DRV on U.S. Bombing: The Vietnamese People Will Not Bow Down to Nixon

Excerpts from a Statement of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, of December 29, 1972, on "The Extermination Raids over North Vietnam."

For more than ten days, the Nixon administration has mobilized the quasi-totality of American strategic aircraft in Southeast Asia and the Pacific and the tactical aircraft in South Vietnam, Thailand and the Seventh Fleet and has undertaken the most ferocious strategic bombing campaign against North Vietnam in the history of the U.S. aggressive war in Vietnam. However, the Nixon administration has failed miserably in both the military and political spheres. The more it escalates the war, the more miserable its defeats become and the deeper its isolation becomes.

The Vietnamese people are determined to never bow down to the absurd demands of the Nixon administration. The peoples of the world, including the American people, are uniting in solidarity with us, demanding that the Nixon administration sign without delay the accord on the cessation of the war and the reestablishment of peace to Vietnam, which it concluded with the Democratic Republic of Vietnam on October 20, 1972.

Far from attaining its objectives, the Nixon administration has been severely condemned by all of humanity. Many governments, state leaders, political parties, liberation movements, national and international organizations, prominent persons, and the world press, have been outraged, have vigorously denounced the extremely odious crimes of the Nixon administration, and are demanding that it immediately stop its acts of international piracy. Many workers' organizations from different countries have organized meetings and demonstrations to protest against the Nixon administration and have boycotted U.S. merchant vessels. The obstinate, bellicose, brutal, and deceitful nature of U.S. imperialism has never been so obvious.

As long as the Nixon administration continues to pursue its escalation of the war and tries to negotiate from a position of strength, its defeats will be all the greater.

If the U.S. wishes to withdraw honorably from the war, the Nixon administration must stop its present demoted escalation of the war and stop maneuvering to negotiate from a position of force. The United States must strictly respect the agreed upon clauses and sign without delay the agreement on the cessation of the war and the reestablishment of peace in Vietnam, which it concluded on October 20, 1972 with the government of the DRV.

It is this course which meets the interests of the Vietnamese people, the American people, and fulfills the aspirations of the peoples of the world.
Dear Reader,

We wish to extend our sincerest thanks to those who have supported this publication by sending subscriptions, contributions and letters of encouragement.

When the first issue of INDOCHINA appeared, it was widely assumed in America that peace was at hand. Regrettably, events have borne out our initial assessment, written before the monstrous bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong occurred, that the Nixon administration has not abandoned its bellicose policies in Indochina.

A month ago there were many false hopes about peace. Now angry voices all over the country are being raised to condemn this latest U.S. barbarism. People are demanding that the Nixon administration cease its aggression in Indochina and sign the peace agreement concluded with the DRV immediately.

We feel that now is the time for maximum action against the Nixon administration. All the bombing in Indochina -- in South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos, as well as North Vietnam -- must be stopped.

We would like to continue our contribution to the movement against U.S. aggression in Indochina by providing you with up-to-date information and analyses of the evolving situation. If you have not already done so, we strongly urge you to take out a subscription.

Your financial support is also needed at this time since we would like to expand the size and coverage of the publication and bring it to the attention of more readers. This would require more than our present funds, which are very limited.

Thus we renew our appeal to you to subscribe and to contribute generously as subscriptions alone cannot cover full costs.

The Editors

The Light at the End of the Tunnel


"Every quantitative measurement shows we're winning the war ... U.S. aid to Vietnam has reached a peak and will start to level off." Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, 1962.

"Victory ... is just months away, and the reduction of American advisors can begin any time now. I can safely say the end of the war is in sight," Gen. Paul Harkins, Commander of the Military Assistance Command in Saigon, Oct. 31, 1963.

"I personally believe this is a war the Vietnamese must fight. I don't believe we can take on that combat task for them." Secretary McNamara, Feb. 3, 1964.

