STUDENT UNREST AND VIETNAM WAR

As the Vietnam war dragged on into its second decade with no perceptibleend in sight, and American casualties mounted along with its atrocities, young men who had received deferments because of their student status found themselves increasingly in jeopardy as graduation approached, and the promised end to hostilities failed to materialize. Atrocities mounted with indiscriminate massive bombing with both explosives and napalm reaching new heights. The hatred for the authority of national leaders whose platitudes and slogans had proved false spread to a distrust of students for all traditional authority figures, causing students to question the authority of all those in positions of power and/or dominance. From the President and Joint Chief s of staff to college and university administrations and parents, students began to question the way things were done, and to demand the "real" reasons behind collective and individual behavior patterns. Students, now being called on to kill and die, wanted to know the truth, free of cant, platitudes, and propaganda.

Once the traditional arguments were dismissed as meaningless, hope would be born for a new world free of tradition's savage competition, hatred for others and desire for power. Free of materialistic enslavement we would see the error of the old ways and people everywhere could live in peace. The idea encompassed every sort of freedom, beginning with freedom from racial, and sexual, and religious biases, from the arrogance of power, and stupidity, and from disregard for the environment and life. The Calvinist idea that power, and money were synonymous with righteousness was challenged by students who were its potential victims by being inculcated into the system's meanness of spirit.

That such ideas were greeted by administrative repression against anything but "business as usual" on campus, and in the White Houses of both Johnson, and ultimately Nixon and divided a country grown increasingly querulous as our own corpses and maimed returned from the battlefields of Viet Nam. Finally, when Hai Phong Harbor was mined, Cambodia invaded and the heaviest bombing of civilians since World War II unleashed, campuses erupted and unarmed students were fired on and killed at Jackson State and Kent State by police, on one hand, and the National Guard on the other.

from: http://scholar.library.miami.edu/sixties/studentUnrest.php

student unrest happened all over the world - here is an example of how the vietnam war impacted students at Berkely in California:
The mass media gave intensive coverage to the Berkeley events, and Americans were exposed for the first time to a new sort of news story --the tumultuous campus disruption. It was news in a traditional sense because it involved conflict and controversy. It was especially suitable for television because it was colorful and visually interesting. Night after night, television film of events on one campus carried the methods and spirit of protest to every other campus in the country.

Most student protesters, like advocates of all ages and points of view, welcomed television coverage. Many of them grew sophisticated in inviting it, and some of them undoubtedly played to it. Television news crews obliged them, occasionally in an irresponsible fashion. But of far greater importance was the selective nature of the television medium itself, with its tendency to emphasize the most emotionally and visually exciting aspects of stories. Again and again, the cameras focused on whatever was most bizarre, dramatic, active, or violent. Few television or radio and news- paper reporters had the time or knowledge to explore the causes and complexity of campus protests.

The public reacted to Berkeley with concern and anger. In California and throughout the nation, campus events became, controversial political issues. Many citizens believed that students had no reason to protest. Many were deeply opposed to the protestors' disruptive tactics. Many also criticized the faculty and administration for not taking a sufficiently "hard line." As student protest spread to more campuses and as its tactics became more disruptive or violent, citizens and political leaders called for action to prevent further campus disturbances.

Even in 1964-65, the year of the Berkeley disturbance, there was much more turmoil on campus than the media reported or the public knew of. Of 849 four-year colleges responding to a national survey that year, the great majority reported some kind of protest. But almost all of these protests were of the pre-Berkeley variety --traditional, single-issue protests, many of them conducted off-campus. More than a third of the campuses reported off-campus civil rights activities, and just over one-fifth had on-campus protests against the Vietnam War. A variety of other issues stimulated protests on campus, including the quality of food, dress requirements, dormitory regulations, controversies over faculty members, censorship of publications, rules about campus speakers, and the desire for more student participation in university governance.

This early pattern of student protest, then, was over a large number and broad range of distinct issues, which students rarely lumped together in criticisms of "the system." The university usually was subject to protest only over matters that were within its own control.

