

"Vietnamese p 15-28
Studies" 37-77

**A SHORT HISTORY
OF
U.S. NEO-COLONIALISM**

NGUYEN KHAC VIEN

ANY capitalist economy reaching a certain stage of development is inevitably impelled to reach out of the national frontiers, into the industrially less developed countries, for new markets, raw materials, cheap labour and profitable investment of capital. This colonial expansion takes on most varied forms, for numerous factors interfere and give colonialism its very diverse looks. Of prime importance is the balance of forces between the colonial power and the colonized peoples, between the different imperialisms that confront each other on the same territory; in our times, the existence of socialist countries considerably affects the colonial policy of the imperialist powers. The present epoch is profoundly different from the 19th century as regards the balance of forces in the international arena, and the classical methods of colonialism are no longer possible. On the other hand, neo-colonialism is part of a policy of world counter-revolution, which has become a vital necessity for the

imperialist powers. Colonial policy is subject to the needs of world strategy. Colonial exploitation, the prime and often sole objective in the last century, can in some places, be momentarily relegated to the second rank for the benefit of this strategy.

The above considerations enable us to bring out the characteristics of US colonial policy at different times; conversely, a short historical outline will shed light on the various factors that give this colonialism its present features.

I. Control over the American continent

The American nation was born of a fierce struggle against British colonialism. Moreover, during a long period, US capitalism concentrated its efforts on the exploitation of the immense resources of an almost unoccupied national territory. The extermination of Indians, the slave exploitation of Negroes were phenomena of "internal colonization". Those facts have supplied some people with the argument that, contrary to European capitalist powers, the USA had no colonial ambitions, at least for a long period of its history.

But historical reality is quite the opposite. As early as the beginning of the 19th century, while "internal colonization" was far from being completed, US capitalism already looked beyond the national frontiers,

especially having an eye to its neighbours of Central America and further to those of South America.

The American continent was then shaken by a fierce struggle of the people against Spanish and Portuguese colonialism; this struggle, however, did not result in total independence, for the landed oligarchy which had come to power in the various Latin American countries, incapable of building truly independent nations, rapidly established relations of close dependence with the European powers, in particular with Great Britain.

Thus, right at the start, US colonialism met with two powerful adversaries: the people in revolt against Spanish and Portuguese colonialism, and a redoubtable rival, British imperialism. US colonial expansion had to take on indirect forms, other than outright conquest.

In 1823, under the signboard of pan-Americanism, President Monroe proclaimed his famous "doctrine", interdicting all direct intervention by European powers on the American continent. In fact the formula "America for the Americans" covered a policy which was to take shape rapidly and prompt the great Latin American patriot Simon Bolivar to utter these bitter words: "The United States seems to be destined by Providence to overwhelm America with misery in the name of liberty." (December 17, 1830). The American continent was to become gradually an exclusive preserve for Yankee capitalism.

In 1831, US Marines landed on the Falkland Islands and as early as 1834 the USA intervened in Mexican affairs; a series of plots and intrigues which led in

1845 to a war against Mexico half of whose national territory, about two million square kilometres, was seized by its powerful neighbour. Other American States, Colombia, Nicaragua, Uruguay, the Dominican Republic, Cuba, made acquaintance with US interventionist policy one after another, during the 19th century.

By the end of that century, US capitalism had strengthened its economic power and become more and more enterprising. Senator Beveridge openly stated:

"American factories are making more than the American people can use. American soil is producing more than they can consume. Fate has written our policy for us; the trade of the world must and shall be ours. And we shall get it as our mother England has told us how. We will establish trading posts throughout the world as distributing points for American products. We will cover the ocean with our merchant marine. We will build a navy to the measure of our greatness. Great colonies, governing themselves, flying our flags and trading with us will grow about our posts of trade. Our institutions will follow our trade on the wings of our commerce. And American law, American order, American civilisation and the American flag will plant themselves on the shores hitherto bloody and benighted, by those agencies of God henceforth made beautiful and bright."

The year 1898, during which Senator Beveridge, a spokesman of the business circles, made that profession of faith, was that of the Spanish-American war. The

scenario is well known: the US cruiser *Maine* exploded in a mysterious way in the port of Havana, and Washington made this a pretext to declare war on Spain, a war which enabled it to seize not only Cuba, the scene of the explosion, but also Puerto Rico and the Philippines. US troops occupied Cuba till 1901. Then they withdrew, but only after having imposed a pro-US government, tied to Washington by the Platt amendment (1), subjoined to the Cuban constitution, which permitted US troops to intervene whenever the need arose. US troops continued to occupy the Guantanamo base; the Cuban economy was completely dependent on the USA. One can understand why, in "independent" Cuba, the US ambassador was generally acknowledged to be the most important man in the country.

Thus, as early as the 19th century, US imperialism already worked out a formula of colonialism rather different from methods adopted by European countries in Africa or in Asia. US control was disguised behind the screen of a native government, which was politically, economically and militarily in complete dependence. This indirect administration has become one of the main characteristics of neo-colonialism.

The first years of the 20th century were marked, during the presidency of Theodore Roosevelt, by numerous financial and military interventions in the Dominican Republic, Nicaragua, Honduras and Venezuela. In 1903, with the assistance of US troops, a new republic, that of Panama, was created, cut off from Colombia,

(1) Platt, who had proposed this amendment, was a US Senator.

which had to surrender its sovereignty over this zone where the inter-oceanic canal passes, henceforth put at the disposal of the USA.

Theodore Roosevelt openly proclaimed the right of the USA to intervene militarily in Latin America, and it was he who first used the now classical phrases of "big-stick policy" and "international gendarmerie". This big-stick policy materialized in numerous military actions against Cuba in 1906 and 1912, against the Dominican Republic in 1907, against Nicaragua in 1909, against Mexico in 1913 and 1914. All those brutal interventions were justified by Theodore Roosevelt by "the permanent injustice or impotence which results from a general loosening of the rules of civilized society, which finally requires the intervention of a civilized nation." (retranslated from the French — Tr.). General MacArthur (father of the MacArthur who made the Korean War), when he was governor of the Philippines, declared: "We implant in the East the idea of freedom. Wherever the American flag goes, this idea propagates. Implantation of freedom, not money, is what we seek." (retranslated from the French—Tr.). Senator Beveridge was still more lyrical: "God has not during a thousand years prepared the Teutonic and English-speaking peoples for only vain and lazy self-admiration. He has made us the master organizers of the world so that we could establish order where chaos reigns. He has made us able to govern so that we could administer barbaric and senile peoples. Without such a force, this world would fall back into barbarity and darkness. Of all the races, He has appointed the American people as

the nation of His choice eventually to lead the first generation of the world." (retranslated from the French—Tr.).

General Smedley Buller, commander of the Marine Corps, put it more bluntly in his memoirs written after his retirement:

"I spent 35 years 5 months in the active service as a member of this country's most agile force, the Marine Corps. I helped make Mexico, especially Tampico, safe for the oil interests in 1914. I helped make Haiti and Cuba a decent place for the National City Bank to collect revenue in. I helped purify Nicaragua for the Banking House of Brown Brothers in 1909 to 1912. I brought light to the Dominican Republic for American sugar interests in 1916."

President Taft, succeeding Theodore Roosevelt, declared that he wanted to replace bombs by the dollar, to substitute dollar diplomacy for that of the stick. In fact, Taft and Roosevelt made lavish use of both. One can say that from Monroe to Theodore Roosevelt and Taft, US colonialism, with regard to the American continent, had gained long experience in combining the action of the Marines with that of the dollar; it even worked out a "doctrine" to justify its actions.

However, a latecomer in the colonial competition, US capitalism still played second fiddle to British imperialism, up to the First World War. In 1913, US investments in Latin America amounted to 1,242 million dollars as against nearly 5,000 million for the British.

The First World War (1914-1918), having caused the European imperialisms to lose their pre-eminence, compelled them to yield ground, especially in Latin America, to the benefit of US imperialism. In 1929, US investments, which had increased rapidly since 1918, almost equalled those of Great Britain, which had hardly advanced (5,587 million dollars against 5,889 million).