"We are not about to send American boys 9,000 or 10,000 miles from home to do what Asian boys ought to be doing for themselves." President Lyndon Johnson, Oct. 21, 1964.

"We have stopped losing the war." Secretary McNamara, Oct. 1965.


"We have reached an important point when the end begins to come into view ... the enemy's hopes are bankrupt." Gen. Westmoreland, Nov. 21, 1967.


"I will say confidently that looking ahead just three years, this war will be over. It will be over on a basis which will promote lasting peace in the Pacific." President Richard Nixon, Oct. 12, 1969.

"General Abrams tells me that in both Laos and Cambodia his evaluation after three weeks of fighting is that -- to use his terms -- the South Vietnamese can hack it, and they can give an even better account of themselves than the North Vietnamese units. This means that our withdrawal program, our Vietnamization program, is a success ..." President Richard Nixon, March 4, 1971.

The Stone-age Logic of the White House

Less than two months after the conclusion of the draft peace agreement on Vietnam, which presidential advisor Henry Kissinger said at the time was 99% completed, the Nixon administration launched the most barbaric bombing raids ever conducted by the United States against North Vietnam. The raids were explained by the administration only in terms which defy human reason. The White House expects American and world opinion to accept the killing and maiming of tens of thousands of noncombatant civilians just at the threshold of peace.

Of course the administration denied it was attacking indiscriminately; it claimed that American planes were merely bombing "military targets" in Hanoi, Haiphong and their surrounding areas. These are North Vietnam’s most densely populated regions, and when scores of B-52’s and hundreds of other aircraft carried out daily raids the result was inevitably a massacre that could not have been anything but deliberate and premeditated.

Confronted with charges of terror bombing and world-wide protests, the administration issued the most cynical possible clarifications. When the North Vietnamese reported that American bombs had caused damage to a POW camp (located in a residential area) holding captured U.S. pilots, the Pentagon first denied the report and then changed its line and charged that if POW’s were injured North Vietnam would be guilty of violating the Geneva Convention on POW’s for locating the camp near military targets. The Pentagon did not explain where such camps should be located. No explanation, in fact, is possible since the Nixon administration has demonstrated that all North Vietnam is fair game to U.S. bombers. Equally callous was Pentagon spokesman Jerry Friedheim’s statement that civilian casualties, if any, were the consequence of falling B-52’s that had been shot down. By the administration’s logic, the North Vietnamese were responsible for the deaths of their own people while the B-52’s that dropped thousands of tons of bombs played no part in devastating homes and hospitals.

Any doubt that mass destruction was the intended aim of the Christmas-season bombings can be dispelled when it is recalled that the Johnson administration destroyed completely all the major urban centers of North Vietnam except Hanoi and Haiphong, stopping short there because it feared stimulating any greater domestic and international opposition to its policies. As the Pentagon Papers reveal, the Johnson administration cherished the hope that it could break Hanoi’s will by bombing. This fact is pointed out in a staff report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, based on the Pentagon Papers and issued in October. The report observes that “one of the most pervasive justifications” for the bombing of North Vietnam during the Johnson administration was to break Hanoi’s will. This was never publicly admitted at the time. Summarizing documents in the Pentagon Papers, the Senate report, entitled “Bombing as a Policy Tool in Vietnam”, states:

Although the reasoning is seldom explicit, the argument that the bombing would affect the will of Hanoi’s leadership is generally based on three suppositions. First, the bombing would so reduce North Vietnam’s capability to successfully prosecute the war that Hanoi would either sue for peace or substantially reduce the level of warfare. Second, the leadership would decide that the level of destruction visited upon the North Vietnamese economy was greater than the gain from supporting revolution in the South. Or, third, that the morale of the North Vietnamese population would so deteriorate that the leadership would be forced to seek relief from the bombing through negotiations or reduced support for the forces in the South.