After 1964-65, however, this pattern began to change, and students increasingly related campus issues to broader political and social issues. As they did, the Berkeley invention began to spread to "other campuses. The growing frequency with which campus protest reflected the Berkeley scenario was largely the result of the emergence and development of three issues: American involvement in the war ill Southeast Asia, the slow progress of American society towards racial equality, and charges of "unresponsiveness" against both the federal government and university administrations and against their "repressive" reaction to student demands. These three issues gave campus protests their unifying theme. They were defined by protesting students as fundamentally moral issues; and this definition gave a tone of passion, fervor, and impatience to student protest.

The rapid escalation of American military efforts in Vietnam in 1965 made the Vietnam war one of the bitterest issues of the decade. This issue gave student activists an ever-increasing self-assurance and solidarity for growing public concern over the constant escalation of the war seemed to legitimate the activists' early opposition. They redoubled their efforts; the Vietnam issue came to dominate their thoughts; and the previously scattered pattern of campus protest began to alter accordingly.

The war was strenuously debated among students and faculty. At first there were considerable differences of opinion on the subject. During this early period, students and faculty at the University of Michigan created a new method for discussing the war: the teach-in. When it began, the teach-in was a balanced affair that took the form of an extended debate, rather than a vehicle for antiwar protest. But it did not last in this form. When the teach-in reached Berkeley, it was simply a mass demonstration in which no supporters of the war were heard. Soon, government spokesmen who went to campuses to explain or defend American foreign policy were shouted down and, at times, physically attacked. In some cases, the students responsible were never disciplined.

This transformation of the teach-in suggests one consequence of growing opposition to the war and of the rising tide of campus unrest that was to persist and expand through the rest of the decade.

The moral sentiments and passions aroused by the war had a chilling effect on rational academic discourse. Faculty members who met to discuss university policy while thousands of students waited outside or listened to their debates on the radio were at times unwilling to speak their minds on the issues or to speak out against student extremists. Rational debate and critical analysis were replaced by impassioned rhetoric and intense political feeling.

As oppos1tion to the war grew and the war continued to escalate, explanations of America's involvement in it became more radical. From having been a "mistake," the war was soon interpreted by radical students as a logical outcome of the American political system. They argued that what was most objectionable was not the war itself, but rather "the system" that had entered, justified, and pursued it. According to this logic, the appropriate target of protest was "the system itself, and especially those parts of it that were involved in the war. The university, too, came to be seen as a part of "the system," and therefore it became a target --as distinct from an accidental arena --of antiwar protest. As it did, the Berkeley invention, with its dual issues, increasingly dominated the pattern of campus protest.

The escalation of the war in Southeast Asia produced an increasing demand for military manpower that resulted in larger draft calls. In 1965, the federal government decided to defer college students from the draft on the basis of their academic standing. Draft boards asked universities to provide such information, and students and faculty passionately debated the propriety of compliance. In the end, the issue was usually resolved by agreeing that draft data would continue to be divulged only at the student's request.

There were major student demonstrations over the question, and some of them borrowed directly from the Berkeley scenario. One of the most notable of these demonstrations occurred at the University of Chicago, where the administration building was occupied and many demonstrators were later suspended.

When disciplinary actions followed such disruptions, a new issue arose --the demand for amnesty. Students who faced punishment for disruptive actions taken in the name of high moral principles felt they should be exempt from the rules applied to other students. Increasingly, radical groups charged that university attempts to impose disciplinary sanctions were only further evidence of the university's larger complicity in the evils of American society and the war effort.

These groups --particularly the SDS --actively sought information, sometimes by illegal means, concerning all connections between the university and the war. Their research provided a constant flow of information and misinformation. Sometimes it yielded dramatic findings, for in fact there were many links between the university and the defense establishment. For example, it was revealed in 1967 that a "research center" at Michigan State University was a conduit for the funding of a CIA operation in Southeast Asia. Many other research centers were accused, often justly, of receiving military money and, less justly, of conducting "imperialist" research. In some cases student aid programs that were tied to defense spending were cited as proof of the university's involvement in the war. Campus recruiters from the military and from war-materiel corporations were harassed, and some found it necessary to conduct interviews with students and other prospective employees off campus.

As the escalation of the war in Vietnam proceeded and as a radical analysis of the wider society evolved, few campus issues were seen as not related to the basic problems of the nation.

Anger and despair over persistent racial injustice in American society provided a second and equally important focus for student protest. Racial prejudice -- especially against blacks but in some parts of the country equally cruel in its effect upon Mexican-Americans, and Puerto Ricans, and other minorities --became increasingly unacceptable to many students. For many young blacks in the mid-1960's the drive for equality and justice took a new form, symbolized by the concepts of black power and black pride. Young whites, even those who feared black separatism, could not deny. the justice of demands for equality.

