the Delta councils managed to rise to three feet, and for the peasants who couldn't be bothered stopping to help, the gates were always open. In Malaya, the inhabitants were kept armed, to ward off guerrilla attacks. In South Vietnam, weapons were kept locked in the hamlet chief's office and distributed in emergencies. Emergencies managed to come too fast for effective distribution. In Malaya, the communists were effectively cut off from the peasants. In Vietnam, the flow of propaganda, terror, food and information continued unhindered.

We were preying ourselves over the beginnings of democratic self-government we had introduced into the strategic hamlets. The Vietnamese were sharing our public enthusiasm by announcing that a long-sought social revolution had taken hold of their country. Hamlet residents were now given an opportunity to elect their own leaders and to vote themselves on possible self-help programs founded by the U.S. I asked a close Vietnamese friend of mine in the government whether the peasants were in fact being given this opportunity. "Of course not," he answered. "The day before the election, the district chief instructs the peasants in what choices they are to make. Then, the following day, when you Americans are there, the peasants know exactly how to vote." "Have the peasants ever made up their own minds?" I asked. He was surprised that I would ask such a ridiculous question.

 Militarily, we claimed to have turned the tide against the Communists. We were proudly reporting "mopping up" operations on the Voice of America with statistics kindly supplied us by the Vietnamese government information service, listing 200 Viet Cong killed and one government soldier wounded. Yet, even with such a high mortality rate among the Communists, within eighteen months 10,000 Viet Cong regulars managed to swell to 25,000.

The Vietnamese were exploiting the situation beautifully. We were the successors to the French, they said, moving our men and equipment into the country to destroy Vietnamese independence and convert the country into a colony under American imperialism. They turned a page in the history of the country's fight for freedom from the Western colonialists. They portrayed Diem as a puppet of the West, who had no concern for the interest of his countrymen. They made no move, however, to topple the government, for they were convinced that it would fall by itself.

The horror of the situation came not from what the Vietnamese were doing, but from what Americans thought they were doing. As the New York Times had consistently pointed out, there was little relationship between what we lowered and the people were being asked to do. As the popular American officials in Saigon were reporting back to Washington, the State Department now blames the Central Intelligence Agency for stopping the flow of realistic information to Washington, but there was a ban on negative reporting throughout the entire American Mission in Saigon until only recently.

**DIEM LOSES WHILE HE WINS**

All of us, I am sure, the Ambassador included, knew at least unconsciously that we were winning no war, that Diem was winning no support of his people, and that there was no prospect of victory over the Communists with our present policy. If it was to be "sink or swim with Ngo Dinh Diem," we all knew that we were sinking. But those who had to take responsibility for our actions no longer dared to reverse themselves. They had spent too many billions, been in Vietnam too many years, and lost too many men to admit that it had been in vain. To protect themselves, they could accept only those facts that would support the only policy they thought possible.
The final proposal has been offered by General De Gaulle. After establishing a cease-fire, the Geneva conference would negotiate reunification of the south with the north and neutralization of the entire country. We answer that North Vietnam is already not dominated by Communist China to be effectively neutral in the Cold War.

Any decision as to the direction of Vietnam must obviously take into account the feelings of the Vietnamese people. As all peoples, they want peace. As the people of a divided country, they want reunification. As the pawns of colonialism and now of communism, they want an opportunity to work out their own destiny.

The nation, the group of nations, the international organization that could guarantee a reunified and peaceful Vietnam, freed from the pressures of the Cold War, would have the support of all Vietnamese -- in the north, in the south, or in exile.

In May, 1963, David Arnold, the author of this article, had been serving in South Vietnam for the past 14 months with the USIA office on the Mekong Delta area, resigned from government service in protest. Assigned to the branch public office in Can Tho, he was responsible for explaining United States policy and goals to the Vietnamese in that area. Dr. Arnold, who holds a Ph.D. from Harvard in linguistics, is now executive assistant at the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation in Princeton, N.J. This article originally appeared in Fellowship (the magazine of the Fellowship of Reconciliation) of May 1964. Copies are available from the F.O.R. (Box 271, Hyack, N.Y.) or from PREP.

simply a job for objective economic analysis -- it is fundamentally a job of muckraking and exposure.