The long crisis of 1929 which lasted until 1938, up to the eve of the Second World War, and the rise of Hitlerite and Mussolinian fascisms, quite active in Latin America, considerably limited Yankee expansion. Franklin D. Roosevelt, on becoming President of the USA, was obliged to proclaim a "good-neighbour policy". That did not prevent Washington from imposing economic sanctions against the Mexican government for nationalizing its oil industries, and demanding from Mexico large reparations for US companies. Neither did F.D. Roosevelt hesitate to make use of local dictators as instruments of Washington's policy.

It is safe to say that till the Second World War, US colonial expansion had been directed solely at the American continent. Attempts at penetration into Asia had run into resistance by Asian peoples and active competition by European, then Japanese, imperialisms. Let us point out that while Washington had proposed the formula "America for the Americans" for the American continent, in China it proposed a policy of "open door" and not "China for the Chinese".

Latin America gradually became the "backyard" of the USA, supplying it with oil, minerals, tropical goods necessary for US industries and the maintenance of US

living standards. Through financial, political and military means, Washington managed to put under its control the local bourgeoisies and landed oligarchies. The defence of the interests of US companies and the maintenance of backward socio-economic structures are closely interconnected and are ensured by a militarist caste trained, formed and supported by Washington.

This collusion between US imperialism and the local reactionary forces and the impotence of the local bourgeoisie to promote real independence and real economic development have led Latin America to that state of external dependence, misery, and glaring social injustice described by observers of all tendencies.

II. Neo-colonialism and global strategy

The end of the Second World War was marked by sweeping changes in the international arena. The German, Italian and Japanese fascist regimes collapsed, the British, French and Dutch imperialisms were considerably weakened. With its resources undamaged by war, with its economic power stimulated by war and a scientific and technological revolution of wide scope, with the monopoly of atomic weapons and the possession of considerable stores of conventional weapons, the USA became the undisputed leader of the capitalist world. US troops occupied South Korea,

Japan, were stationed in Western Europe as far as Berlin. Scores of countries in the world were bound to Washington by loans, grants, subsidies in food and arms. US imports and exports exceeded by far those of pre-war years, and investments abroad increased rapidly. Here are some figures :

	<i>Exports</i>	<i>Imports</i>	<i>Investments abroad</i>
	(in million dollars)		
1939-1940	3,177	3,192	10,746
1945	16,273	10,232	16,818
1960-61	20,662	14,713	71,497

The dollar had become the dominating currency, serving as standard currency in international transactions. The USA drained raw materials from the five continents, exported its goods to every part of the world. Let us also mention the fact that the war had enabled it to settle the very serious question of unemployment (9 million unemployed people in 1939).

To assume leadership of the capitalist world, the USA possesses industrial, agricultural and scientific power that surpasses by far the means of any other imperialist countries at any times. This economic power, in a capitalist regime, has a double consequence :

— it exacerbates the needs in raw materials and markets and strongly impels the investment of capital abroad ;

— it provides US imperialism with tremendous and multiform means of domination, incomparably superior to those of European powers.

The era of isolationism had utterly ended ; pretensions to world hegemony asserted themselves. Some

authors tried to minimize the needs in raw materials and in foreign markets and the necessity to invest capital abroad, by arguing that US industry could easily find substitutes for any raw materials and has an enormous home market. We shall not go into the details of those economic considerations, which will be dealt with in the subsequent article. Let us point out simply that in his inaugural speech on January 20, 1953, President Eisenhower laid particular emphasis on this problem of raw materials coming from other countries, just as Nelson Rockefeller did in his report to the President in 1951 (1). Worldwide colonial expansion had become an imperative necessity from the economic point of view.

An extra-economic factor was to come to the fore, however, after 1945, for having become the ringleader of the capitalist world, the USA had to face a problem which did not confront the imperialist powers in the 19th century. It had to assume colonial responsibilities in a world where revolution had made decisive headway. The Soviet Union had clearly displayed its vitality by defeating Hitlerite fascism : new socialist States were coming into being, while the colonized peoples began to rise up in an irresistible movement. Even the rear areas of the major capitalist countries were no longer

(1) See Claude Julien : *L'Empire américain*.

For American attempts at self-justification see the N° 4 - 1969 issue of the French review *Esprit*.

Let us recall that in 1953, to justify American aid to the French in IndoChina, Eisenhower spoke of the necessity for the USA to get control of the sources of raw materials in South-East Asia.

safe because the workers' and people's movement for better living conditions, for democracy and peace, had influenced broad strata of the population. The very survival of the capitalist system was at stake. The crucial question for the USA henceforward was how to get rid of this world revolution, how to face this surging tide, how to "stem" it, to "contain" it, to destroy its main bastions, to nip in the bud the nascent movements, to drain the already formed abscesses.

In short, economic expansion and counter-revolution, both worldwide, are two closely inter-connected policies. Thus, at the end of the Second World War, the USA found itself in a situation which could be characterized as follows:

— It possessed obvious, even absolute, material and technical superiority over all other countries.

— It was politically on the defensive, having to fight the forces of social progress, of national liberation and of peace in the world. This was really a rearguard action.

US policy vis-à-vis the industrially under-developed countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America was thus determined in terms of its global strategy, which was itself defined mainly by Washington's policy vis-à-vis the bastion of world revolution, the socialist camp. One can say that, broadly speaking, US neo-colonial policy has taken two different directions, each prevailing in a different period.

Immediately after the end of the Second World War, US leaders geared their action towards a direct offensive against the Soviet Union. They believed they could easily attack the Soviet Union which had suffered tremendous destruction by the war, and which did not possess the atomic weapon as yet. In 1945, the political future of the East European countries was still unsettled. A US-Western European coalition would command overwhelming material and technical superiority over the Soviet Union (1).

One of the post-war primary tasks was to restore and strengthen the economic and military potential of the Western allies so as to integrate them into an anti-Soviet coalition later on. The other major preoccupation of the US was to "stop" the Soviet Union on its eastern frontiers by a counter-revolutionary China under the dictatorship of Chiang Kai-shek; the occupation of Japan and Korea had already given US troops access to the Asian continent.

Under those circumstances, the under-developed countries interested Washington only in so far as they could serve as military bases against the Soviet Union, in so far as they had common frontiers with the socialist countries. Economic preoccupations were only of secondary importance, relegated to the background by strategic considerations. At the time, India was of less

(1) To give an idea of this material superiority and hence of US aggressiveness, let us recall simply that in 1945 US steel output was more than four times that of the Soviet Union; a US-Western Europe-Japan coalition would result in an output eight times that of the Soviet Union.

interest than Turkey, Greece, Iran (1). In the Middle East, oil-and strategic interests coincided; but the whole of Africa, and South-East Asia, with their vast riches, still remained, if not outside, at least in the background of US preoccupations. For the reasoning of Washington strategists was simple: if the Soviet Union fell, the USA would pick all those countries like so many ripe fruit.

In the ideological field, anti-Communism, outright anti-Communism and anti-Sovietism, served to justify all measures taken in the world arena as well as at home. John Foster Dulles called all neutralism immoral, and a witch-hunt started in the USA culminated in McCarthyism.

..

Immediately after Roosevelt's death, as early as 1945, Truman began to attack. On April 23, 1945, eleven days after Roosevelt died, talking to Molotov, the Soviet Foreign Minister, Truman used a "Missouri mule-driver's language", as the American columnist Drew Pearson put it. Control over under-developed countries bordering on the Soviet Union, the establishment of strongly anti-Communist and anti-popular dictatorial regimes in those countries, the transformation of the

(1) Turkey, Greece, Taiwan, South Korea, South Viet Nam, with a total population of 75 million, received from 1946 to 1961 8,700 million dollars of economic aid, 7,900 million of military aid, i.e. a far higher amount than that received by India with a population of 450 million.

latter into military bases and suppliers of cheap soldiers (the maintenance cost of a South Korean soldier is estimated at 25 times less than that for a US soldier) rapidly became urgent objectives of US policy. In South Korea, US troops brought back to power Syngman Rhee, who had spent 37 years in the United States, to establish a brutal dictatorship and build up a large army. In Iran, an oil-producing country having common frontiers with the Soviet Union, evacuated by Soviet troops in 1946, "the Americans moved in — not with troops and revolution — but silently with dollars in support of the status quo. In addition to American funds, the Iranian government received American advisers, civil and military, and Iran became in effect an American satellite. If America did not yet have military bases there, she could have them any time she wished." (1)

The US intervention in Greece was an occasion for Truman to define his "doctrine"; addressing the US Congress on March 12, 1947, he drew a Manichean picture of the world composed on the one hand of the "free" nations, and on the other of countries under a regime of terror and oppression. He declared:

"I believe that it must be the policy of the US to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures. The free peoples of the world look to us for support in maintaining their freedoms. If we falter in our leadership, we may

(1) David Horowitz: *From Yalta to Viet Nam*, p.84.

endanger the peace of the world and we shall surely endanger the welfare of our nation."