It is apparent that the Nixon administration has followed a similar bomb-them-back-to-the-stone-age logic in going up the ladder of military escalation, especially when it ordered the wholesale destruction of Hanoi and Haiphong. And if these cities have not yet been completely des-
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troyed, the administration is entering the new round of top level talks with the threat that massive bombing could resume if the DRV does not engage in "serious" negotiations.

At this point in time it is obvious that peace was not "at hand," as Kissinger proclaimed in October. There has been considerable speculation in the press about what derailed the peace talks, and much of the debate, such as whether there is a rift between Nixon and Kissinger, seems to miss the main point. Such hypothetical differences do not change the fact that the Nixon administration tried to revise fundamentally the October draft. Kissinger failed to get the new U.S. position accepted during the November-December rounds of negotiations, during which he threatened the DRV with renewed bombing. Then, Nixon unleashed on North Vietnam the greatest aerial bombardment in history, using a tonnage of bombs in two weeks equivalent to the Nazi bombing of Britain during all of World War II. There is no evidence that this rain of death disturbed Kissinger's conscience.

Some of the alterations of the draft agreement that Kissinger demanded in Paris were: elimination of the recognition of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam; reduction of the scope of the Council for National Reconciliation, the Vietnamese body to be set up to implement the peace agreement; and most important, elimination of the principle of Vietnamese unity. The White House also demanded that the American POW's be returned while it wanted no provision for the re-release of the tens of thousands of political prisoners languishing in the jails of Nguyen Van Thieu. The proposed U.S. changes in the draft agreement mean an indefinite division of Vietnam and they imply that the "state" in the South would be under U.S. hegemony.

The United States has tried to impose a pro-U.S. dominion in South Vietnam ever since the CIA installed the Ngo Dinh Diem puppet regime in Saigon, following the great Vietnamese victory over French colonialism at Dien Bien Phu in 1954. (On the eve of the defeat of the French, whose military effort was chiefly financed by Washington, Nixon, then Vice-President, publicly urged the use of American troops to prevent the Vietnamese victory.) The long, aggressive war waged by the United States against Vietnam, both North and South, originated in this effort to install a client regime in South Vietnam. For nearly nineteen years the United States has tried to divide and subjugate a people whose national unity had been rigorously tested in the arduous struggle against French colonialism. The Vietnamese people have passed ever greater tests in their heroic resistance to American imperialism, which is one of the greatest epics of all history. For nearly nineteen years every U.S. strategy against Vietnam has been defeated. In response, the Nixon administration has resorted to an escalation in cruelty to try to break the will of the people. After four years of failure in this attempt, the Nixon administration now proposes a "peace" settlement that would permanently divide Vietnam, thereby justifying all past U.S. aggressive actions in Vietnam and sanctifying in advance any future efforts to dominate South Vietnam.

In presenting its demands in Paris in November and December, the Nixon administration profoundly misjudged the situation in Vietnam and assumed that the Vietnamese were willing to conclude a speedy peace agreement because they were in a position of weakness and faltering will. After the Vietnamese rejected the U.S. demands at the negotiating table, Nixon again resorted to force -- the most massive military effort mounted against North Vietnam by the United States. The terror bombing of North Vietnam was the most vivid possible evidence that the United States has not relinquished its aim of maintaining a neo-colonial regime in South Vietnam. The message of the B-52's to the people of North Vietnam was: cease supporting your brethren in the South or face all-out destruction.

This modern version of gunboat diplomacy failed ignominiously both militarily and politically. There was an outcry of protest around the globe: the universal sentiment was that Nixon was a new Hitler in trying to bomb the Vietnamese people into submission. Militarily the Vietnamese answered the American attacks with a defense that must have shocked Washington. The greatest American bombers were being swatted down like flies and if the attacks had been maintained a large portion of the B-52's would have been lost.