Just as the Vietnam war was escalating, the civil rights movement underwent a fundamental change. The summer of 1964 was the last in which black and white students, liberals and radicals, worked together in a spirit of cooperation and non-violence. But urban riots in Harlem, in Rochester, and in Watts divided many white liberals and moderates from those white and black militants who considered the riots legitimate rebellions. In 1965, Stokeley Carmichael helped establish an all- black political party in Lowndes County, Alabama. During the next spring, he led those who were no longer committed to non-violence in taking control of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee. Subsequently, whites were expelled from the organization. In the summer of 1966, the cry of "Black Power" was first heard, and Huey Newton and Bobby Seale founded the Black Panther Party in Oakland.

These events marked a rapid erosion of the commitment by the civil rights movement to non-violence and to interracial political action --and had important consequences for campus protest. Militancy on southern black campuses increased during 1966 and 1967. In May 1967, students at Jackson State College in Mississippi fought with police for two nights. The National Guard was called out, and one person was killed. Militant actions by students at Howard University established a pattern that was to be repeated at black colleges and would spread to northern campuses as well.

Whereas earlier civil rights activism had generally attacked off-campus targets, the protests of black militants now were usually directed against the university itself. The university, they claimed, had helped to perpetuate black oppression through its admissions policies, its "white-oriented" curriculum, and its overwhelmingly white teaching staff. Black students found their cultural heritage slighted or ignored altogether. Their critique of the university intensified in the late 1960's, when predominantly white institutions began to admit, black students in larger numbers. At Harvard, at San Francisco State, and elsewhere, black students organized groups dedicated to serving the larger black community. Their aim was to establish for blacks an equal place in all parts of the university. Their attention thus focused not only on curriculum, faculty appointments, and student living conditions, but also on non-academic matters like the university's hiring practices and its impact on local housing conditions.

The escalating war in Vietnam and the unresolved problem of racism helped push radicals toward an increasingly political view of the university. By 1968, radicals were almost unanimous in viewing the university not as a center of teaching and scholarship but rather as an institution guilty of "complicity" with-a "system" charged with being immoral, unresponsive, and repressive. In an attempt to undermine the war effort, more students began to demand that the university eliminate ROTC and end defense research. Increasingly, the stated purpose of radical demands was the transformation of the university into a political weapon --their Own weapon --for putting an end to the war, racism, and the political system they considered responsible for both. The demands of some black student groups had a similar thrust.

In addition to war and racism, a third issue -- the issue of "repression" --began to emerge. The charge that the American system is basically "repressive" originated with radicals. But moderates began to give it credence as student protest encountered official force. Many students were "radicalized" by excessive police reactions to disruptive demonstrations. Although major property damage in campus disruptions between 1960 and 1970 was almost entirely perpetrated by students, and although injuries to students occurred largely during confrontations which they themselves had provoked, students suffered far more deaths than their adversaries. A growing number of students came to see themselves as "victimized" by law enforcement officials.

Events at the Democratic National Convention in 1968 had a particularly strong impact. Student protest at the convention was often disruptive, provocative, and violent, and it was met by a police reaction so brutal that the Walker Report called it a "police riot." Some students perceive "repression" also in the harassment of young persons with distinctive clothing or long hair, and in police enforcement, which they believe to be selective, of the laws against marijuana and other drugs.

Whether or not they accept the radical slogan of "repression," many students have come to believe that the American political system is unresponsive and must be fundamentally reformed. They have been bitterly disappointed by the failure of a national majority and the national government to accept, and quickly to act upon, political positions that they find morally compelling. Like most Americans, they were profoundly disheartened by the murders of Martin Luther King, Jr., and Senator Robert F. Kennedy, the more so because these murders followed a moment of high hope for the end of the war, when President Johnson announced that he would limit the bombing of North Vietnam and also that he would not run again for the Presidency.