Truman asked for a credit of 400 million dollars for financial and military assistance to Greece and Turkey. The American aid made it possible for the Greek reactionaries to win the civil war over a coalition of Communist and anti-Fascist forces. This resulted in the establishment of a blood-thirsty dictatorship in Greece, which was supposed to be part of the "free" world, and that of American control over a country adjoining the socialist camp and holding major strategic positions in the Eastern Mediterranean and the Black Sea.

Turkey, a strategic base of prime importance against the Soviet Union, also received especial attention as Greece did: 1,158 million dollars of economic aid, 2,000 million of military aid from 1946 to 1960, as against 1,593 million of economic aid and 1,238 million of military aid for Greece from 1946 to 1958. The Turkish government was opposed to all social reforms, but built up a half-million-strong army and the country was studded with airfields—later with missile sites—from which bombers could carry out raids against the Soviet Union at any time.

On account of its oil resources and its strategic position, the Middle East permanently lies at the centre of Washington's preoccupations. Through economic and military intervention if need be, Washington imposed on several countries anti-Soviet, dictatorial, corrupt governments, entirely devoted to US interests. In Iran, the Mossadeq government, which nationalized the oil companies was overthrown in 1953 by a

CIA-engineered plot; the British lost their monopoly of Iranian oil to the benefit of US companies.

In 1955, Washington managed to set up the Baghdad military bloc including Turkey, Iran, Iraq, and Pakistan; with Greece, those countries thus formed a continuous chain of military bases along the southern frontiers of the Soviet Union.

Eisenhower loudly proclaimed the "right" of the USA to intervene in the Middle East. On January 1, 1957, he declared that "the existing vacuum in the Middle East must be filled by the US." On January 5, 1957, addressing the US Congress, he proclaimed: "Nothing is more necessary... than that our policy with respect to the defense of the area be promptly and clearly determined and declared." At his request, the US Congress adopted the following resolution:

"The President is authorized to undertake... military assistance programs with any nation or group of nations of that area desiring such assistance. Furthermore he is authorized to employ the armed forces of the US as he deems necessary to secure and protect the territorial integrity and political independence of any nation or group of nations requesting such aid against overt armed aggression from any nation controlled by international communism."

On July 15, 1958, US Marines landed in Lebanon, while the 6th Fleet was deployed in the Eastern Mediterranean. This show of force was aimed both at

supporting Lebanese President Chamoun who was favourable to the "Eisenhower doctrine" and at intimidating the Iraqi insurgents who had overthrown the government of the dictator Nouri Said.

The landing in Lebanon was coupled with an overt menace toward the socialist countries: "If small wars were to break out in several places in the world simultaneously, then we would not fight on the enemy's terms and be limited to his choice of weapons. We would hold the Kremlin or Peking responsible for their actions and would act accordingly." Washington sought to stem the national-liberation movement by resorting to nuclear blackmail against the socialist camp.

This search for military bases undertaken in the Middle East with a view to the encirclement of the socialist countries was pursued with tenacity in Eastern Asia right after the victory of the Chinese revolution in 1949. It is highly significant that all US documents quite naturally used such phrases as "we have lost China" and "the loss of China", as if that country belonged to the United States. This "loss" of China was explained by Secretary of State Acheson in this very simple manner:

"The Communists took over China at a ridiculously small cost. What they did was to invite some Chinese leaders who were dissatisfied with the way things were going in their country to come to Moscow. There they were thoroughly indoctrinated so that they returned to China prepared

to resort to any means whatsoever to establish Communist control. They were so completely subservient to the Moscow regime. These agents then mingled among the people and told them on the personal material advantages of Communism."

On May 18, 1951, Dean Rusk, then Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, stated:

"The Peiping regime (so he called the P.R.C. —Ed.) may be a colonial Russian government. It is not the government of China. It is not Chinese. It is not entitled to speak for China. The national government of the Republic of China (Chiang Kai-shek) more authentically represents the views of the great body of the people of China."

It was now a question of overthrowing the revolutionary regime of China, if possible, or at least of encircling it, setting up around revolutionary China a solid belt of military bases and satellite countries. Against the new Chinese government, which they believed to be fragile, the Washington rulers tried first to provoke a war, limited at the outset, then to "escalate" it gradually till the defeat of the revolutionary regime.

On May 30, 1950, Syngman Rhee, a Washington protégé, suffered a severe setback in the legislative elections in South Korea, in spite of a regime of police terror. A base for attack against China, a bridgehead on the Asian continent, might be lost for the USA. On

June 25, hostilities broke out between North Korea and South Korea. On June 27, while the UN Security Council still recommended that both parties should seek the mediation of a neutral country, or undertake direct negotiations, President Truman ordered "US air and sea forces to give the Korean government troops cover and support." In the same order of the day, the 7th Fleet was to take under its protection Taiwan which Washington had recognized before as rightfully belonging to China, and military aid to the Philippines and especially to the French Expeditionary Corps in Indochina was to be reinforced. A US military mission, MAAG, came to Indochina and established itself alongside the French Command. Washington took charge of the war against the national liberation movements in Indochina.

The intervention of the US armed forces in Korea was accepted by a docile UNO as a sanction by the United Nations in response to the "aggression" by North Korea. It was the period of triumphant McCarthyism, and one could judge the atmosphere prevailing in the United States by the applause in the House of Representatives to a proposal for atomic bombing of North Korea. On September 15, MacArthur landed his marines at Inchon; on the 30 the US ambassador to the United Nations declared that "the aggressor forces must not be allowed to take refuge behind an imaginary line... The artificial barrier dividing North and South Korea has no ground for existence, either in right or in reason." (retranslated from the French — Tr.) On October 1, MacArthur demanded that the

North Koreans lay down their arms, and South Korean forces under his command crossed the 38th parallel, threatening the Sino-Korean border. The United Nations, in face of a fait accompli, again acquiesced. In late October, China countered by sending volunteers to North Korea. On November 24, while delegates of People's China were to come to New York to take part in discussions at the Security Council, MacArthur rushed 100,000 men toward the Sino-Korean frontier. His intention was clear: to cause the failure of the negotiations at the United Nations, and to involve China directly in the hostilities with a view to retaliation. The US Command particularly had in view the "Manchu sanctuary". The vigorous counter-attack by North Korean and Chinese troops and the anxious reaction by world opinion compelled Truman to recall MacArthur, then to start negotiations and reconcile himself to an armistice in 1953. The Korean War was for the US Command an occasion to completely destroy all industrial installations, cities and villages of North Korea and to experiment a new weapon: napalm.

In Indochina, considerable financial and material aid by the USA, covering three-fourths of the expenses of the French Expeditionary Corps, did not prevent the Resistance from scoring daily more important victories. In April 1954, as the French entrenched camp at Dien Bien Phu was about to fall, a plan was worked out by Washington for intervention by US air and naval forces. The successes of the Viet Nam People's Army, the hesitation of the British government and

reaction by world opinion frustrated the project. Washington then tried to undermine the Geneva negotiations in 1954, but in vain. The USA brought Ngo Dinh Diem to power in Saigon and in September 1954 the South-East Asia military bloc (SEATO) was set up, including the United States, Great Britain, France, Australia, Thailand, the Philippines and Pakistan.

Thus, in 1955, ten years after the end of the Second World War, a belt encircling the Soviet Union, the East European socialist countries and People's China, composed of countries bound to the USA by the pacts of NATO (14 countries), Baghdad (5 countries), SEATO (7 countries) and ANZUS (3 countries) provided the US Command with hundreds of big bases from which giant bombers, powerful fleets and powerfully equipped armies could be sent out. Mention should also be made of bilateral agreements signed with Japan, Taiwan, the Philippines and South Korea.

The Latin American countries did not escape this military "pactomania". The Rio Pact, completed by the Bogota Charter, set up an Organization of American States (OAS) as early as 1947 with a view to a "defence community" (20 countries). However, in those countries, situated far away from the socialist camp, but where US companies are established in force, the defence of the interests of those companies came to the fore. Let us recall the Guatemala episode.