Whether or not the Nixon administration has drawn the lesson of its stubborn, illusory pursuit of a military victory will soon be apparent in Paris. If the White House persists in its present course there can be no speedy peace settlement and the war will be prolonged, but not indefinitely, even if that is its intention. It has been demonstrated that the bombs cannot break the will of the Vietnamese people, even if the Nixon administration does not understand this. The administration resorted to terror bombing after its "Vietnamization" program collapsed during the spring-summer offensive of the liberation forces in South Vietnam. By re-Americanizing the war with its massive bombing, the administration provoked an unprecedented reaction of world opinion, outraged by the latest U.S. war crimes. In the face of the united, heroic resistance of the Vietnamese people alongside the peoples of Cambodia and Laos, as well as an aroused world opinion and wide condemnation in this country of the new barbarism, the Nixon administration cannot indefinitely maintain its present policies and will be compelled to agree to a peace settlement.

R. E. Ward
The Struggle in Cambodia

As attention once again focuses on the resumption of negotiations between the United States and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, the questions involved in political settlements for Cambodia and Laos are also raised. In a future issue we will print parts of the program and current position of the Nea Hak Sat Lao (the Pathet Lao). Some of the main issues of the Cambodian problem are treated here.

Although the United States has annually poured $300 million into Phnom Penh and to date continues heavy bombing of the Cambodian countryside, the U.S.-backed Lon Nol regime has progressively become weaker and weaker. According to the latest figures, the National Liberation Army (NLA) led by the National United Front of Cambodia (NUFK) controls 85-90% of the territory. Only a circle of 40-50 miles wide, around the capital city, remains in the hands of the Lon Nol group, according to Le Monde (December 13, 1972). Dispatches from the New York Times correspondent in Phnom Penh corroborate this claim; a November 30 article reports that 75% of the territory is now under the NUFK. This same dispatch claims that this represents about 40% of the population; however, a recent communiqué from Prince Sihanouk's Royal Government in exile states that 90% of the population now lives in the liberated zone. The latter figure is nearer the mark as urban refugees are pouring back into the countryside since the city has been cut off from its own rice source since last September. (See map for current military situation.)

Lacking popular support, the Lon Nol regime has been forced to become more dependent on U.S. economic and military assistance and continued U.S. bombing. It has been faced with rice riots, student demonstrations, internal dissension even among its top leaders, and recent press accounts indicate that corruption is the main order of business. On November 30, the New York Times correspondent wrote, "The corruption -- in particular, the pocketing of army payrolls and the selling of food and military supplies to the highest bidder, including the enemy -- is universally confirmed here by foreign diplomats and other independent observers." The same reporter, on December 28, revealed that one-third of the Lon Nol army has been acknowledged by Phnom Penh itself to be "non-existent," the phantom soldiers having been entered on army payrolls exclusively to line the pockets of top generals and unit commanders.

In contrast to the fragility of the Lon Nol faction is the strength of the resistance, a broad coalition of diverse groups, organized after the U.S. supported coup against Sihanouk in March 1970. This coalition, the National United Front, leads the resistance in the countryside, and comprises monarchists, liberal and professional people, Buddhist monks, peasants and the "Khmer Rouge" (the name used in the Western press for the Cambodian communist movement.) Although the Khmer Rouge is an important element in the Front, it is not the predominant one. The Front's program is also a source of its popular backing: it calls for independence and neutrality, and while it guarantees private property, under its provisions land belonging to absentee landlords who have chosen to collaborate with Lon Nol has been distributed to peasants. The Royal Government's and the Front's political advantage are furthermore strengthened by Sihanouk's great personal popularity with the mass of the Cambodian people.

Because the liberation forces in Cambodia are so much stronger politically and militarily than the Lon Nol faction isolated in Phnom Penh, the NUFK and the Royal Government are unlikely at present to accept any political compromise with the Lon Nol faction, or abide by any conditions imposed upon it by the United States. The 9 point draft peace agreement of October 29, 1972 for Vietnam only states, with respect to Laos and Cambodia, that all foreign troops must be withdrawn from these two countries. Prince Sihanouk has recently issued a statement (on October 29, 1972) asserting the present negotiations between Vietnam and the United States do not apply to Cambodia. An official communiqué from the Royal Government (October 24, 1972) states that the Cambodian people "will never accept any compromise with the United States and their puppets, the traitors of Phnom Penh." This position has been supported by the GRP of South Vietnam, in a statement issued on November 7, as well as by the DRV.

