

The two Nixon doctrines

By GARY WILLS

As usual, Nixon dwelt little (and with little spirit) on domestic affairs in his inaugural speech — and even then he offered up domestic policy as a mere reflex of his foreign one:

"Abroad and at home the time has come to turn away from the condescending policies of paternalism, of Washington knows best." In other words, the Nixon doctrine of a "low profile" in the world is to become a new low profile for the American government even in America. We are not only going to cut off, finally, Vietnam, but cut off our fellow citizens as well if they cannot "make America" by work instead of welfare.

Well, there is something to be said for this approach in both arenas — but the obvious thing to say about Nixon's at-

tempts at harmonizing his foreign and domestic policies is this: He won't. For a very simple reason. He means it at home. He does believe the government should not help the poor — for one thing, this weakens the government; and, for all his talk of low profiles, that is the last thing Nixon really wants.

So, when he turns abroad, Nixon still talks, despite his own "doctrine," of America's active presence in the world as the only source of real stability: "Unless we in America work to preserve the peace, there will be no peace. Unless we in America work to preserve freedom, there will be no freedom."

How, then, can Nixon claim that we are abandoning the view that "Washington knows best" for other countries around the world? His speech also contained these words: "We shall support vigorously the

principle that no country has the right to impose its will or its rule on another by force." How do we do that? Obviously we have to decide what is a country, who is an invader, whether that invader is relying on force or internal sources of consent.

These are not easy matters in a place like Vietnam. Is it one country or two? Was the war there an aggression, a civil war, or the legitimate authority's attempt to regain power, despite a foreign nation's interposition to keep them out of it? After all, we did not hold the elections agreed to in Geneva because we thought Ho Chi Minh would win them. In that sense, we have been depriving a legitimate government of its position by external weight of sheer force. Yet Nixon argues that we are the defenders of freedom there, and the government which the people wanted is the aggressive power.

The point here is not who was right or wrong in Vietnam, but that we felt it was our duty and right to decide who was the legitimate power, and who was not — in short, that we felt "Washington knows best."

Nixon still feels that in foreign affairs. Only we can decide what the demands of "peace" are, and back up those demands. Only we can preserve freedom for other people. Nixon, who is great on self-reliance for people in the ghetto, has for four years now propped up the feeble Thieu. He only hates "paternalism" at home which weakens government in the effort at helping weak people. Abroad, paternalism wears a different face — that of imperialism, of America's strength arranging the world at our whim — and when Nixon looks upon that face, he likes what he sees.

Treaty a victory for Vietnamese

By WENDEL BRUNER

Editor's Note: Wendel Bruner is a graduate fellow in chemistry at the University. He's been active in the San Francisco Bay area anti-war movement and wrote for the Daily Californian at the University of California at Berkeley.

The third Indochina peace treaty is about to be signed. Like the preceding two in 1945 and 1954, the treaty doesn't signify the end of the struggle, and probably not even the end of the fighting. It does represent a victory for the anti-war movement however, and sets the stage for further conflict with the U.S. under conditions more favorable to the Indochinese liberation forces.

The magnitude of the difficulties the treaty represents for the U.S. is reflected by the temper tantrum Nixon waged over Christmas when faced with the written realities of the post spring offensive situation in Indochina. Now, with perhaps 10 per cent of the strategic bomber fleet shot down or damaged and world opinion aroused against him, Nixon agrees to terms presented in October.

American invasion

The war in Vietnam represents an attempted invasion of Vietnam by the United States in an effort to dominate that country, and the resistance to that invasion by the Indochinese people. Many people will argue that the Vietnam war, while a tragic error in American foreign policy, cannot be equated to an attack by the U.S. in an attempt to make a colony of Vietnam. After all, the argument goes, the war is primarily between Vietnamese, with the Saigon regime fighting the Hanoi-backed Viet Cong. They miss the point that the Saigon regime is not really Vietnamese. It is an American contrived artifact, created, supported, and nurtured by the U.S. government. It has no roots which allow it to exist in Vietnam; without American backing it couldn't last three months. Sometimes that form of domination of one nation by another is called neo or new-type colonialism.

Actually, it is not even new. The British dominated and exploited hundreds of millions of Indians with just a few tens of thousands of troops. Primarily they did it with the local equivalents of the Saigon regime, using Indian to fight Indian in a classic example of British Imperialism.

Believe Nixon

The American left has refused to claim its victories. People believe Nixon when he says he doesn't pay any attention to peace marches. No one seems to recall that the previous President said the same, as he flew from military base to military base in 1967, afraid to appear in public. The following year Johnson resigned in the face of mounting opposition to his policies. The American peace movement drove him out of office and forced the program of de-escalation of the War. Not total victory, Oregon Daily Emerald

but still vitally important to the Vietnamese.

During the invasion of Cambodia the American peace movement achieved its greatest single success. It forced Nixon to pull out in 30 days and promise he would never do that again. The following year the invasion of Laos was made without American troops, culminating as a result, in the rout of the Saigon forces and setting the stage for this spring's offensive. Today by U.S. estimates 80 per cent of Cambodia is controlled by the Khmer Rouge (Cambodian Liberation Forces).

Yet most anti-war people today believe that the Cambodian demonstrations were failures, and the Emerald ran an editorial saying they demonstrated the futility of going into the streets. Last year anti-war protests prevented the systematic bombing of the dikes, at least that is the opinion of ABC news, saving North Vietnam from possibly crippling destruction.