The Arbenz government elected in 1950 with an overwhelming majority (267,000 votes out of 370,000) issued a decree in June 1952 for a land reform which expropriated the powerful US company United Fruit,

which owned hundreds of thousands of hectares of land in that country. Moreover, the landowners who constituted 2 per cent of the population owned 70 per cent of the land, and the peasants who made up two-thirds of the population owned only 10 per cent. On June 17, 1954, an army of Guatemalan exiles and mercenaries financed by the CIA, assisted by US planes, and starting from Honduras, invaded Guatemala and overthrew Arbenz. The military junta led by Castillo Armas which supplanted the Arbenz government called off all social reforms and established a brutal dictatorship. Many workers and peasants were massacred by landowners coming back to power. Let us point out that the Bogota Charter, counter-signed by Washington, interdicts all foreign interference in the internal affairs of the American States.

From Syngman Rhee's South Korea, through Taiwan, South Viet Nam, Thailand, to the Turkey of Menderes, the Greece of Tsaldaris, the Iraq of Nouri Said, the Iran of the Shah, and the military dictatorships in Latin America, everywhere the USA was bound up with anti-popular regimes, kept in the hands of reactionary landowning oligarchies which survived only by means of brutal police repression. The collusion between US imperialism and those anti-popular governments is not at all a chance happening; one can say that it proceeds from a real law of history. Fighting against the forces of social progress, the USA cannot but ally itself with the most reactionary and most retrograde forces of the countries which stand in need of both national and social liberation.

This is one of the main weaknesses, if not the main one, of US neo-colonialism. In 1961, the (non-Marxist) British historian Arnold Toynbee wrote:

"America is today the leader of a world-wide anti-revolutionary movement in defence of the vested interests. She now stands for what Rome stood for. Rome consistently supported the rich against the poor in all foreign communities that fell under her sway; and since the poor, so far, have always and everywhere been far more numerous than the rich, Rome's policy made for inequality, for injustice, and for the least happiness of the greatest number. America's decision to adopt Rome's role has been deliberate, if I have gauged right."

(Quoted by Horowitz, *op. cit.*)

..

This weakness of US neo-colonialism soon became apparent, only a few years after the conclusion of those many pacts and agreements which bound numerous governments of under-developed countries to Washington. In 1958, Vice-President Nixon, making a Latin American tour, was pelted by hostile crowds with rotten eggs. The victory of the Cuban revolution dealt a heavy blow at the neo-colonial system. In 1959, Nouri Said was overthrown in Iraq and hanged by the people. In 1960, Syngman Rhee and Menderes were ousted from office and in Laos the neutralist troops carried out a coup against the pro-US faction in power. In Saigon, Diem who had been so far presented as the

"greatest Asian statesman" was nearly toppled. None of the regimes and governments set up by means of US dollars and weapons had proved to be steady.

A real crisis upset American conceptions with regard to global policy and strategy. Around 1960, the Soviet Union eloquently affirmed her economic and military might; the socialist regime was firmly established in China and in the Eastern European countries. Direct military confrontation with the socialist countries became a dangerous adventure which would imperil the very survival of capitalism in the world.

At the same time, the national-liberation and social revolution was shaking more deeply than ever the Asian, African and Latin American countries. More than ever before, in those countries, the popular masses became conscious of their own interests and historical role. The propertied classes gradually lost control of the leadership of the national movement. In those conditions, national liberation seriously jeopardized the interests of foreign imperialist powers, in particular those of the USA; on the other hand, there arose the acute question of the path of development to be followed — capitalist or non-capitalist. A problem of world significance was whether the newly-independent Asian, African and Latin American countries would progress toward capitalism or socialism. At a time when the existence of a socialist camp determines the course of historical development and brings valuable support to the newly-independent countries in all respects, at a time when the people of those countries are awakened to sharp political consciousness, when Marxism-Leninism

exerts influence over ever larger strata of the population, it is highly probable that the countries of the Third World, becoming really independent, will rapidly progress toward socialism. It is necessary for the imperialist world to impede this evolution at any cost.

It fell upon John Kennedy, who became President in 1961, to define and apply a new policy. Kennedy's conceptions, clearly expounded in his book "The Strategy of Peace" led to a radical change in US world strategy. Whereas his predecessors had focused all efforts of world counter-revolution on the Soviet Union and the socialist countries, and thought strategically in terms of nuclear war, neglecting the under-developed countries and regarding them as mere military or diplomatic pawns (1), Kennedy was to steer US global strategy along two different courses, regarded as of equal importance. It consisted in the first place in continuing to maintain maximum military pressure, a permanent nuclear threat, over the socialist countries, and in forcing them into immobility, so to speak, in the world arena, without risking direct military confrontation, while seeking to undermine from within the more supposedly shaky socialist regimes. Then the USA would be able to carry out an active, dynamic policy toward the Third World, regarded as a revolutionary hotbed which should be speedily stamped out. With Kennedy, it was a real promotion of

(1) From 1946 to 1953, thanks to its faithful satellites, the USA had 97 per cent of the 800 resolutions submitted to the UNO voted in its favour.

the under-developed countries to the forefront to be a major objective of US policy. Once those countries are subjugated and kept in the capitalist orbit, the socialist countries would be completely isolated, and capitalism would be restored through simple "peaceful evolution".

"The great battleground," said Kennedy, "for the defense and expansion of freedom today is the second half of the globe: Asia, Latin America, Africa and the Middle East... It is a battle for the conquest of the minds and souls, as much as for the conquest of lives and territory. In such a struggle, we cannot fail to take sides."

(Quoted by Maxwell Taylor in
Responsibility and Response)

Schlesinger, Kennedy's counsellor and biographer, told us that he was in fact a "Secretary of State for the Third World" (*A Thousand Days*, p. 409). By pathetic appeals, Kennedy sought to mobilize US opinion for urgent action with regard to the under-developed countries, to intimidate would-be adversaries and to impress the peoples and leaders of the Third World.

"I am talking about the economic gap — the gap in living standards and income and hope for the future—the gap between... the industrialized nations of the north... and the overpopulated, underinvested nations of the south... It is this gap which presents us with our most critical challenge today. It is this gap which is altering the face of the globe... our security and our alliances, more than any current military challenge."

(*The Strategy of Peace*)

"Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and success of liberty...

"To those people in the huts and villages of half the globe struggling to break the bonds of mass misery, we pledge our best efforts to help them help themselves, for whatever period is required — not because the Communists may be doing it, not because we seek their votes, but because it is right."

(Inaugural Address, 1961)

The Kennedy Administration set up an important brain trust to study and define an appropriate policy vis-à-vis the Third World; a new team of counsellors entered the White House, composed of economists (Rostow, Staley), strategists (Taylor), reputedly liberal intellectuals, specialists of problems of under-developed countries. Kennedy particularly endeavoured to set up a complex military machine with a view to conducting all possible varieties of war, so as to fight effectively against the national-liberation movements. Elaborate means of ideological action were also worked out so as to "win the minds and souls" as Kennedy stated.

One can say that with Kennedy, US neo-colonialism reached its most elaborate form, with a clearly formulated "doctrine" and means of action in all fields; those various means of action we are going to study.

III. The weapons of neo-colonialism

It is French general Navarre, commander-in-chief of French troops in Indochina in 1953-1954, who has given a precise description of the various means and methods used by US neo-colonialism, which he had seen at work in the "Associated States", when the French position had been particularly weakened by the blows of the national-liberation movements, especially the Vietnamese resistance.

"It is now the British Empire and especially our own Empire that the United States has in view, but the methods have changed. They 'aid' the colonized peoples. They set up strategic bases in their countries. They send there innumerable military, economic, diplomatic, cultural, religious missions having large budgets. They show how life would be better and easier—at least for the leaders—in 'free association' with America than under our domination. On all occasions they express the sympathy of the American people for the aspirations of the colonized peoples and their disapproval of us. They systematically encourage all our adversaries. They call the UNO to the rescue if necessary. Little by little they push us out. They take our place, but in an almost invisible form which only the power of the dollar can afford. There is no governor, no resident, no high commissioner, but there is an ambassador of the USA, without whose permission nothing can be done. The peoples believe

they are free because they are governed by politicians of their race, without seeing that those politicians, pitilessly held under the sway of money, are but American puppets."