These experiences, events, and feelings tended to make radicals of liberal students and tactical extremists of moderates. But the vast majority continued to believe in the American system of government and thousands worked within it for change, notably in the primary campaigns of Robert Kennedy and Senator Eugene McCarthy in 1968. And, although they were dismayed and disappointed by Kennedy's death and by McCarthy's defeat, the fact is that their work had helped bring about change in national leadership and in policies toward the war. Still, the gradual nature of that change in policy and the refusal of the government to disengage itself from Vietnam quickly and completely left many students convinced that "the system" was unresponsive to their best efforts to work within it.

From: http://64.233.169.104/search?q=cache:QE1GKmNdbEUJ:dept.kent.edu/may4/Campus\_Unrest/campus\_unrest\_chapter1d.htm+student+unrest+and+vietnam+war&hl=en&ct=clnk&cd=2&gl=us&client=firefox-a

The Vietnam war protests,or Anti-war movement, initiated by college students, was instrumental in questioning the policies surrounding America's involvement in Indochina's affairs.  Twenty five years have passed since the United States officially relinquished their involvement in Vietnam. Not since the Civil War had the country been so divided. Every American family was impacted, losing husbands, sons, daughters, nieces, nephews, and friends. Over 50,000 Americans were killed and many of those who returned suffered and still suffer deep physical and emotional scars. Many more veterans took their own lives, were treated as social outcasts or ended up on America’s streets among the homeless. What the war did to Vietnam and to the Vietnamese people was even more drastic. By the time Saigon fell to invading North Vietnamese forces on April 29, 1975, close to 2 million Vietnamese had died. Countless others perished or disappeared later in Cambodia during the carnage perpetuated by the Khmer Rouge. The Vietnam conflict was a war whose origins many did not understand, that seemed an exercise in futility, and that left a nation questioning the policies of a government they’d always trusted.

Vietnam has always been rife with conflict. Migrants from China first settled in the tiny, lush country bordering the South China Sea over 3000 years ago. Vietnam boasts a diverse topography of valleys, rivers and highlands. It is home to over 40 million people whose origins stem from an equally diverse mix of tribes and kingdoms that subsisted mostly on what they harvested on terraced parcels of land. Rice was the greatest commodity and is still a major export today. Invasion by neighbouring armies from Thailand, Cambodia, Laos and China posed a constant threat. China did finally manage to impose its rule over the country, but the Vietnamese eventually overthrew the imperial yoke in 938 AD. A succession of Vietnamese Emperors brought peace, stability, prosperity and the opportunity for Vietnam to create its own national identity.

Rebellions were common over the next 500 years as Vietnam continued to grow and change, not only its political views but also its varied religious ideologies like Buddhism and Taoism. French and British domination also threatened. The French established sovereignity in 1863 and maintained it for almost a century. Vietnam became a country of the rich and the poor, of corruption, of subjugated peasants, of bandits and frequent uprisings and revolts. France built opulent cities like Saigon and Hanoi, European-styled mansions and churches, plantations and industries that bolstered their economy but did little to help the peasant. They also introduced a new cash crop - the poppy. Opium trade and export was soon as prolific and profitable in the region the French now called Indochina as the rice trade. Japan too was looking at Vietnam as a means to feed its emerging country and its future armies.

The early 20th century also saw the rise of Ho Chi Min, a young student who prescribed to leftist doctrines and whose dream was to lead his people and Vietnam into independence. As eventual head of the Vietminh guerrilla movement, and with help from British, Chinese and American allies, he would succeed in 1945. But France wasn’t willing to forget about Vietnam. Revolution would eventually divide the beleaguered country into North and South and initiate a decades-long and bloody conflict that would not only include France, China and Japan but the United States as well.

Seven presidents were involved with decisions that impacted America’s presence in Vietnam: Truman, Roosevelt, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon and Ford. Harry Truman initially supported France’s dispute with communist leader Ho Chi Min in the early 1950’s. During the Eisenhower and Kennedy terms America’s presence increased, politically, economically and militarily.The OSS, now the CIA, was also deeply involved with covert intelligence operations as early as 1944, not only in Vietnam but in neighbouring countries.

By 1959 Vietnam was divided into North and South and in July of that same year 2 American soldiers died after a Viet Cong attack in Bien Hoa. Continued unrest within Vietnam escalated into revolts against the repressive regime and the highly publicised self-immolations of Buddhist monks, their deaths also protests against the strict regime . In November of 1963 a military coup toppled president Ngo Dinh Diem’s government and the next day he and his brother were assassinated. Events were leading inexorably to full scale war and by August of 1964, after the North Vietnamese attacked an American destroyer, Congress gave Lyndon Johnson carte blanche authority to initiate troop movements into Vietnam.