Transformed defeat

Most recently it was the massive outpouring of outrage and world wide protest, culminating in 100,000 persons in Washington for the coronation, that transformed Nixon's bombing of Hanoi into a defeat for U.S. policies and finally compelled the signing of the treaty.

The signing of the treaty opens a new phase in Vietnam's fight against American colonialism. At the peace march Saturday there was a sign "Now the war is over, we must rebuild Vietnam". That is exactly the present strategy of the U.S. government. With the support and even the urging of honest and well meaning liberals, Nixon will ask for and Congress will appropriate huge sums of money to "rehabilitate" Vietnam. That money will form a tremendous backing for the dictatorial Thieu regime. It will send flocks of A.I.D. (read C.I.A.) men to Vietnam. U.S. advisers and pacification workers will be transferred from military to civilian roles. Great quantities of food will be shipped to Vietnam as a humanitarian gesture to feed the millions of peasants in refugee camps who will be prevented from returning to their rich fields by the Saigon government.

Factories built

It will be called "Food for Peace". Factories will be built in the cities to provide jobs for the unfortunate homeless refugees. The factories will also provide huge profits to their American owners, as a result of the low wages they will pay.

Probably the U.S. government will guarantee the investments of U.S. corporations in Vietnam, another humanitarian gesture to aid in the rapid development of that backward part of the world. Your tax dollars will pay for all of that. Vietnam's off-shore oil will be rationally exploited by Texaco, Union Oil, and Standard Oil of New Jersey. Mutual benefit will accrue to some corrupt Saigon officials and to the American oil companies, mostly the latter.

They will pay no taxes, as an added

inducement for development. At least that is the scenario that is in the minds of Nixon and his backers. Fortunately, it isn't likely to work.

Just long enough

The cease-fire called for in the treaty will probably last just long enough for the U.S. troops to get out, and then the fighting will continue. The scenario that the U.S. has in mind for South Vietnam depends upon a strong Saigon army which can control the population.

Already the Thieu regime has declared a death penalty for Viet Cong political activity, a violation of the treaty.

It is necessary to keep the people from returning to their homes, and suppressing any signs of independent national aspirations. During the spring offensive it took all the might of U.S. air power to prevent the total collapse of the Saigon

Troops, and even so the government's position was much weakened. Without massive aircover, especially B-52's, the Saigon army is no match for the liberation forces.

As the Thieu regime in its desperation becomes increasingly repressive, its control over the population will swiftly erode. The next few years should see the final culmination of Vietnam's long struggle for independence.

The victories of the Vietnam war belong primarily to the Vietnamese people, who have fought with a courage and tenacity that is almost unimaginable. But their victories are our victories too, for without our efforts to awaken the conscience of America and put rein on our policy makers, all the Vietnamese courage and intelligence might not have been enough.

The treaty in Paris is not the end of the struggle, but it represents a concrete victory of 13 years of battle.

Letters

Larger scheme

I feel that the recent attacks by Roger Wyatt on several members of the ASUO Senate have been shown to be completely without basis. If any "conspiracy" exists, it is the conspiracy that Cliff Zukin operated to ensure his retention and confirmation for another term in the \$105 per month job as Senate President.

What Roger Wyatt hopes to gain by acting as a hatchet man for Zukin is not yet clear, although Wyatt's latest appointment as a member of the Governing Committee (even as a non-Senator) may be a portent of things to come.

Perhaps Zukin and Wyatt have some larger scheme to foist on the students, such as a Wyatt-Zukin ticket for the Spring ASUO Presidential election, similar in content to the Wyatt-Bonnie Kooser ticket of last Spring.

Philip Gerlicher
Pre-med

War ends

On Saturday, the 27th, the Vietnam war will come to an end with the signing of a cease-fire agreement. Within 60 days of the agreement, all American troops will be withdrawn and all prisoners of war will be released.

The United States has been actively engaged in the Vietnam war for 12 years. The lives of 56,000 Americans have been lost, along with billions of dollars worth of tools, weapons, and machinery.

During the increasing escalation of the war effort, Americans witnessed minor dissatisfaction escalated to violent outrage. Proponents of contrasting views of the war waged bitter campaigns against each other. Contempt grew for the

Presidents involved in the greater part of the war — the late Lyndon Johnson and Richard Nixon.

It is an impossible task to estimate the number of families that were affected by this war — the families of POW's, the families of those missing in action, the families of the wounded, and of the dead. Those associated with men who served in the war and were unharmed may give prayers of thanks.

The families of those lost must look to the future. They have no alternative, for there is nothing to be gained by looking back. They can only be proud that their men gave their lives willingly, for an unclear and possibly unjust cause.

Joseph J. Reisner
Pre-journalism

The mystery

For quite some time letters have appeared in the Emerald condoning this, condemning that, accusing here, denying there. The end result is a flock of magpies at each other's throat. The original purpose of the senate has been overshadowed by continuous mudslinging attacks that lead to the defeat of its governmental ideals.

Our proposal is that the Emerald must take the responsibility of investigating this predicament, not just provide a battle field.

In theory, the senate's purpose is to reflect the student's desires and needs. Therefore, its course should be directed in such a manner, not off in some field dueling amongst themselves for king of the mountain.

Jesse Smith.
Jeff Sweeney
Dave Danielson
Terri Brown
Page 5