(*Agonie de l'Indochine*, p. 331)

It is a real cobweb, encompassing in its meshes the most diverse fields, which imperialism weaves over the colonized country, enabling it to gain almost total control of the latter in spite of an appearance of independence. Let us take a treaty like SEATO (South East Asia Treaty Organization) which, in appearance, has only military incidences. This is how an American author, an advocate of that policy, describes the paramilitary apparatus of SEATO:

"The USA began to use their foreign-aid program to give SEATO wider objectives than mutual defence. SEATO began to offer means to encourage regional cooperation for economic and cultural objectives and programs of special training. The vast project of developing the Mekong, expanding programs of international communications and transport, of important cultural exchanges, were wholly or partly supported by American funds. Conducted and financed by the US mission of cooperation with the Thai Ministry of Health and the World Health Organization, the project calls for a coordinating centre for the activities of anti-malaria units in Burma, Cambodia, Laos, Malaysia and Viet Nam. A communications program constitutes the most important one of

American regional programs, comprising a project of highway network for Thailand, Laos and Viet Nam (Cambodia has refused), for military use, for the navy, the police, civil and commercial aviation. A program of teaching English was worked out by ICA (1) in 1958, with its headquarters in Bangkok and University of Michigan teams of linguistic studies. ICA has helped put up a program of oceanographic researches in Viet Nam and Thailand, with the hope that Cambodia would join, and also proposed regional studies on insects and pests, expecting to include Burma, Cambodia, Laos, the Philippines, Thailand and Viet Nam...

"SEATO has its headquarters in Bangkok, which, though mainly busy with military questions, has also become a major centre of economic planning for South East Asia. Under the aegis of SEATO, the USA has financed a contract with the University of Hawaii to institute a program of training skilled workers throughout the region, and another contract with the University of Colorado to found an engineering school for students of all South East Asia... Half a dozen programs were being successfully conducted in 1959."

(From Montgomery, *The Politics of Foreign Aid* — retranslated from the French — *Tr.*)

(1) ICA: International Cooperation Administration.

One can see the scope and variety of means put in use, the infiltration starting from one or several points and then expanding to many fields. We can distinguish five main fields of action:

- economic and financial action;
- political action;
- intelligence, espionage, plots;
- cultural and ideological action; and
- military action.

In view of its importance, US economic action toward the Third World will be studied separately in the next chapter.

I. POLITICAL CAMOUFLAGES

The great innovation of neo-colonialism is the establishment of an indigenous administration, devoted to Washington, where old colonialism, "that of daddy", resorted to direct government. It is both a cunning manoeuvre and a sign of weakness, a concession that US imperialism is forced to make in face of the national-liberation movements. The colonized country has "its" government, often its parliament, its constitution, its different political "parties", its representative to the UNO, its ambassadors throughout the world; the US representative in that country is only an ambassador, other Americans coming to the country are only "advisers" and "experts". But tied up financially,

economically and by deliveries of arms, the governments of such countries are completely dependent on Washington, serving as puppets both to maintain the privileges of US companies and to act as pawns in the international and diplomatic game of the USA. We shall not dwell upon this process which is now well known and has been described in many writings. We shall only mention a few particular points:

- the class character of the governments tied to Washington;
- the importance of the military and police machine in those governments.

Old colonialism already practised a policy of collusion with local propertied classes, in particular with the feudalists in order to "keep order". Kings, sultans, rajahs, caids, mandarins, village notables willingly collaborated with the colonizers to maintain their privileges.

With the bourgeoisie, there was this classical differentiation:

- A comprador bourgeoisie, composed of simple executive agents of foreign imperialism, living on crumbs handed out by the latter, wholly submissive, alien to all notion of national interest, always ready to hire themselves out to the richest imperialism. It has no independent economic activities.

- A national bourgeoisie, desirous of developing national industry and commerce, whose interests are thus opposed to those of imperialism. Consequently this bourgeoisie is animated by a certain will of independence, it is capable of allying itself with the

labouring classes in the struggle for national independence. To this national bourgeoisie are often attached Western-trained liberal intellectuals. This bourgeoisie often claims leadership of the national movement.

To this classification, it is necessary to add some corrections. The crumbs left over by imperialism, with the technical means at the disposal of US capital, have now become big morsels, at least for the ruling classes of the under-developed countries. Neo-colonialism can give much larger handouts than old colonialism could, and there is not only a tiny minority to profit from American largesse. A whole State apparatus — civil, military and police — often of considerable size, lives on American funds. Like gangrene, corruption catches and spreads rapidly to all administrations contaminated by American aid, without exception. It is the State apparatus, often a clan, a "party", that monopolizes the most profitable activities: imports and exports, financial speculations, investment of funds in foreign banks; a real "bureaucratic" capitalism is established, for which the so-called American way of life has become a daily need and dependence on Washington a vital necessity. US imperialism sometimes let local companies build up some small industries, such as assembling plants, processing mills for agricultural raw materials, textiles, wood, etc. (but US companies fiercely defend their privileges, as shown by the case of that Brazilian firm which was squarely barred from setting up a powdered-coffee mill). One can say that, on account of the proliferating State apparatus and the power of the dollar, neo-colonialism can secure in the cities a much

larger support than old colonialism, at least for a certain time.

In face of American power, and also in face of the allurements which Washington can offer, the national bourgeoisie, already hesitant in its intentions, becomes more hesitant than ever. Under the double pressure of popular movements on the one hand and of US imperialism on the other, the national bourgeoisie differentiates and splits up rapidly; some of its elements join the compradors, others give up the claim to leadership of the national movement to be integrated into a large national and democratic front. The bourgeois intelligentsia, on the one hand tempted by CIA offers, on the other hand profoundly affected by US attacks against national independence and culture, sees its ranks break up.

In the countryside, it is always the landowning oligarchy and its political apparatus that neo-colonialism, like old colonialism, calls on to try to "keep order". In some cases, conscious of the fragility of indigenous feudal classes, Washington has sought to promote "land reforms", not in favour of landless peasants, but in an attempt to build up a class of middle-sized landowners with a larger social basis and less backward means of economic exploitation. This has always been in vain, for the big landowners and feudalists are everywhere the best defenders of US presence. This situation has become a classical one in Latin America, where land reform projects inspired by Washington have accumulated, but where big estates still remain the rule.

Whenever a government like that of Arbenz in Guatemala, or of Goulart in Brazil — not to mention Cuba — sought to start a real land reform, total or partial, the US government reacted with violence.

Everywhere, in an attempt to subdue the people's national revolution, Washington's policy is based on the rallying of the propertied classes, if necessary on the creation of new propertied classes, around a government of national appearance. On March 13, 1962, before the ambassadors of Latin America gathered in the White House to celebrate the first anniversary of the Alliance for Progress, Kennedy stated:

"For too long a time, my country, the most powerful nation on a poor continent has failed in her responsibilities toward the sister republics. We have now assumed this responsibility; in the same way, *the men of wealth and power (our emphasis — Ed.)* must assume their own responsibilities. They must lead the fight for those basic reforms which alone can preserve the fabric of their own societies. Those who make peaceful revolution impossible will make violent revolution inevitable."

(Retranslated from the French — Tr.)

"The men of wealth and power": Kennedy's appeal is clear, like the appeal for "peaceful revolution." The point is to prevent all social upheaval that might bring popular classes to power, lead the country into the path of non-capitalist development, and, in many countries, primarily in Latin America, harm the interests of US companies.

But to "make violent revolution impossible", the weak civil administration of the propertied classes in the under-developed countries proves to be ineffective in face of the labouring classes rising in a powerful national and democratic movement. The establishment of a large army in those countries remains one of the unchanging features of US policy; this army, financed, equipped and trained by the Americans, constitutes both the best defender of US interests and the best counter-revolutionary army. Within those armies, Washington especially endeavours to create an officer corps wholly tied to the USA by material advantages, by their military training and their ideological education. Juan Bosch, former president of the Dominican Republic, has described this US military penetration into Latin America in these words:

"The Inter-American defence organization served in Latin America as a means of penetration into the armies of this region, to which penetration North-American military missions must contribute. Social and cultural aid missions comply with this plan so as to prevent workers' and cultural organizations of the subjugated countries as well as their information media (newspapers, radio, television) from getting in the way of the work accomplished by those military missions. Secret commissions were charged with compiling files on the social and economic standing of the military chiefs of Latin American countries. On this basis, numerous grants were accorded for equipment materials and scholarships in military camps in the

United States and in the Panama canal zone. The goal pursued during this stage was to attract the total goodwill of the military leaders of those countries, to dazzle them by the sight of US military might and to persuade them to be faithful not to their respective governments or countries, but to the United States... When control over the armed forces of a juridically independent but politically and economically subjugated country could be exerted without fail, any effort by the government of that country to exercise power in independence was broken by the threat of military attack."

