's territory.

3. The liberation armed forces of the South Vietnam people are strong. Viet Minh has not won any war on our initiative. They are endowed with a very high determination to fight and to win, have made quick progress in politics, tactics, technique, organisation and command.

4. Our brothers and friends all over the world now are more numerous than ever before. They are supporting the South Vietnam people more powerfully than ever, both morally and materially, including the offer to send volunteers when necessary. Many important international organisations have recognised the Front as the sole genuine representative of the South Vietnam people. President Johnson has openly said that "the Front's voice...has been heard at nearly all the rostrums of important international conferences, from London to Phnom Penh, Jakarta, Cairo, Accra, Helsinki, etc."

"At present, the U.S. imperialists are on the one hand, prattling about 'peace' and 'negotiation' in order to buy time for their preparation for the war, and in the background they are secretly organizing a secret arms deal with the U.S. military. While still singing 'peace' songs, they are secretly preparing their own forces to continue their aggression. This is the so-called 'peace' and 'negotiation' policy of the U.S. imperialists. The U.S. imperialists have not yet renounced their bellicose and aggressive policy and are deliberately obstructing to South Vietnam attempting to turn our country into a new-type colony and military base of the U.S. and force the yoke of neo-colonialism on our people."

Aid to the N.L.F.—why history, etc.
cont. from pages 1 & 2.

the Australian Government has forced them to go there and fight an aggressive war—not because of our aid to the NLF. The slaughter on both sides will end only when the war ends and our troops are brought home.

We opposed the launching of this dirty war right from the start and our only desire is to see it brought to an end but it is now clear that this can only be achieved by the total withdrawal of all Western troops.

It is the Government who are traitors for sacrificing Australian lives in defence of American interests.

Some people say that they agree completely with our views, but that by raising them in public at this time we can only harm the broader anti-war movement. However, the ALP and the DLP have consistently opposed the war, and the Liberal Party has even commented that the war is a "disaster".

We disagree with this because we believe that it is extremely important to revitalise the war movement on a new basis. The movement was gradually becoming assimilated by its environment. Instead of actively opposing American aggression and being a source of concern to the government by frustrating its war plans the peace movement was being taken in by such slogans as "Stop the War, Negotiate!" which reflect President Johnson's position and engage entirely in such activities as peaceful poster parades which cause the Government no inconvenience. The movement was beginning to unfold in on itself community of 'vietnicks' and 'peacecivics' solemnly telling each other about the virtues of a peaceful solution to the war, while it was vital that this movement turn away from holding demonstrations to convince each other about how bad the war is and towards effective action to end it.

We think the movement should reject the slogan 'peaceful solutions' and lay the blame for the war squarely on the shoulders of the Americans and look for a solution where it can be found — complete withdrawal of the Americans and their allies. It is only when the main purpose — to re-awaken political interest in Vietnam and it has also succeeded in bringing home certain points which could not be made in any other way. People are having to find out who the enemy is and what the NLF-Viet Cong business is all about. They are learning to hate the enemy.

So the question was, is it an enemy Congo — an anonymous group of terrorists probably originating from North Vietnam or China but the National Liberation Front in most of southern Vietnam with diplomatic representatives overseas.

The most obvious fact that any group of Australian citizens would actually be the enemy is causing doubts about the war in the minds of many people — it has never been very clear why it is happening now. It is really rather strange that people who oppose the NLF and support the war came out in support of our democracy and to aid the enemy. It all helps to weaken the Government's position. We have certainly not harmed the broader movement by our stand. On the contrary, we have been regarded as extreme and moderate and respectable as a result of our action. This was particularly noticeable at the National Front where the Labor Party had previously been unable to speak for us. SRC to declare itself against the war but a meeting of 800 students called specifically to condemn us carried a resolution opposing the war and calling on the Australian Government to recognize the NLF as a radical and principled organization. In this connection we should perhaps mention that in this country medical aid has made widespread and medical aid seem respectable by comparison when previously medical aid would have been regarded as an equally treacherous aid. We have embarrassed the Labor Party it is because we look for a party to once again take a definite stand on the war and on civil liberties. It has certainly been made quite clear that we are in no way connected with the party and we have done nothing to injure it. In the long run, the present controversy can only do the ALP, the Labor Movement, and the peace movement, good. It can do any noticeable damage so far.

Get your organization to carry resolutions of support or, if you prefer, of support for medical aid only for support of a democratic right. Arrange for distribution of this pamphlet and other available material.

Whether we agree with us or not, make fullest use of the opportunities for political discussion provided by the controversy over whether we have the right to send aid.

Editor's note:—

In anticipating criticism to the effect that this publication is 'very one-sided', we admit quite openly that it is, in the Australian political context, it is also 'extreme'.

The war is seen (and we believe correctly) in this publication as a matter of right and wrong with the NLF in the right, and guess who's wrong?