It wasn’t until Johnson began his massive bombing campaign against North Vietnam in 1965 that the Antiwar Movement actually found its roots and dug in. Words like “counter culture”, "establishment”, “nonviolence”, “pacification”, “draft-dodger”, “free love”, “Kent State”, and “Woodstock” were added to the American vocabulary. It was the beginning of the hippie generation, the sexual revolution and the drug culture. The country’s youth, the ones dying in the line fire, began demanding answers to America’s high profile presence in Vietnam. They wanted to know why peace talks were organized and continually failed. They wanted to know what they were fighting for. Extensive media coverage brought the violent and bloody guerrilla war home each night to every American living room. People realised that the glowing reviews of the war effort their government had been releasing were “sanitised” and far from the truth. Even congressional senators began questioning Vietnam policies. Through it all the bombings continued and more and more of America’s young GI’s came home in body bags.

Once the draft was introduced young people on college and university campuses all around the country began to organise protests against the war. Teach-ins and student organizations like the SDS (Students for a Democratic Society) held rallies and marches, the first of which happened in Washington in April of 1965. Over the next 2 years the anti-war movement snow balled. Activists, celebrities and musicians like Abbie Hoffmann, Timothy Leary, Allen Ginsberg, Jane Fonda, Jefferson Airplane, and countless others took up the Anti-war cause and waved Anti-war banners. Their speeches and their music reflected the anger and hopelessness that Americans felt over the Vietnam war. Even the GI’s stationed overseas began supporting the Anti-war movement in whatever capacity they could, from wearing peace symbols to refusing to obey orders.

By 1967 America was mired in its own urban problems. As the bombings and body count in Vietnam continued to escalate so did civil unrest. 100,000 Anti-war protesters gathered in New York and thousands more in San Francisco. There were urban riots in Detroit. Johnson’s support was falling drastically on all fronts. Anti-war rallies, speeches, demonstrations and concerts continued being organized all over the country. There was a backlash against all that was military. Soldiers returning home from the war were no longer regarded as heroes but as “baby killers”. Young men sought to evade the draft by being conscientous objectors or leaving for Canada. North Vietnam’s bloody TET Offensive of 1968 and the resultant horrendous casualties the Americans suffered eroded the situation at home even further.The assassinations of Martin Luther King and Robert Kennedy also sparked racial tension and unrest. Wisely Lyndon Johnson did not seek re-election.

Richard Nixon’s number one campaign promise to Americans was that he’d end the war with “Vietnamization”, or systematic troop withdrawals. Yet the American presence in Vietnam remained high and casualties mounted, as did the cost of running the war effort. Taxpayers were paying 25 billion dollars per year to finance a conflict no one believed in anymore. The Woodstock concert brought 500,000 together from across North America in a non-violent protest against the war. Nixon’s plan to attack communist supply locations in Cambodia failed and set off another round of protests. The Kent State student protest in May of 1970 turned deadly when National Guardsman fired into crowds, killing 4 students and injuring dozens more. Students all across the country became enraged and over the next few days campuses all over the US came to a virtual standstill.

As the year drew to a close Nixon’s plans to end the Vietnam war had not been realized. American citizens were not impressed, however, after Kent State Anti-war activism seemed to wane. Yet the people still demanded to know why their country was involved in a war where a resolution seemed impossible. 1971 also saw the Mylai massacre come to light, an atrocity committed by American soldiers that shocked the world and gained huge media attention. Another round of peace talks were organized on the heels of this controversy but again all attempts to end the fighting in Vietnam failed.

Bombings raids on North Vietnam were re-escalated in the spring of 1972, after peace talks headed by Henry Kissinger once again collapsed. The cities of Hanoi and Haiphong were subjected to night raids by American B-52 bombers that was unprecedented and that left the world in shock. Peace talks resumed in Paris and by the end of January, 1973, a pact had been signed by the United States, South and North Vietnam and the Viet Cong. By March all American troops were pulled out of the country and systematic release of prisoners of war on both sides was initiated. Yet by the time the Watergate scandal came to light and ruined Nixon’s presidency at the close of 1974, Communist forces had overrun Saigon. Within a few short months most of Indochina would fall into Communist hands. The Anti-war movement’s mantra of “what are we fighting for” seemed eerily prophetic.

