



the failure of

nb

america and vietnam
supa and the board of governors
letter writers and gateway
page 5 and you

america refuses to face realities

The following is a summary of 'the failure of American foreign policy,' by the famous historian Arnold J. Toynbee, which appeared in the Sept./Oct. issue of Fact, an independent American magazine.

compiled by patrick connell

The Administration at Washington appears to resent criticism of its foreign policy. It is claiming the right to make life and death decisions in private. But to deliberately escalate a 'conventional' war is knowingly to increase the risk of this ranking into an atomic war. And the threat of an atomic war legitimately concerns the whole human race. Therefore the 85 per cent of the human race that are neither Russians nor Americans have a legitimate interest in the consequences of American and Russian foreign policy. But we do not even have a vote. (President Johnson is carrying on an undeclared war without the mandate of the American people and without a debate in Congress). The American people have a small say in decisions about their own fate—THE REST OF US HAVE NO SAY. What the non-voter must do is to offer some alternative policy that is obviously preferable, and at the same time, obviously practicable.

The century's foremost historian then asks if the following account of the administration's standpoint is approximately correct. President Johnson believes that the United States is confronted with a Communist movement, unitary and worldwide, that aims at converting the whole world to Communism, by force if persuasion does not succeed (and, in Mr. Johnson's view, no country has ever turned Communist voluntarily).

This aggressive monolithic Communism, the President believes, is making the war in South Vietnam. The people of South Vietnam are thought to be united in opposing the Communist attempt to subvert the anti-Communist regime in South Vietnam from outside. They are also thought to be united in wanting to remain separate from Communist North Vietnam. The U.S., in intervening militarily in South Vietnam against the Vietcong guerrillas on the invitation of successive anti-Communist governments at Saigon, is (in President Johnson's view) defending freedom and self-determination and, in the process, doing something necessary for her own national security.

In opposing world-wide Communist aggression, President Johnson claims the right—at his administration's discretion) and without first obtaining a mandate from the United Nations—to intervene militarily in any foreign country, anywhere, for either of two purposes: to keep in power an existing non-Communist government, or to keep out of power a government that, even if itself not Communist, might open the way for a Communist take over.

If this account of President Johnson's views is approximately correct, he is claiming, in effect, that the only alternative to Communist

domination of the world is American domination of the world. According to what seems to be President Johnson's doctrine, the government of a foreign country can not justify its existence in the eyes of the U.S. Government merely by virtue of being constitutionally elected, or of being representatively elected, or of being representative of a majority of its people, or of being non-Communist. It must be sufficiently anti-Communist to satisfy the U.S. government that it will not serve unwittingly as a 'Trojan Horse' for a Communist takeover. The disturbing thing about President Johnson's whole present policy is that it is a policy of ESCALATION WITHOUT ANY FORESEEABLE LIMIT. People who have regarded the Soviet Union and China as the archaggressors and bullies are, after U.S. intervention in Vietnam and Santo Domingo, now beginning to wonder whether the United States is becoming the world's No. 1 aggressor and bully.

In the United States today there is current an opinion which holds that because her military might is superior to the power of the rest of the world put together, she can do whatever she chooses and no one will dare to challenge her. This was the German government's line of reasoning and was surely proved fallacious.

Professor Toynbee goes on to examine the picture of the facts on which President Johnson's policy appears to be based. Is there a world-wide unitary Communist movement working methodically to make Communism prevail all over the globe? What is true is that conversion of all mankind is one of Communism's official objectives. But so is it also one of the official objectives of Christianity, Islam and Buddhism. But to maintain that there has been a monolithic Communist movement since China went Communist is fantastic. It is fantastic to believe that the Russo-China feud is a piece of shadow-boxing. It is a quarrel in deadly earnest, and this quarrel is one of the most important current international facts.

China and Russia have quarrelled because their views of their respective national interests have led them to pull in contrary directions. To ignore this conflict between Communist China and Communist Russia is perverse; to base a policy on deliberate refusal to recognize an important fact is to ask for trouble. One of the unfortunate effects of the United States Government's present military policy in Vietnam is that it is forcing Russia and China back into one another's arms. Washington, in fact doing its best to turn the imaginary bog of Communist solidarity into a real menace. But there is still time to relax the present United States pressure on Russia and China and they will fly apart again. For there is nothing but American pressure holding these two nationalist-minded Communist powers together now.

Then there is the thesis that the war in Vietnam is being made solely by Communist pressure from without. This does not explain the existence or the tenacity of the Vietcong. These guerrillas are not Russian or Chinese or North Vietnamese. They

are South Vietnamese. And the cause for which they are fighting must be one they have very much at heart because they are accepting severe privations and heavy casualties. The Vietcong South Vietnamese guerrillas are fighting for national liberation and national unity—causes for which other peoples including the American have fought stubbornly in the past.

For about two thousand years the Vietnamese resisted being dominated by the Chinese. For a hundred years they resisted being dominated by the French. Now they are resisting being dominated by the Americans. American intervention is not only preventing the South Vietnamese from expressing their national will and from establishing a regime that represents the majority of the people; American intervention is also preventing the two severed halves of Vietnam from uniting. And every partitioned nation wants to reunite.

