

## **Historical Ignorance**

Transcript of A Commentary by Ambrose I. Lane Sr.

August 24, 2007 – We Ourselves – WPFW 89.3 Washington

And top of the morning, this is *We Ourselves*. I'm Ambrose I. Lane, Sr. We have a brief commentary and then we're going to open the phones. The number is 1-800-588-0893.

Once again this White House reveals it's passionate believe in the historical ignorance of the masses of American people and in the almost criminal connivance of America's corporate press with the White House. So confident are they in these two passionate beliefs that they proudly sent George W. Bush, as chief propagandist, to the Veterans of Foreign Wars convention to lie and distort historical facts and truths, figuring we wouldn't figure it out.

Bush's propaganda has been cleverly put together and is most notable for what it does not say, rather than for what it says. For example Bush told the veterans that, and I quote:

“One of unmistakable legacy of Vietnam was that the price of America's withdrawal was paid by millions of innocent citizens who's agonies would add to our vocabulary new terms like boat people, like re-education camps, and like killing fields.”

What the President did not say was who was responsible for what happened in the Vietnam withdrawal and what lead up to those mass killings in Cambodia and who was responsible for that.

The withdrawal from Vietnam began in 1968 after President Lyndon Baines Johnson woke up to the atrocities he was responsible for having our troops commit in that country in the name of anti-communism. And when his generals asked, like Bush's generals asked, for several hundred thousand more troops so they and he could win that war after the North's Tet offensive, Johnson turned them downed and he told his fellow Democrats at home that he would not seek nor accept the candidacy of his party for re-election He was forced to face the fact he did not want to face, and namely that was America would lose the Vietnam War.

The result was his party lost that election and Richard Milhous Nixon and his foreign policy svengali, Henry Kissinger came into power because Nixon lied to the American people that he had a secret plan to end the war. Of course he had no such plan. He and Kissinger entered into a plot to do what they wanted and what President Johnson had wanted for too many years and too many lives, and that was to win the war. They ordered the military to increase our bombing of that small country many fold over what had gone on before. And the defoliation and napalming of the landscape and people also escalated.

And – huh – Cambodia? I fully agree with the conclusion of David Hendrickson, a specialist on history on American Foreign Policy, who wrote these words:

“Khmer Rouge leaders of Cambodia would never have come to power in the absence of the war in Vietnam. This dark force arose out of the circumstances of the war, and was in a deep sense created by the war. The same has happened in the Middle East today. The foreign occupation of Iraq has created far more terrorists than it has deterred.”

So said David Hendrickson. But who was responsible?

I will never forget the Nixon speech<sup>1</sup> from his desk in the White House announcing that as he spoke we were invading Cambodia to destroy the (Vietcong) headquarters that was supposed to be there. Of course it was not there. But our troops acting under the Kissinger-Nixon plan to win the war helped to destroy that small country, killing its innocent people and destroying one of its major export crops; rice.

If you want the full truth read Sam Yette’s book *The Choice*<sup>2</sup>, and discover how America became one of the worlds major exporters of rice after we destroyed by bombs and defoliates and napalm so much of the crops and farmers of these small nations beginning with Cambodia. Because of our use of defoliates the soil of many of these surround countries could not grow crops that humans could safely eat for many years.

It became clear very quickly that Nixon had lied throughout his campaign; there was secret plan to end the war. And the nation’s youth who were subject to draft made it clear that they knew this truth and would resist becoming more cannon fodder for a dishonest, lying war machine maneuvered from the White House. In the tens of thousands they protested, they marched on Congress and the White House, and they left the country in droves while others just disappeared somewhere in the country when their draft boards called. The pressure was so great that finally the Congress and Nixon jointly ended the draft.

Nixon finally choice what he called Vietnamization of South Vietnam, what Bush is now saying he is doing in Iraq. I guess we can call it Iraqization, turning internal power over to Iraqi police and military forces. Nixon used our nation’s superior air power to keep the North Vietnamese at bay while our troops were withdrawn. Many thousands of the 58,000 American troops died in Vietnam were killed during that withdrawal period while we killed and injured tens of thousands of Vietnamese with our bombs, defoliates, and our napalm.

But what Bush has created in Iraq is a much worse disaster, both at home and abroad. I ask you, who has the power in Iraq to make things happen? But who do our leaders blame for the continuing mess in that country? With our more than 160,000 troops in Iraq, with our control of most of the money in Iraq, with more than a 100,000 corporations we are supplying with contracts in Iraq, with Iraq having a Parliament that must hide from its own people in the Green-Zone of safety, with America building a one-half billion dollar embassy on 104 acres with our own built-in protection for the projected 4,000 Americans who will work there we must answer my first question by admitting that America alone has the power in Iraq.

But now folks on both sides of our American political world are telling us, and the world that our leaders blame the Iraqis for the mess in their country, even for the killing of more than 700,000 of their people, and that's a minimum number. Even Democratic Senators Carl Levin of Michigan and Hillary Clinton of New York have joined the Bush folk in calling for the ouster of Iraqi Prime Minister Nuri al-Maliki. In fact I thought that Levin was cute in listing several pieces of legislation that Iraqi's Parliament has failed to pass; the number one of course being the US and European corporate oil theft law that Bush's people wrote and expected to be passed by last December. Maliki is doing what a democratic leader is supposed to do, if there democracy in that country, that is listening to the Iraqi people who are unalterable opposed to giving their oil away to those corporate giants under threat. I was pleasantly surprised but amazed this morning when I picked up the New York Times whose lead editorial is titled "The Problem Isn't Mr. Maliki" (New York Times, August 24, 2007)<sup>3</sup>. I'm gonna share part of it with you and then we're gonna open the phones and we'll take your calls at 588-0893 or 202-588-0893.

---

<sup>1</sup> Cambodian Incursion Address (<http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/richardnixononcambodia.html>)

<sup>2</sup> Samuel F. Yette, *The Choice: The Issue of Black Survival in America* (Cottage Books January 1, 1996).

<sup>3</sup> "The Problem Isn't Mr. Maliki" *New York Times*, 24, August 2007, Editorial section.