(Juan Bosch: *Le Pentagonisme*, p. 67)

The New York Times in its Dec. 22, 1968, issue disclosed that 21,000 Latin American officers had been trained in the United States since 1951 and 25,000 others in military camps in the Panama canal zone. In this zone, the Southern Command has a series of schools of counter-guerilla, infantry, staff, communications, paratroops. Latin American officers are trained there chiefly in counter-guerilla.

One understands that all Latin American governments permanently live under the tutelage of an officer corps wholly devoted to Washington and that military dictatorships have always been preferred by the US government. Repeated proclamations by Washington in favour of democratic regimes do not change much. Robert Kennedy was obliged to note:

"Since 1961 (the presidency of J. F. Kennedy—Ed.) elected or other constitutional governments

have been overthrown, or prevented from taking office in Honduras, Peru, Argentina, the Dominican Republic, Brazil, Guatemala, Ecuador and Bolivia. Almost every Latin American government lives under threat of such military action; (...) All too many of the young officers who have intervened in politics, in Latin America and elsewhere in the world, have been trained in the United States."

(*To Seek a Newer World*)

Together with the army, "US Aid" missions take particular care of training the police in the subjugated countries. All those armed and police forces are specially trained and equipped with a view to internal repression. When he was still a Senator, Hubert Humphrey once exclaimed:

"Do you know what the head of the Iranian Army told one of our people? He said the Army was in good shape—thanks to US aid; it was now capable of coping with the civilian population. That army is not going to fight the Russians. It's planning to fight the Iranian people."

(Quoted by Horowitz in *From Yalta to Viet Nam*)

A typical example of this military and police regime established by Washington in subjugated under-developed countries is that of South Korea where "Marshal Park Jung Hee" reigns: an army of 700,000 men, 23 political parties reduced to underground activities, 240 people's organizations dissolved, hundreds of publications banned and tens of thousands of political prisoners. According to the *Washington Post*, "Park

shudders on hearing the mere word democracy." In 1968, Park Jung Hee arrested 34 intellectuals educated in Europe who demanded the reunification of Korea; trials resulted in two death sentences, four life imprisonments and 28 sentences totalling 150 years of imprisonment. It is worth noticing that in that country, American electronics firms pay their workers about 15 dollars a month, i.e. fifteen times less than US wages for the same job. (1)

2. INTELLIGENCE, ESPIONAGE, CULTURAL AND IDEOLOGICAL ACTIVITIES

It may seem odd to gather under the same heading such different activities as those of intelligence services and those of cultural bodies. But as far as US neo-colonialism is concerned, there are organic ties linking those two types of activity. Who could have imagined for instance that it was the University of Michigan that took charge of the training of Ngo Dinh Diem's police in South Viet Nam? In the countries where American missions operate under various names — medical or technical aid, charity work, university teams, intelligence — there is even close coordination under unified direction, under the aegis of the CIA.

(1) "A girl working at transistors in Fusan earns about 35 cents a day" (Business Week, 7-5-1966). For comparison, note that the minimum wage in the USA is 1.4 dollars an hour.

The CIA is too notorious, too well known for us to describe it in detail (1). Let us note only that its budget reaches, according to the American author James Hepburn, two billion dollars, and that intelligence expenditures cost the US government the smart sum of four billion (See: *The Plot*). The CIA does not limit itself to the classical activities of espionage and intelligence; for when dealing with governments of the less developed countries whose budgets and means are by far smaller than those of the CIA (which controls tens of thousands of agents, a private air force and navy), its operations tend to make or mar governments, to set up parties, trade unions and cultural organizations favourable to US implantation, to foment plots and coups against progressive governments, to finance revolts and secessions in weakly governed countries. It is the "secular arm" of the US government entrusted with "dirty tricks" in which the official government in Washington does not want to dip its hands.

In the countries of the Third World, CIA activities are most diverse: to make anti-communist propaganda, to spread rumours discrediting progressive parties and personalities, to infiltrate into revolutionary organizations, to bribe and buy over leaders of trade unions and student and religious organizations, politicians, officers, writers, journalists, to organize and arm reactionary forces, to help them seize power or overthrow popular

(1) See in particular David Wise and Thomas Ross, *The Invisible Government*.

governments. The dollar affords one a lot of things in a poor country.

Let us recall some of those well-known operations: Guatemala, Iran, Cuba, Laos, Indonesia (attempt on the life of Sukarno then help to counter-revolutionary officers in 1965), assassination plot against Norodom Sihanouk, elimination of Chedi Jagan in British Guyana... To prepare the ground for those subversive activities, quite often the CIA first utilizes university or charity missions at the stage of infiltration, of preliminary contact with the land and the men. Robert Kennedy noted in his above-quoted book:

"US university missions all over the world are now suspect. Recent revolutions show that the sincerity and prestige of our universities have been seriously compromised by arrangements with agencies of the US government."

In their well-known work, "The Invisible Government," Wise and Ross wrote:

"The relationship between the CIA and the universities is two-way — the CIA secretly finances research programs at some universities; in turn the universities help recruit personnel. Perhaps even more important, the universities provide a pool of expert knowledge about foreign countries upon which the intelligence agency can, and does draw.

"Despite the possible loss of academic freedom, most universities and professors have shown little reluctance to work for the CIA. The agency has been able to obtain the services of almost all

of the academic institutions and individuals it has approached."

In 1965, a scandal broke out around the operation code-named "Camelot": it was learned that under the pretext of sociological studies in Chile, US university members were engaged in real spying. On this occasion, Senate debates revealed that under the cover of "sociology", a wide program of espionage was put into effect in numerous countries of the Third World. The official document made public by Senator Fulbright showed that the aim of this program was to determine the possibility of "internal war" and the efficiency of some counter-measures, by questioning wide sections of the local population. Senator Morse also denounced those operations of "sociology" as being conducted in some forty countries and showed the Senate a dozen "handbooks" on various countries (Ethiopia, Cuba, Ghana, Nigeria, the Sudan, Guinea, Panama, etc.) containing concrete instructions for an eventual US expeditionary force. In 1967, on the eve of legislative elections in India, the Indian press denounced the "Brahmaputra" plan, an espionage operation seeking to exert influence on the internal situation of the country.

In 1967, the CIA signed 103 contracts with 75 universities concerning 34 countries (according to Montgomery, op. cit.). Studies on the Third World have multiplied. The French newspaper *Le Monde* has sounded the alarm on the activities of American universities in Africa, hitherto an exclusive preserve for European colonialism.

"In America," wrote that paper, "some thirty universities and ethnological centres scientifically gather, analyse and exploit the information collected by hundreds of experts sent south of the Sahara to this end. The best studies on Black people problems will be henceforth published in English. On the spot, the 4,000 young Americans of the Peace Corps thus are in possession of a far better Africanist culture than that of our military men of the contingent sent there without preparation."

(*Le Monde hebdomadaire*, June 5-11, 1969).

It is difficult to draw a line between disinterested studies and those directly benefiting the intelligence services, US university people being accustomed to pass from one field to another without the least qualm. Professor Noam Chomsky of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology has vigorously denounced this pragmatic tendency of American intellectuals to put their technical knowledge at the service of the administration and the Pentagon, without worrying about the moral purposes which this utilization implies. (Noam Chomsky: *America and Her New Mandarins*).

In February 1967 the US review *Ramparts* dramatically disclosed connections between the CIA and student organizations. The ISU (National Students Association) of the USA, founded in 1947, was the sponsor of the ISA, an international association of students, in opposition to the ISU, the international union of students which includes members from the socialist countries.

The ISA has managed to group 55 national unions, more than half of them from countries of the Third World. NSA international activities, supported by a large budget, financed by numerous foundations, many of which are mere cover names for the CIA, include cultural exchanges and programs of aid to foreign students' unions. The CIA takes particular interest in student leaders of under-developed countries, regarded as future political leaders of those countries; it tries to buy them over, if possible, or otherwise to neutralize them or suppress them. In the above-mentioned book, James Hepburn gives the names of several dozen associations and foundations financed by the CIA, which, under cover of scientific or philanthropic activities, have in fact financed spying activities. This author estimates at a few hundred the number of associations thus engaged in those operations. The CIA has been very active among students' circles.