Twenty five years have passed since the end of the Vietnam war. During that time Americans and the world learned more about the history of the conflict and why it all began in the first place. Many agree that the Anti-war movement had significant impact on the length and perhaps even the outcome of the Vietnam war. Others might disagree saying that the massive protests were part of an eroding and troubled society. One thing is certain however -- the Anti-war movement left an everlasting mark on an entire generation and its country.
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The Communist-held Democratic Republic of Vietnam was opposed by the US-supported Republic of Vietnam. Disagreements soon emerged over the organizing of elections and reunification, and the U.S. began increasing its contribution of military advisers. U.S. forces were soon embroiled in a guerrilla war with the National Front for the Liberation of South Vietnam (NLF), the insurgents who were indigenous to South Vietnam. North Vietnamese forces unsuccessfully attempted to overrun the South during the 1968 Tet Offensive and the war soon spread into neighboring Laos and Cambodia, in both of which the United States bombed Communist forces supplying the North Vietnamese Army.

With its own casualties mounting, the U.S. began transferring combat roles to the South Vietnamese military in a process the U.S. called Vietnamization. The effort had mixed results. The Paris Peace Accords of January 27, 1973, formally recognized the sovereignty of both sides. Under the terms of the accords all American combat troops were withdrawn by March 29, 1973. Limited fighting continued, but all major fighting ended until the North once again sent troops to the South on April 30, 1975, following the collapse of the South Vietnamese government. South Vietnam briefly became the Republic of South Vietnam, under military occupation by North Vietnam, before being officially integrated with the North under communist rule as the Socialist Republic of Vietnam on July 2, 1976.

Postwar

Upon taking control, the Vietnamese communists banned all other political parties, arrested public servants and military personnel of the Republic of Vietnam and sent them to reeducation camps. The government also embarked on a mass campaign of collectivization of farms and factories. Reconstruction of the war-ravaged country was slow, and serious humanitarian and economic problems confronted the communist regime. Millions of people fled the country in crudely-built boats, creating an international humanitarian crisis.[7][8] In 1978, the Vietnamese army invaded Cambodia (sparking the Cambodian-Vietnamese War) to remove the Khmer Rouge from power. This action worsened relations with China, which launched a brief incursion into northern Vietnam (the Sino-Vietnamese War) in 1979. This conflict caused Vietnam to rely even more heavily on Soviet economic and military aid.
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Two Important Results of the Vietnam War
Apr 1, 2004

Of the two extremely important Vietnam War results, one has been completely ignored by left-leaning "scholars," writing their many books about the war. The ignored result is that the Vietnam effort was the "last straw" on the backs of Russian Communism, eventually crushing its world-domination movement.

The Russian "Bolshevik" branch of Communism supplied both the Korean and Vietnamese Communists with guns, ammunition, expensive MIG fighter planes, and enormous amounts of other supplies. In both Vietnam and Korea, the Russians ran out of steam and were replaced by the Chinese, but not until tremendous strains had been put on the Russian economy, preventing it from ever getting ahead of the game in the production of civilian goods. Russia was internationally borrowing more and more billions of dollars to buy wheat and meat, and they finally realized they were falling behind further every year, so they quit altogether. Those expensive military supplies were donated to Vietnam at the very peak of Russian production, which went downhill from then on.

The Korean War and the space race contributed to this, but Vietnam was the final climax that turned into a downfall. (We should have won the Korean War by bombing the Yalu Bridges, and we should have won the Vietnam War by occupying the supply pathways in Laos and Cambodia, as I pointed out in my Treasonous Democrats column. But we were too worried about irritating the Chinese, and that's another story.)

The other important result of the Vietnam War, which is reported in left-leaning books as a good thing rather than a bad one, is the triggering of the Hippy Revolution. The anti-war movement of the 1960s was a response to Vietnam, and it grew to become an entire culture of rebellion, glorification of jungle music, and other lower class cultural traits (illegal drugs, extramarital sex and childbirth, ridiculous symbols such as untied shoes, etc.) plus pacifism. Massive atrocities committed by Communists were ignored. However, the few committed by our frustrated troops (faced with "civilians" tossing hand grenades) were put on the front page. The whole Women's Liberation movement was propelled to extreme levels by the Hippy philosophy, resulting in our present culture-destroying situation, where unwed mothers are becoming the majority. It all started at Columbia University, mainly by Margaret Mead, with her utter lies about the South Sea Islands. (Examples are "female dominance" among the Arapesh and "free sex" among the Samoans --- both are utter lies, as you can see if you read the books I refer to in my Women's Liberation column, visible at the link shown above.)