In refusing to recognize that the Vietcong represents a national liberation movement made by the South Vietnamese themselves, and in attributing the war wholly to Communist intervention, from outside, the United States is unintentionally making herself the heir of European colonialism in Asia. While she believes herself to be opposing Communism in South Vietnam on behalf of freedom, she is actually opposing national self determination there. This is colonialism.

This began by supporting an unrepresentative local government dependent on the colonial power because it would be overthrown if outside support were withdrawn. In thus resuscitating colonialism, the U.S. is challenging one of the most powerful political forces in the present day world—a force stronger than either Communism or capitalism. She is challenging the Asian, African and Latin American determination—the majority of mankind's determination—to recover equality with the Western minority.

The present foreign policy of the United States Government is based on ignoring the Russo-China feud and on ignoring the true nature of the Vietcong. It is also based on ignoring China, and this is the third of America's refusals to face realities. It was possible to ignore China in the age of colonialism. It is no longer possible to ignore China, and China's destiny in Eastern Asia is as manifest as the United States destiny is in the Western hemisphere.

Toynbee goes on to say that if one thinks that the United States present policy is a mistaken one, based on a serious misreading of the facts, what policy suggests itself as an alternative?

First, he suggests that Americans discard the myth of a Communist world conspiracy, and instead, deal realistically with each of the respective Communist countries. By this he means taking account of their national interests—interests that often conflict as sharply as the interests of capitalist countries.

Second, he suggests that the Americans recognize that the suc-

letters

gone again

To The Editor:

Gratefully, Varsity Guest Weekend is gone for another year. Chalk up another farce. Ice statues, art displays, hootenannies, hockey games, dances and model, model lecturers certainly don't show a visiting public the real university. One display missing might have been a sample exam room, in which visitors would be locked for three hours. It would be interesting to

know just how many of the claimed 20,000 visitors were over the age of fourteen.

Possibly to show just what university life has done for some varsity students, all visitors should be taken on a guided tour of the washroom walls. Another year, another act.

Forrest Bard

usurpation

To The Editor:

The recent usurpation of the powers of the Discipline, Interpretation and Enforcement Board by the University Provost, Mister Ryan, has dealt a serious blow to student autonomy on the campus. Furthermore, Mister Ryan has established two distinct classes of students—those living in university-administered residences and all other students. Mister Ryan's recent actions have clearly established the principle that residence students are outside the jurisdiction of the DIEB.

A residence student who was lawfully charged, under the Students' Union Bylaws was summoned to appear before the DIEB. Mister Ryan, who is a member of both the student judiciary and the university administration, suggested to the student that he need not appear.

The student followed Mister Ryan's advice and subsequently was fined for his failure to appear. This fine, however, cannot be collected without the aid of the administration and it is hardly likely that the administration will enforce a fine that was levied against a student who was acting on the judgment and advice of a university administrator.

Mister Ryan's actions as a university administrator were within his bounds of jurisdiction. However, his actions as a member of the judiciary were out of keeping with a judicial system. A situation such as this should not be tolerated by the students of this campus. The removal of Mr. Ryan from the appeal board to the DIEB should be actively sought by the Students' Council.

Students living in the university-administered residences can no longer direct their grievances through the DIEB, which prior to Mister Ryan's directives had been their right.

Ronald C. McMahon
arts 3

to the board of governors

open letter

Dear Sirs:

On the basis of the fact that the last Board of Governors' meeting (Feb. 11, 1966) did not bother to consider the recommendation of the General Faculty Council in regard to the establishment, in the teaching buildings, of free zones for public discussion and dissemination of information and opinion, S.U.P.A. held a meeting at which it was decided, by consensus, that we should express to you our grave concern over what appears to be your obvious disregard for the needs and wishes of the student body.

The issues at stake, we feel, are twofold:

Firstly, excessive procrastination by the University authorities has resulted in a de facto denial of effective means of freedom of speech for the student body. We recognize that other channels for discussion do exist but booths in the teaching buildings are a means of reaching many students who are not normally involved through other methods. Questions such as this should be of primary importance to any university for this sets a tone of vitality in what is ostensibly an intellectual community. Important issues such as this must always be decided upon as soon as possible by the Board of

Governors. Time pressures resulting from meetings held only one afternoon a month must not be allowed to determine the degree of academic freedom on this campus.

Secondly, the issue over which S.U.P.A. originally established the booth was—and still is—of critical importance to our community. The Vietnam war must be discussed with students here—and now—through the most direct methods possible. We reluctantly suspended our booth activities in the teaching buildings last November 30th "to allow a period of further discussion" for the benefit of the whole campus. The urgency of the Vietnam situation—especially in view of the resumption of bombings by the United States—makes it imperative that we resume our activities as soon as possible.

We feel that we have fulfilled our commitment to cooperate with the Administration in light of our cessation of activities for the past two and one half months. Therefore, we strongly urge that all administrative decisions in this regard should be reached by the conclusion of the March 4th meeting of the Board of Governors.

STUDENT UNION
FOR PEACE ACTION
Morton Newman, Chairman