

theoretician like Marshal Lin should *not* say: "Since World War II U.S. imperialism . . . has been trying to build a great American empire by dominating and enslaving the whole world. It is the most rabid aggressor in human history and the most ferocious common enemy of the people of the world."

Let me pause to emphasize that these are Lin's words, not mine. For the moment I am concerned that my fellow Americans should understand him and the regime and the people for whom he speaks and thereby see themselves as others see them.

What is clear to those who are willing and able to look dispassionately and honestly at the world scene is that we cannot look upon others—e.g., the Chinese, or the Russians—as violent and addicted to violence but ourselves as essentially nonviolent. We cannot look upon others as the originators of war in the modern world and ourselves as seeking to put an end to war, people who would be peaceful if only other nations were not constantly stirring up trouble in which we have to intervene in order to quiet things down. It would mean quite an advance toward sanity and peace if we could get that into our heads—and into our bones, as it were.

If we accept that and take another look at Marshal Lin's pronouncement, I think we have to say that it presents a logical, integrated case which is very appealing to many thoughtful people around the world as well as to multitudes of those "who suffer most." There are peoples reaching out for national independence, for human dignity, for economic well-being, for a brotherly society, for "a classless and warless" world; peoples who are most of all, perhaps, in deep psychological revolt against the humiliation to which they as colored peoples have been subjected for centuries. In their countries there is only a semblance of democracy, if even that. The old colonial powers suppressed any effort at funda-

mental change as long as they could. The policy of the United States today is essentially one of suppression, allegedly because Communists are involved in the social revolts, as witness the actions in Vietnam, the Congo, the Dominican Republic. There has to be change and, historically, such changes do not come about without violence, as we know from the American Revolution of which we boast. In an age in which the leading nations have shed so much blood and fought so bitterly to suppress revolt, "how can it be argued that the imperialists and their lackeys may kill people everywhere, while people must not strike back in self-defense or help one another? What kind of logic is this?"

This is said in relation, among other things, to the war the United States is waging today in Vietnam. I think it must be said that, by contrast, the case the Johnson Administration presents today is much less logical and coherent and holds out no such clear prospect for the "resolution" of the basic problems in Vietnam or elsewhere. In substance, its objective in the frightful and daily escalated war in Vietnam is simply, to cite the formulation used by James Reston in *The New York Times*, to make possible "a negotiated settlement in which American power can be withdrawn from the peninsula." This and other aspects of the current administration program constitute a vast retreat from the earlier position; namely, that the United States was responding to the call of a little people, under a democratic government, being invaded by a foreign power, North Vietnam, instigated to do so by Red China for no reason except to wipe out democracy in South Vietnam and to extend cruel Communist rule all over Asia. In such a situation there could be no negotiation except on the basis of complete victory for democratic South Vietnam, selflessly backed by the United States. In taking its present position, the