

Japan and NATO as well. The U.S. bankers and industrialists hope to first of all wrest as many economic, political, and diplomatic advantages from the PRC leadership as possible before the U.S. commits itself to sending sophisticated technology to China, particularly of a military type. In the meantime, Washington has given its blessing to West European attempts to sell military hardware to the Peoples Republic of China (PRC). These are already in progress.

Thus the British Harrier helicopter deal as well as some deals made by the French and German imperialists have been approved by the Carter administration. There are other arms sales in the works meant to bolster the PRC war potential against the USSR. There can be no mistaking the fact that the neutralist stance of the U.S. is so preponderantly weighted against the USSR that it could scarcely be hidden from any but the most naive.

At the same time that the U.S. State Department issued its hypocritical neutrality statement, it vigorously asserted its "obligation" to help its ally in Southeast Asia, the reactionary Thai regime, with arms and economic assistance. It is an open secret that the PRC leaders are using Thai territory to funnel military assistance to the Pol Pot forces in the struggle against the Kampuchean National United Front for National Salvation. Arming the reactionary Thai government while its territory is being used as a funnel against the Peoples Republic of Kampuchea as well as against Viet Nam is in effect arming China against Viet Nam and Kampuchea.

Should these efforts by the U.S. fail to overwhelm the Kampuchean forces and should the efforts by NATO, Japan, and the U.S. in supplying the PRC with technology and materiel nevertheless also fail to overwhelm the Vietnamese, it is a foregone conclusion that U.S. efforts at quickening the pace in the delivery of military aid and material support to China will take on a new, more ominous dimension. This, however, will in no way exclude the continual play-acting of the neutrality stance.

As in past pre-war periods, side by side with a so-called embargo on the export of arms to the belligerents there is also the supplying of war materiel and military and economic assistance. Such export bans have been entertained by the U.S. Congress and passed in earlier pre-war days, but have always proved to be a dead letter in practice. As night follows day the developing war psychosis grips the

military establishment and as the capitalist media whip up a hysterical campaign for the U.S. to enter the arena, the administration finally and "reluctantly" enters the war to "defend its own vital [i.e., imperialist] interests."

REVOLUTIONARY UPRISINGS CAN UPSET U.S. WAR PLANS

At the present moment the imperialist establishment has its hands full with the Iranian Revolution and the possibility of a blow-up in the Middle East where a varied assortment of U.S. puppets are sitting on a virtual powder keg.

The mass of the people in the U.S. are still war-weary as a result of the Viet Nam debacle. A much larger section of the population than ever is conscious of the vulnerability in U.S. imperialism maintaining a far-flung world empire at a time when revolutionary conflagrations, ignited by tremendous mass protest and indignation against oppression, are ever more prevalent.

Nevertheless, moves in Congress such as that made by Senator Stennis urging the renewal of the draft, long championed by the Pentagon, are a sign of what the militarists are pushing for. The swollen military budget, which keeps ever rising, is without a doubt the single most significant indicator as to where the military establishment and the military-industrial complex are hopelessly heading.

But the mass of the people are not at all acclimated to any type of war adventure which involves actual military intervention, especially on a large scale. The most likely course to be taken by the U.S. government is for it first to slowly position U.S. forces in areas where they seem to serve a purely defensive purpose but where their presence will inevitably take on a Tonkin Gulf coloration.

It must be remembered that there never was a Congressional vote in favor of the Viet Nam or Korean wars. Executive actions by the Truman and Johnson administrations proved to be definitive war measures without Congressional sanction. They were faits accomplis and Congress rubber-stamped the actions. The intervention in the Dominican Republic wasn't even put to a Congressional vote of any sort.

Nor does the so-called War Powers Act of 1974, which is supposed to limit Presidential and executive action in the military field, really