The success of the NUFK program and the vic- (continued on next page)
The Struggle in Cambodia
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tories of the NLA have been such that the Lon Nol faction is only holding on by a thread in Phnom Penh. U.S. propaganda has tried to deny the strengths of the resistance and to accuse it of being dominated by the Vietnamese. Sihanouk has repeatedly denied these allegations and in his statement of October 29, he welcomed a cease-fire in Vietnam, not only because a cease-fire is desirable for Vietnam but because it will prove decisively that the struggle to liberate Cambodia is being led solely by Cambodians.

Ministers in the Cambodian Royal Government in the liberated zone. From left to right: Poc Doeukomar, Hou Yuon, Khieu Samphan, Hu Nim, and Yiv Ol.

A week-long demonstration in Phnom Penh, April 1972, to protest killing of students by the Lon Nol regime.

Nixon on Freedom

Extract from a speech given by Vice President Richard Nixon on December 23, 1953

Let us turn now to another area of the world—Indochina. And many of you ask this question: Why is the United States spending hundreds of millions of dollars supporting the forces of the French Union in the fight against communism in Indochina? I think perhaps if we go over to the map here, I can indicate to you why it is so vitally important. Here is Indochina. If Indochina falls, Thailand is put in an almost impossible position. The same is true of Malaya with its rubber and tin. The same is true of Indonesia. If this whole part of Southeast Asia goes under Communist domination or Communist influence, Japan, who trades and must trade with this area in order to exist, must inevitably be oriented toward the Communist regime. That indicates to you and to all of us why it is vitally important that Indochina not go behind the Iron Curtain.

Now I may say that, as far as the war in Indochina is concerned, I was there, right on the battlefield or close to it, and it’s a bloody war and it’s a bitter one. And may I make the position of the United States clear with regard to that war. The United States supports the Associated States of Indochina in their understandable aspirations for independence. But we know as they do that the day the French leave Indochina, the Communists will take over. We realize as they do that the only way they can assure their independence and the only way they can defend it is to continue the fight side by side with their partners in the French Union against the forces of Communist colonialism which would enslave them. And may I also say this, and this we should never forget, the free world owes a debt of gratitude to the French and to the forces of the Associated States for the great sacrifices they are making in the cause of freedom against Communist aggression in Indochina.

Extensive damage to hospitals and other non-military targets occurred throughout North Vietnam long before the 10-day period of terror raids pelted the DRV from Dec. 18-29. This photo shows the remains of the hospital in the city of Nam Dinh, destroyed by U.S. bombs on June 20, 1972.
Eye-Witness Reports of Bombing of Hanoi, Haiphong

Following are excerpts from an account of the bombing of Hanoi, by Professor Telford Taylor, published in the January 7 New York Times.

At midday on Thursday, Dec. 21, the fighter bombers came screaming over the hotel. The bomb explosions were disturbingly close, and soon the electric light in the shelter went out.

That night and the following morning, the inevitable consequences of using the B-52's against targets in the city became apparent. In the An Duong district of northeastern Hanoi, a low-rent housing development was obliterated by a "carpet" of heavy bombs. The 20 or so housing units were smashed like matchwood, and the viewer had to pic his way through the edges of enormous craters. According to the North Vietnamese, there were 261 casualties, of which 135 were deaths.

Bach Mai is the name of an area at the southern end of the city, and it is the site of the largest hospital and medical research center in North Vietnam. It is an extensive complex of buildings and grounds lying about a mile and a half south of the railway station and half a mile north of the small Bach Mai airfield. We were told that individual buildings of the hospital had been hit in June of 1972 and again on Dec. 19, but the raid early in the morning of Dec. 22, when B-52's unloaded a carpet of heavy bombs that covered the entire complex wreaked virtually total destruction.