The cultural values of Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln and other greats who built this country are surely being eroded by the leftist cults. I doubt that we could have won the Wars in 1776 and 1945 if we had the philosophy being taught to our youths by the leftist teachers in our schools now. I doubt that we could have built up our present capitalist prosperity if the leftist economics teachers had always been there.

Communism is still dominant in China and southeast Asia, and we might have to fight some kind of war to dethrone it, in order for us to survive. I hope the "war" will be commercial, rather than military. Fortunately, Russia with its thousands of missiles and tanks is not threatening us this time, thanks to the Vietnam War, which was the last straw on the back of Bolshevism.

from: http://www.useless-knowledge.com/columnists/danshanefield/article6.html
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ietnam: The True Victory

By O.M. Eather

With release of the film 'We Were Soldiers', based on the Battle of Ia Drang, the reality of the Vietnam War is finally given a reasonable and unbiased depiction. This is far removed from the patent, defeatist fantasies of films such as "Platoon" and "Apocalypse Now". It also leads to examination of the persistent myth that America and her Allies were "defeated" in the Vietnam War, a myth peddled continuously by journalists, academics and other commentators with a vested interest in convincing all that it is reality. The 'Big Lie" of military defeat that, said often and long enough, becomes the 'reality".

News organizations such as the BBC, the ABC, the 'New York Times' and the 'Washington Post' are among those most strident in the relentless peddling of this falsehood. It is bias and inaccuracy of the highest order, at odds with the supposed impartiality and high standards of these renowned news institutions, but it powerfully imbeds the myth in the mainstream of accepted truths. To argue against the American 'defeat' now automatically brings a conditioned response of disbelief and condescension, so pervasive has this campaign been.

One of the most persistent and recognizable motifs of this longstanding perspective is the continuous and excessive use of footage of the helicopter evacuation of US citizens from the US Saigon Embassy, a completely non military activity. It gives the impression US Forces were driven out of the country in 1975 - all presumably exiting from the roof of the Embassy. This is invariably accompanied by dialogue using the words "defeat" and "tragedy" and other emotive and fact-less commentary to complete the quite shameless distortion.

Most recently, the 'Sydney Morning Herald' reported on the opening of an Australian memorial in Phuoc Tuy Province for the Battle of Long Tan. The reporter exhibited all the results of thirty years of misinformation. Firstly calling the Australian campaign 'ill fated', he went on to describe the battle as an 'ambush' of the Australian force, finishing by only mentioning Viet Cong and North Vietnamese casualties, not the Australian twenty dead. By some convoluted logic he managed to imply that Australians were militarily inept by being ambushed, but were also callous and brutal in daring to proceed to slaughter the enemy once engaged, while suffering no casualties ourselves.

The facts of the Battle of Long Tan are well known, particularly that it was an encounter battle, not an ambush. It was far from a blundering disaster. In fact, it unbalanced a determined and numerically superior attempt to destroy the newly established Australian Task Force at Nui Dat, precisely what large, armed fighting patrols are intended to do. It also, irrevocably, wrested the initiative from the Viet Cong and the People's Army of Vietnam in Phouc Tuy Province. So much so that, eighteen months later during one of the most dangerous periods of the entire war (the 68 TET Offensive) 1 ATF was able to commit two thirds of its strength outside the province to assist the Americans. However, such factual analysis escaped the 'Herald's reporter completely.

The Tet Offensive is often offered as an example of how American and Allied forces were completely outclassed by the Viet Cong and PAVN, the Siege of Khe Sanh being one of the key 'tragedies' of the Tet Offensive. The facts are that, for North Vietnam, the Tet Offensive was an unmitigated and wildly overestimated disaster. There was no mass, popular uprising and all that was achieved was the exposure of both Viet Cong and Main Force units to the withering destruction of American and Allied firepower. The Viet Cong in South Vietnam were effectively wiped out and ceased to play any effective role in the war from then on. The North Vietnamese mounted an undeniable invasion of South Vietnam through neutral Laos and Cambodia; an act of military amorality equal to Pearl Harbor and the two invasions of Belgium by the German Army in 1914 and 1940. Virtually all their first line combat units were decimated, suffering over forty thousand killed and half that number wounded.

