

V I E T N A M

First — Vietnam . . . Much has been spoken and written about Vietnam, but let this much be said: It has become apparent that our American military effort in Vietnam in the 1960's has occurred out of the same concerns which, back in 1954, had us paying for 80% of the French effort to hold on to her colonies . . . concern for the protection of a Free World market for corporate investment.

Looking back on the Indochinese conflict in his memoirs in 1963, Dwight Eisenhower wrote that the loss of Southeast Asia "would have spelled the loss of invaluable deposits of tin and prodigious supplies of rubber and rice."

The area alone supplied (and still supplies) the world with more than 90% of its natural rubber and 60% of its tin.

Such considerations were, apparently, among the considerations which led the U.S. in 1956 to install in South Vietnam Ngo Dinh Diem, dictator—called home from sunning on the French Riviera. We bolstered our man with arms and advisers. In further violation of the '54 Geneva Accords, elections which had been planned to reunify the country were not held. A campaign of political repression began.

Many of the Vietnamese who had fought hard against the French found that the wars were not yet over. By 1960, the guerrilla fighting force of the National Liberation Front had grown strong enough to begin to shake the U.S. position. The flow of U.S. arms was stepping up, and by 1964, 16,000 U.S. troops had arrived. In 1965, Johnson began bombing the North, and by 1968, the number of U.S. troops had risen to some 600,000. Who really knows how many troops we have in Indochina now?

In 1965, Wyoming Senator Gale McGee described the U.S. stake in Vietnam as follows. Is it a U.S. corporate stake? "The empire in Southeast Asia is the last major resource area outside the control of any one of the major powers on the globe . . . the condition of the Vietnamese people, and the direction in which their future may be going, are at this

stage secondary, not primary."

In that same year, Alfred Wentworth, in charge of Far Eastern Operations for the Chase Manhattan Bank, explained that the "U.S. actions in Vietnam this year . . . have considerably reassured both Asian and American investors."

And in December of 1969, Business Week commented on the area's tremendous resource potential and on the fact that American businessmen were utilizing its expanding markets, low-cost labor pool, tourism, oil, and metals.

So what're we fightin' for?

At the same time that businessmen are reassured on their investment decisions, the Vietnamese and American troops are dying. With the recent expansion of U.S. combat operations, Cambodians are dying for the rich as well.

D A V I D P A C K A R D

Perhaps Mr. David Packard's managerial expertise with Hewlett-Packard allowed his elevation to the Pentagon and appointment to the Defense Department's No. 2 position. Other of Mr. Packard's past positions include his serving on the Board of General Dynamics and the Chase Manhattan Bank, and presiding over the Board of Trustees at Stanford University.

Mr. Packard is an able man. Since coming to Washington, he has played a role in implementing the lottery draft system, in designing the ABM, and in redesigning the "decision-making process". Business Week (March 21, 1970) reports that the new Packard scheme was designed to "give . . . professional military people a larger say in the decision."

Last November, Packard was appointed to "a little known committee . . . within the framework of the National Security Council, expected by Administration officials to play a central role in shaping American