By the end of the first week of bombing, a new wave of evacuation was well under way. Buses were assembled at various collection points for those who could not make their own way to the country, trucks were hired by groups of families, and others went by bicycle or even on foot. A frequent sight was a pedicab with grandmother, small children, and bundles of possessions trundling out of the city to some refuge with relatives or friends.

In the city many shops closed and the traffic dwindled to a fraction of its previous volume. According to semi-official reports, by Christmas Day Hanoi was 75 to 80 per cent evacuated.

Not all of the evacuees found safety, for the bombers were operating over the adjacent provinces. It was officially reported -- and confirmed to me by relatives of some of the victims -- that on Dec. 23 there were heavy casualties in two villages west of Hanoi and that some of the wounded evacuees had to be brought back to hospitals in the city.

Christmas day and night were quiet, but the heavy bombardments that followed more than compensated for the respite. During the night of Dec. 26-27, B-52's laid a "carpet" beside the busy Kham Thien thoroughfare, a few blocks southwest of the railroad station, in the heart of Hanoi's "native" district. The dwellings here are, by Western standards, shacks and shanties, and the flimsy structures disintegrated under the weight of the bombs and the force of the blasts.

Despite the evacuation and the shelters there were 215 reported deaths and 237 other casualties. Many acres of closely packed houses were razed and the whole kratte area was a scene of desperate misery, with many survivors loudly lamenting the loss of their kin as they picked through the debris.

The Vietnamese people are an emotional people.

(Continued on next page)

Haiphong Devastated

By Jean LeClerc De Sabbion

HANOI, Jan 6 -- Recent American air raids virtually razed Haiphong's western industrial area, one of North Vietnam's biggest concentrations of factories, and caused widespread destruction in several residential areas.

Haiphong municipal authorities told journalists who visited the port city yesterday that between Dec. 18 and 30 the United States made 296 strikes against the port area.

They said 305 persons were killed, including 76 children. There were 885 wounded, they said.

The raids destroyed 5,000 homes and other buildings, the officials added.

The relatively low casualty toll is explained partly by the efficiency of Haiphong's air raid shelters and partly by the fact that almost two-thirds of the population had been evacuated.

The observers saw square miles that had become a desert of mud, rubble, twisted metal, fragments of walls and heaps of debris of all types.

Six miles from the city there are craters in the rice paddies, hundreds of yards from any building.

Main Street Smashed

The city's main thoroughfare, Cua Dat Street, is smashed in this manner at two points. Further on, there is a little market that has been flattened.

Municipal Theater Square, in the center of the city, was hit by several bombs that smashed into the central lawn and flower garden. One of them crushed a shelter, and rescue workers later recovered 11 dead and 15 wounded.

The port itself appears deserted, its warehouses empty. At least three warehouses have been destroyed.

There are about 10 freighters docked at the harbor, including the Polish ship, Josef Conrad, which was hit by a bomb killing four sailors.

Other ships were damaged as was a Haiphong Chinese secondary school a movie house and a hospital.

The hospital had been evacuated Dec. 22, a day before two bombs hit the building. One landed in the courtyard and the other flattened half of the contagious diseases ward.

Several other parts of the building were damaged by the blast but no one was injured.