Many students and intellectuals of under-developed countries are thus contacted and filed; they are offered scholarships, study trips to the USA, important posts in international organizations. In the United States, they take to the American way of life and way of thinking, are impressed by the material power of the USA, are taken care of by organizations which guide them politically so as to turn them gradually into men devoted to Washington. Returning to their own countries, with the financial aid and "technical" assistance of the USA, those intellectuals set up trade unions, student organizations, political parties, trying to provide a social basis and ideological justifications to

the propertied classes in the service of neo-colonialism (1).

On the spot, in the subjugated countries, the cultural and ideological offensive is conducted on various planes. As regards the masses, the best weapons are the massive introduction of films, comic strips, televised pictures, corruption by debauchery and drugs, the imitation of the "American way of life". In underdeveloped countries which do not resist such an invasion, American films and other "cultural" products may conquer almost the whole market. This massive injection, at least into the cities, of American subculture is aimed at dissolving all national sentiment, all class consciousness, all sense of dignity; in a second stage, this mob of degraded and depraved people, caught in the fatal clutches of debauchery and corruption, supply the colonizers with all kinds of hirelings (soldiers, policemen, spies, torturers). One should not underestimate the importance of those mass media in the service of neo-colonialism.

In the field of information, US agencies assume quasi-monopoly in countries which do not have the necessary means. US embassies throughout the world

(1) Schlesinger informs us that President Kennedy, "with his understanding of the crucial role of the Latin American intellectuals, seized opportunities to meet with academic and artistic groups at the White House — Chilean rectors and deans, Brazilian students, the writers, painters and architects assembled at the annual Meetings of Robert Wool's Inter-American Committee for the Arts." (*A Thousand Days*).

take particular care of this propaganda work through the agency of information centres, reading halls, libraries, centres for learning the American (English) language. Schlesinger tells us that Murrow, appointed by Kennedy director of the US Information Agency, directed his efforts especially at the developing countries. "USIA became one of the most effective instruments of Kennedy's Third World policy." (Schlesinger: *A Thousand Days*, p. 487).

At a higher level, US university missions in Third World countries seek to turn all cultural developments into a disparagement of national culture, a negation of national traditions, a falsification of national history. Among a large section of intellectuals already impressed by US material power, this results in an indelible inferiority complex and a blind admiration for Western culture, which strip them of all fighting will. Researches on ethnology, sociology and the economy conducted under the aegis of US universities thus aim at a double target: to supply the colonizers with intelligence and to prepare indigenous minds for US tutelage. Even school textbooks are written in the USA. In a history textbook used in South Korea, we can read:

"Thanks to the mild climate and the mountainous nature of our peninsula, our people have developed a flexible character which makes them timorous and liable to lean intellectually on others."

A Korean who had lived in Japan cried out on his return to South Korea:

"I have come back in the hope of seeing my native country again. But it has disappeared. In place of Seoul, I have found a depot of American rubbish. Where have they gone, our four thousand years of national culture and our traditions? All that we have at heart has disappeared. Seoul has been infected by the virus of transoceanic culture. There are no more Korean folk dancers. Seoul dance the twist frantically. The minds of the younger generation are dazed by American gangster films and pornographic literature." (1)

Special mention should be made of the Peace Corps, a particular instrument of ideological penetration and intelligence. Founded on March 1, 1961, with a starting budget of 40 million dollars by a special decision of Kennedy who took particular care of it, the Peace Corps by October 1968, according to the *Reader's Digest*, comprised 17,750 members who operated in 58 countries and territories of the world (close to 5,000 in Latin America, 4,000 in Africa, a thousand in India). Washington attaches great importance to this organization, "symbol of the free world's policy, dedicated to harmonizing the interests of the developed nations and those of the under-developed nations." (Rostov).

The aim is to present to the American public and to the world's people the image of a rich and generous America, ready to help the poor and ignorant peoples in

(1) Quoted by Trashenko in "South of the 38th Parallel" - New Times, Dec. 11, 1968. For Viet Nam see second part.

all fields. Young Americans are enlisted for volunteer service in poor countries where they help to build schools, hospitals, nurseries, to teach the people living in the most miserable quarters in cities and villages to observe rules of hygiene, to use new seeds and irrigate their fields. They are real missionaries of new America.

And just as Christian missionaries of past centuries served as harbingers of old colonialism. Peace Corps members pave the way for US neo-colonialism. They must learn the language of the country where they operate, know the customs and conform to them, become technical and spiritual advisers to the local people. They must recruit indigenous disciples, train a local Peace Corps and thus increase their influence.

And as in the case of university missions, the line between philanthropic activities and espionage activities is not neatly drawn: the CIA has its agents in the organization, whose members besides supply official services with the necessary intelligence occasionally. In countries at war, the Peace Corps and health organizations take a direct part in "pacification" operations. (1)

With the Peace Corps, the idea cherished by Kennedy of a total mobilization of the American nation for the conquest of the Third World took shape. While the

(1) According to AFP (May 1, 1969) US medical teams (Medcap) have become I-cap (I=Intelligence) in the province of Tay Ninh in South Viet Nam. They pass through villages and try to extort intelligence from the sick.

colonialism of past centuries justified its action by the defence of Christianity and the necessity of evangelizing the pagan nations, American neo-colonialism proclaims itself the champion of the defence of the "free world" against "communism". This crusade is presented as a sacred obligation of the USA, predestined to become the leader of other nations, or, to use Kennedy's words, "the sentry on the ramparts of the world's freedom". On August 12, 1964, one week after starting the bombing of North Viet Nam, Lyndon Johnson declared:

"Much of the energy of our efforts has come from moral purposes. It is right that the strong should help the weak defend their freedom. It is right that the wealthy should help the poor emerge from their hunger. It is right that help and understanding should flow from friendship and loyalty."

One of the chief ideologists of neo-colonialism, Walt Rostow—the man who advocated and supported to the end the bombing of the DRVN—has expounded the main theses of this policy in numerous articles and books:

— Communism is the demon lying in wait for the under-developed nations which are going through a difficult period, that of the modernization of their society.

— The communists are the dung-beetles of this process of modernization. They are on the look-out for any division, any weakness or any uncertainty which besieges a society being transformed along a new pattern.

— The USA has a special responsibility for leadership, by mobilizing not only its own resources, but also those of the free world... "We are determined to help destroy this international plague."

— The USA must fulfil this task to safeguard its way of life, its own existence, for any country in the Third World which successfully carries out a revolution is a threat to the security of the USA.

"Why do we Americans expend our treasures and assume the risks of modern war in this global struggle?" exclaimed Rostow. "For America the reward of victory will be simply this: it will permit our American society to continue to develop along the old human lines which go back to our birth as a nation—and which reach deeper into history than that—back to the Mediterranean roots of Western life. We are struggling to maintain an environment on the world scene which will permit our society to survive and to flourish." (1)

Total struggle, defence of the American way of life, survival of Western civilization, such are the themes repeated again and again by official propaganda, which offers the American people the image of a teeming, hungry Third World, ready to assail rich America. As early as the end of the Second World War, American ideologists already brandished that menace; William Vogt in his famous book "Road to Survival" lays the

(1) Quotations from the book: "Views from the Seventh Floor".

blame on the medical corps which, "attached to the doubtful ethics of ignorant people who lived 2,000 years ago, continues to believe it its duty to maintain in life the greatest number of people possible."

On March 15, 1948, before the US Congress, to justify the creation of important armed forces, Senator Lyndon Johnson evoked the spectacle of the American giant tied up, gripped at the throat, an easy and defenceless prey to "any yellow dwarf armed with a knife". And on November 2, 1966, Johnson came back to that theme, speaking of the three thousand million people crowding the world, ready to invade the USA and to "take what we have."

Against this teeming sub-humanity (1), everything is permitted: napalm, B.52s, concentration of whole populations, destruction of crops by chemicals... The USA has the right and the duty to "defend freedom" everywhere in the world, with all the means at its disposal; all those who oppose the American action must be pitilessly swept away.