Some of this form of writing is already being done, and we have included some outstanding examples in this Newsletter. For example, Andrew Frank's Nation article represents a potent expose of U.S. aid policy; Sid Lens has briefly lifted a curtain on how government agencies have been planning to operate in such places as Brazil; Michael Freeman recites the elements of the Brazilian coup (Freeman's article, along with another by Frank from the Nation on the coup, are available from the PREP literature service); and David Martin presents some basic background for the war on Vietnam. All of this material is obvious in the extreme to those who have direct experience in these situations; the fact is that there is hardly a soul in the United States who is aware of any of it.

Awareness is the first step in effecting a policy change; thus, we in PREP have decided to devote major attention to stimulating research and education on these matters. This is a job which students -- with skills, sophistication, and access to information -- are in an excellent position to undertake. So let this be a call to our readers for any kind of information on U.S. relations to the Third World, or put simply, U.S. imperialism. We will distribute material as widely as possible, in the Newsletter and a series ofPREP papers.

Let this be a call to peace activists. Only the peace movement is likely to act on these issues, to formulate alternatives and organize around them. The rich nation/poor nation conflict will cause the wars of the coming period and shatter the promise offered by the détente. Resolution of this conflict is a prerequisite to disarmament. Meanwhile, each small war will have a built-in danger of escalation. Here, our own country is the deepest cause of worry: how many Vietnams, Cubas, and South Africans can occur before general war becomes a reality? It is time to become active again, and around an issue far more profound and difficult than that of nuclear testing. The question before the peace movement now is: Can we educate ourselves on this question? Can we educate the American public? Can we formulate an alternative policy which can win popular support?

The elections of 1964 will afford the Left with a series of political opportunities which should be seized. In this piece, I will try to indicate the types of opportunities that are presented, and the forms of electoral activity which are most suitable in each political situation. I will also include a list of the most appealing opportunities.

The politics of 1964 is colored by two developments of the past year -- the new assertion of several domestic priorities (end to poverty, civil rights) by local insurgent movements, and the coincidence of several international developments which make their realization somewhat more possible. We have a large, militant Negro movement, countless wars and atheism against poverty, a Republican attack on the draft, the wings of organization of the poor around economic issues, and many other manifestations of these developments.

"Political Directions" is one of the favorite debate topics of the Left. These debates would benefit from a systematic approach of setting forth in detail the goals of politics, and matching appropriate tactics to them. Five separate deals for 1964 can be listed:

1. Elect candidates with insurgent bases, wherever possible, at all levels of political office.

2. Encourage sympathetic professional politicians to manifest their sympathy by denouncing the links between the concerns of their constituents to the warfare state, and to the persistence of poverty and unemployment.

3. Recruit new blood to insurgent movements.

4. Defeat conservative incumbents.

5. Support S.I.C.'s effort to realign the Democratic Party in Mississippi.

It may be necessary to add a sixth goal, if the Republicans nominate Barry Goldwater and the possibility emerges that he will be elected and will suppress activity on the Left.

ACT THRU INSURGENT ORGANIZATIONS

In all these activities, we should be aware that our primary activity should be thrown to the framework of new insurgent organizations. We should especially look to organizations which are based among disadvantaged communities. One excellent example of this kind of organization has been brought to light through the Senate candidacy of George McLaughlin in California. McLaughlin, 63, is head of both the national (250,000 members in states) and state (15,000 members) Leagues of Senior Citizens. In 1960, he received 650,000 votes as a maverick Presidential primary candidate. The following report is taken from The New York Times:

"Styling himself 'The Angry American' on the warpath against poverty in a land of plenty, Mr. McLaughlin advocates a Federal guaranteed income of $216.50 a month to every person over 62. This is equal to the Federal minimum wage. The cutlay could be financed by reducing the nation's overseas commitments along the greatest extent, be contends, by reducing the nation's overseas commitments along the interest on federal debt of $14 billion.

McLaughlin's candidacy provides an interesting lesson in the complexities of insurgent politics. His major opponents include Kennedy liberal Pierre Salinger and clubbly.