-Washington Post
An understanding of Vietnamese history, surely one of the most remarkable historical experiences of any nation, helps unveil the mystery of Vietnamese heroism while heightening our appreciation of it. Helen B. Lamb has written a sympathetic and valuable study of Vietnamese history that concentrates mainly on the period from the entry of European missionaries and traders through the French conquest in the second half of the 19th century. The book faithfully portrays the Vietnamese past which is a history of numerous heroic struggles against foreign invaders. Mrs. Lamb correctly understands something perceived by few non-Vietnamese, that the history of Vietnam constitutes a rich body of experience which is deeply embedded in the outlook of contemporary Vietnamese. In evaluating the initial but unsuccessful struggles against French colonialism, she clearly shows that this experience was not in vain. For it vitalyzed the Vietnamese heritage and provided the inspiration for Ho Chi Minh and his comrades who founded the contemporary movement for national liberation by welding traditional Vietnamese experience in national resistance with the liberating force of a modern revolutionary outlook. This provided a firm foundation for the contemporary resistance embracing an entire, unified people -- an indomitable people capable of resisting and defeating modern imperialism. A timely and recommended book.

Books on Indochina


To many people the resistance of the Vietnamese appeared quixotic and visionary when the United States first launched its bombers against Vietnam and sent a huge invading army there. The Vietnamese were considered to be engaged in a noble but futile struggle against an enemy with incomparably greater resources and an almost unimaginable array of modern weapons of vast destructive power. However, now that the Vietnamese have demonstrated that their heroic struggle has not been in vain, there still remains an aura of mystery, in the eyes of many, surrounding the iron determination of the Vietnamese resistance.

An understanding of Vietnamese history, surely one of the most remarkable historical experiences of any nation, helps unveil the mystery of Vietnamese heroism while heightening our appreciation of it. Helen B. Lamb has written a sympathetic and valuable study of Vietnamese history that concentrates mainly on the period from the entry of European missionaries and traders through the French conquest in the second half of the 19th century. The book faithfully portrays the Vietnamese past which is a history of numerous heroic struggles against foreign invaders. Mrs. Lamb correctly understands something perceived by few non-Vietnamese, that the history of Vietnam constitutes a rich body of experience which is deeply embedded in the outlook of contemporary Vietnamese. In evaluating the initial but unsuccessful struggles against French colonialism, she clearly shows that this experience was not in vain. For it vitalized the Vietnamese heritage and provided the inspiration for Ho Chi Minh and his comrades who founded the contemporary movement for national liberation by welding traditional Vietnamese experience in national resistance with the liberating force of a modern revolutionary outlook. This provided a firm foundation for the contemporary resistance embracing an entire, unified people -- an indomitable people capable of resisting and defeating modern imperialism. A timely and recommended book.


Critiques of the Pentagon Papers from various points of view are assembled here by the editors. The essay by Gabriel Kolko on what the Papers reveal about U.S. goals in Vietnam is succinct and well-argued. Wilfred Burchett's essay compares documentation on the war from North Vietnamese sources with the Papers and relates U.S. violations of the 1954 Geneva Accords, not cited in the Papers which he personally witnessed.


This well-presented and readable NARMIC pamphlet, just out, provides details on the manufacture and effects of the weaponry used in Indochina. There are ample illustrations, some of them taken from the annual reports and advertising of some of the defense contractors who manufacture these weapons. An especially relevant pamphlet at this time as the threat and reality of massive bombing hang over Indochina.

AID TO THIEU. By Le Anh Tu and Marilyn McNabb. NARMIC, 1972. 115 p. (Same address as above, $1.00).

Also just available, AID TO THIEU gives the facts and figures on just where U.S. taxpayers' money goes when it is funneled into the Saigon regime. There is a section on how the Saigon economy is intimately dependent on U.S. aid and hidden subsidies. This year the Nixon administration is proposing the largest Vietnam aid bill so far and the authors show where the aid will go, if Congress appropriates the money.

Bombing
(Continued from page 7)

people, affectionate with each other, and family ties are very close. The deep grief of bereavement is matched by delight at finding a loved one safe, and these bombed districts are the scene of poignantly joyful encounters as well as hysterical surrenders to grief.

But those who have suffered no personal bereavement are, by now, remarkably adjusted to the constant strain of the bombardments, especially the children who have grown up under them and take them for granted. As in Britain 30 years ago, so today in Hanoi there is lots of "London pride."
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