None - absolutely none - of the military aims of the Communist forces were achieved and it was called off by Vo Nguyen Giap when its failure became obvious. It was a military defeat of the order the French Army in 1940 or the Gallipoli Campaign. Yet, 'conventional wisdom' by the apologists and mythmakers hold the TET offensive up as a shining victory for the North.
At Khe Sanh, particularly, an outnumbered US Marine garrison inflicted a huge defeat on the Communist forces. There, a combination of fighting spirit and technology beat the four NVA divisions arrayed against them and foiled Giap's aim to repeat Dien Bien Phu. This also destabilized overall Communist strategy for the Tet Offensive, tying down valuable forces in the North, hardly a display of the alleged superior military thought of this 'master' strategist and his political master, Ho Chi Minh. The Tet Offensive was a military miscalculation of the most callous and egregious kind, a complete waste of the military resources deployed by the North.

In Phouc Tuy, the Australian Army never lost a battle, no thanks to the absence of our other SEATO ally, Great Britain, perhaps the underlying cause of the BBC's anti Americanism and its particular attempts to rewrite the results of the Vietnam War. In fact, all American and Allied forces had left South Vietnam by January, 1973, over eighteen months before the fall of Saigon. A peace treaty, the Paris Accords, had been signed by all parties as, to all intents, North Vietnam had been well and truly defeated militarily in the field, despite what years of misinformation would have us believe.

Concurrently, and most germane, was the fragmenting and emasculation of Communist aggression in Asia from the resolute example of America and Australia in Vietnam. The "dominoes" of South East Asia were given a priceless five years to cement their fragile economies and begin to deliver benefits to the people that evaporated the former appeal of Communism. No less an authority than Lee Kuan Yew has confirmed this crucial fact - Vietnam bought the rest of South East Asia the time needed to implement economic and political reform. This was the main game, the defeat of Communist expansion in South East Asia, and we well and truly won it.

Saigon fell because the North Vietnamese broke the Paris Accords, with deliberate and cold-blooded aggression, waiting long enough after Allied forces had left. The Communists attacked with four Armored divisions across the DMZ in a style reminiscent of Hitler's Blitzkrieg. In this new war, the NVA most certainly defeated the numerically inferior South Vietnamese but this was not the American fictional defeat posited by revisionist journalists - the Americans weren't there! If President Nixon had not been emasculated by the 'Watergate' scandal, US Airpower would have been committed to the defense of South Vietnam, however it was withheld by a hostile US Congress.

Finally, another myth is the defeat of US technological might by a bare foot army. The small part played by the Viet Cong against the consistent activities of the every well equipped and numerically superior PAVN forces dismisses the 'barefoot' fallacy. If there was any defeat in the Vietnam War, it was that of the political dimension. This was completely ignored, yet any elementary student (or reporter) of war theory knows, as Klauswitz enjoined, "war is an extension of policy by other means". To focus on technology as the cause of any negative result in that war is a fatal flaw in any argument trying to deduce future directions in warfare.

In the Vietnam War, technology was the equalizer for our forces against a more numerous and well equipped enemy. Helicopters gave flexibility to move less numerous maneuver forces rapidly and productively. Air and artillery support gave them a firepower equalizer when they met these larger enemy numbers. This crucial dynamic of operations in South Vietnam, the technology "equalizer", rarely gets a mention - except as a means of contrasting the combatants in an attempt to reap sympathy for the enemy.

So, when we see the balance bought, at long last, to the realities of the Vietnam War by "We Were Soldiers', the reality of our own military victory, and its long lasting effect on the peace of South East Asia, should also be a part of that balance.
http://64.233.169.104/search?q=cache:4umLvkpDUAkJ:cybersarges.tripod.com/rvnvictory.html+results+of+vietnam+war&hl=en&ct=clnk&cd=10&gl=us&client=firefox-a

A few more references for you:
http://www.csmonitor.com/2005/0613/p11s01-woap.html
http://www.voanews.com/english/archive/2005-04/2005-04-26-voa52.cfm?CFID=227752129&CFTOKEN=12360867