For this analysis we make no apology. Like Mr Amoni (see page 8) we have lost patience with the cold excursions into academia; for much the same reasons. What we are saying is that it is not more than a matter of fact that we in Australia have a government that has detailed its troops to fight on the wrong side in South Vietnam. It's a painful thing to admit but its about time we did. The least we can do in the meantime is work for the withdrawal of these troops and introduce the previously anonymous 'other side'.
Attitudes to Government Action

The Government says that we are traitors, that we are aiding the enemies of our country, and that it is necessary to bring down special legislation to stop us. We say that the Government are traitors, that they are selling young Australian lives for American dollars and that it is necessary to oppose their legislation if we do not want to become accomplices of the sell-out.

If Australia was at war, there would be no problem—our actions would legally be treasonable and we could simply be locked up without anyone worrying very much. But Australia does not declare war against North Vietnam or the NLF because Australia has not done so. Australia could not declare war because this would provide American critics of the Administration in Congress with further ammunition to embarrass Johnson. If the United States and its "allies" were to make a formal declaration of war they would be open to even more criticism as aggressors in the eyes of the world.

Even without a declaration of war the Government could take action by simply proclaiming the National Liberation Front or North Vietnam to be an enemy. This would invoke sections of the Crimes Act that have penalties of death or life imprisonment for "treason" and "treachery." But they do not dare invoke the Crimes Act. First because it would be difficult for Holt to explain to the people why the NLF is an enemy and yet we are not at war. Second, and most important, Holt knows that there is widespread opposition to the Crimes Act with its far-reaching prohibitions and heavy penalties. He knows that he has lost the kind of public support that would enable him to use this sledgehammer law so he has gone to all the trouble of drafting a new law especially aimed at a particular group who were previously engaged in a perfectly legal activity. It means that the Government is getting rather panicky and losing its way out.

Holt knows that the Government's position is becoming increasingly shaky, that as the war goes on casualties will mount and he will have to call up more and more conscripts. He knows that the war is getting more expensive and will lead to higher taxation and wage restrictions which will in turn cause industrial unrest and strike action. He wants to divert the rising tide of anti-government feeling before it can become a scarecrow of the Government. If he gets away with legislation against supporters of the NLF he will then be ready to invoke the Crimes Act to clamp down on all anti-war activity and trade union struggles. Holt was a member of the Liberal Government which drafted the Crimes Act and he could try to use this opportunity provided by the student actions as a preliminary step towards invoking it. He should be stopped now.

We are not claiming that there is any new "academic right" for students in particular to aid the enemies of Australia. But we believe that the Vietnamese people are not Australia's enemies and that all Australians have a right to support them and that they should not be used as a weapon against the war to the limits set by Holt's parliament and Holt's laws. The Australian Government has no right to beairy in the internal affairs of a sovereign state. It is enacting Australian lives in defence of American interests. It is important to oppose this treachery by all means available. There are many in this situation—this is the first time in our history that we have had troops fighting overseas while any section at home actively supports the other side.

Minority of One?

SPEECH AT THE 1964 BEREKLEY TEACH-IN by M. S. Arnoni, survivor of Nazi concentration camps and publisher of The Minority of One, an "Independent Monthly for an American Alternative — dedicated to the eradication of all restrictions on thought and action."

I am appalled by the dry, detached, impersonal, unemotional type of debate that goes on among some professional eunuchs, which is hailed as the passport to academia, and which is supposed to be equaled by equal sobriety whether things concern the wiping out of nations or the destruction of fluoride in our water. Not only is this type of debate inhuman and diabolical but also, and even more so, his moral neutrality. To insist on decorum and politeness in the slaughterhouse of nations is the very peak of human self-deception and of a hellish type of snobbery.

It is thus that I speak to you here not only one of you who tries to analyse international relations but also as one who survived six years of internment in Nazi concentration camps. I am the very peak of human self-deception and of a hellish type of snobbery.

As a survivor of that ghetto, I believe that I am morally justified in warning the millions who did not survive that they could call out to you from their graves or from the fields and rivers upon which their ashes were thrown, they would implore this generation of Americans not to be silent in the face of the genocidal atrocities committed on the people of Vietnam.

This is no time to be silent. When a war is waged by American and American-led troops against a people whose vast majority, as you know, would have American troops on their soil, this is no time to be silent! When eight million out of a total South Vietnamese population of 14 million in concentration camps euphemized as "strategic hamlets" this is no time to be silent! When napalm bombs are thrown on villages and when American civilians are massacred this is the enemy. This is no time to be silent! When ever man and women telling their own soil are taken by the enemy as enemies and therefore as targets for their bullets, this is no time to be silent.

An American genocide is not preferable to a German genocide and the indifference of millions of Americans as criminal and inhuman as was the indifference of millions of German onlookers at the defense life and death struggle of the Vietnamese people. There must be among this young generation, who are insufficiently sensitive to justice, the conscience actions of their government, and sufficiently courageous — to join the people of Vietnam in their struggle.

They, these volunteers, will be the heroes of a future American civilization. They will make a unique contribution toward the survival of America as well as the survival of the prime empire-building stage and be accepted into the family of man not in fear and terror but in earned respect and honor. Thank you.