No wonder that in war time the US command would decide in cold blood to destroy whole villages by napalm or B.52 bombings, that "Green Berets" would atrociously torture a suspect to extort information from him. Let us not forget that we are dealing with a country which has

(1) Mecklin describes the Vietnamese peasant as having but a limited vocabulary of a few hundred words, the mentality of a six-year-old child and a stunted mind (in *Mission in Torment*, quoted by Chomsky, op. cit.).

exterminated nearly all its Indians, where lynching is an accepted practice, where people are murdered at street corners; the men who killed the two Kennedys in cold blood would certainly not hesitate to trample underfoot men and peoples regarded as sub-humans. Those traditions of violence exacerbated by the insoluble conflicts of present-day society, by a propaganda armed with the most efficient techniques of publicity and the most up-to-date means, lead the average American to condone the worse cruelties toward other peoples, and to feel no scruple in committing them himself. As Herbert Marcuse put it, "the brutality of neo-colonialism has its counterpart in metropolitan brutality." (1)

Idealistic phrase-mongering by the rulers is reconciled with the acceptance of the most inhuman acts in government practice and in the conscience of the citizen. Old colonialism had always been cruel in its relations with the subjugated peoples; US neo-colonialism, commanding much more considerable means and benefiting from the experience of fascism and many colonial wars, driven to the defensive by a developing revolutionary movement, displays far worse ferocity. From philanthropy to torture, the step is quickly taken, often by the same man. Such is one of the characteristics of US neo-colonialism.

(1) From the Preface to the French translation of *One-dimensional Man*.

3. A COMPLETE PANOPLY: POLARIS, AIR CAVALRY AND GREEN BERETS

Either as a "sentry on the ramparts of freedom" as Kennedy put it, or an "international gendarme" according to Theodore Roosevelt's formula, the USA must have the necessary armed forces for this policy. Immediately after coming to power, the Kennedy-Taylor-MacNamara team, which oriented US world policy toward the Third World, immediately set about reinforcing the armed forces considerably and adapting them to the requirements of the new US strategy, for this team was profoundly aware of the political weaknesses of neo-colonialism. Armed action remains after all the best guarantee of success, and the new US strategy is directed against national-liberation wars in particular. "We possess weapons of tremendous power but they are least effective in combating the weapons most often used by freedom's foes: subversion, infiltration, guerilla warfare, civil disorder," said Kennedy on November 16, 1961. While Charles Wilson, Eisenhower's Defense Secretary, stated: "We can only afford to fight a big war," Taylor affirmed: "We must have the means to win the small wars." (*The Uncertain Triumph*). Therefore the USA needs "a full spectrum of military strength, under sensitive and flexible control capable of covering all regions of the free world. We have been building military forces over the whole range from unattainable Polaris submarines to the training of our own men and the soldiers of our allies to deter or defeat guerilla warfare." (Rostow, *Views from the 7th Floor*.)

Washington keeps striving to perfect its nuclear armaments, posing a permanent menace to the socialist camp and the world. Concerning the Third World, it is primarily against national-liberation wars that the US armed forces are trained and equipped. US conventional forces see their strength increased rapidly and their equipment supplemented for greater fire power and the possibility of almost immediate intervention in any place in the world. Special forces are trained for effective counter-guerilla warfare. Defence Secretary MacNamara, a former director of Ford, applying the methods of industrial management, started a vast program of building up the armed forces — nuclear, conventional and special — with adequate technical means.

As early as 1963, Kennedy was in a position to present the results as follows:

"In less than three years we increased by 50% the number of Polaris submarines... increased by more than 70% the portion of our strategic bombers on 15-minute alert — and increased by 100% the total number of nuclear weapons in our strategic alert forces... We have accelerated the development and deployment of tactical nuclear weapons — and increased by 60% the tactical nuclear forces deployed in Western Europe. We have radically improved the readiness of our conventional forces — increased by 45% the number of combat-ready army divisions — increased by 100% the procurement of modern army weapons and equipment — increased by 100% our ship

construction, conversion and modernization program — increased by 100% our procurement of tactical aircraft — increased by 30% the number of tactical air squadrons — and increased the strength of the Marines.

“As last month's Operation Big Lift — which originated here in Texas — showed so clearly, this nation is prepared as never before to move substantial numbers of men in surprising little time to advanced positions anywhere in the world... Finally moving beyond the traditional roles of our military forces, we have achieved an increase of nearly 600% in our special forces — those that are prepared to work with our allies and friends against guerillas, saboteurs, insurgents and assassins who threaten freedom in a less direct but equally dangerous manner.”

(Public Papers of the President of the USA: John F. Kennedy).

Neo-colonialism attaches particular attention to the struggle against guerilla warfare, knowing that here lies its Achilles' heel. Trying to remedy the basic political weaknesses of counter-guerilla warfare, Kennedy made particular use of the Special Forces, dubbed the Green Berets. The idea was to draw lessons from former and recent colonial wars, in particular those of Indochina and of Algeria conducted by the French, that of Malaya conducted by the British, and the US own experience in the Philippines, so as to create forces that are specially trained, both militarily and

politically, and capable of dealing effectively with guerilla warfare. The conception of special forces is based on the following essential elements:

— Special military training to prepare the men for all combat conditions, in particular for non-conventional forms of fighting.

— Political training to enable soldiers to wage effective psychological warfare, rally and organize reactionary indigenous elements for counter-revolutionary action, or for political action over the population.

— A combination of tactics and methods based both on the efforts and ingenuity of the men and on the most up-to-date technical means.

— An ideology based on visceral anti-communism, contempt for all human value, so that the “Green Beret” will not hesitate to assassinate, torture, and exterminate people wholesale, including his own allies.

The Green Beret must be able to jump with a parachute, to practise judo and karate, to move and live in the jungle without leaving any traces, to stab or strangle a man without making any noise and in a perfect manner. He must know how to handle and repair the most varied weapons, use and repair the most up-to-date means of communications; helicopters, various electronic devices and ultra-modern automatic weapons are put at his disposal.

The Green Beret must also be able to set up an infirmary, to teach new farming techniques to the population, and above all to spot revolutionary elements

among the population in order to destroy them and reactionary elements in order to organize them and put them in the service of US policy.

In his preface to the book by Robin Moore, "The Green Berets", published in honour of the Special Forces, the French author Jean Hougron writes:

"He (the Green Beret) is there, with his candid racism, his more or less confessed contempt for anything non-American, his paternalism, his fake humanism, the tear in his eyes and his pretty side—let us save first the women and children, but let us kill pitilessly the fanatic, warlike little insects, let us incinerate by napalm the horrible Kraken who threatens the world and whose head is in Hanoi or more probably in Peking and for that purpose let us die gallantly, let us fight to the last grenade. For it is a sacred war and everyone knows that in this kind of war all means are good. The adversary practises guerilla warfare. Let us produce super-guerillas. We will defeat the enemy on his own ground with his own weapons, plus some others invented by our laboratories, for instance this one which clears up a jungle patch so thoroughly that not a plant-louse would survive. And that other, so perfectly and delicately electronic, which instantly shoots at anything that lives, and still that other, completely automatic, which sees so well at night as well as in the daytime and spits out twenty thousand projectiles a minute in so thick a fire

that a Viet cong caught in a burst would be reduced to a kind of marmalade..."

The men of the Special Forces must chiefly know how to train and indoctrinate indigenous forces to use them in this sacred war against the popular movements, so as to have an army that kills, pillages and burns pitilessly, without any scruple. The so-called "special warfare" strategy which the US command tries to put into effect to oppose the national-liberation wars aims at "draining off the water to catch the fish"; it chiefly strikes at the civilian population whom it tries to herd into innumerable concentration camps, by mopping up whole regions and applying on an even larger scale the formula worked out by the British in Malaya.

With a whole range of tactics, psy-war methods, automatic weapons, electronic and chemical devices, Washington believes it has found a solution to the problem of dealing with guerilla warfare. However, with the sole use of the Special Forces and the indigenous army at their service, the US strategists were not quite sure of victory. They must anticipate cases when the intervention of US forces is necessary.

The Kennedy-Taylor-MacNamara team therefore rapidly increased the combat-ready US armed forces, which must be ready to land anywhere to save critical situations. The number of army divisions passed from 11 to 17. The Marine Corps, which numbered 20,000 men in 1939, then 190,000 men in the fifties, reached 275,000 men. The armaments of those divisions were entirely renewed, giving them considerable fire