

Delegitimizing Marxist Historicism: The Mythology of the Bodo League and My Lai Massacres

Matthew Raphael Johnson
Johnstown, PA

The author here is fairly well known for his condemnations of the US military and its actions abroad. He's confronted servicemen on their killings of defenseless people in Afghanistan. He despises the way US military men are treated by the population as gods and sees the typical officer as a mercenary, not a patriot. Nevertheless, he will defend both the US, Vietnamese and the South Korean military in this paper.

Introduction to the Mythology

The American press has condemned every single anti-communist leader abroad of “massacres.” There is not a single exception to this. Even more, research into this is very scanty. The truth is that anti-communist military leaders in Latin America and East Asia were highly principle populists. They were popular because they came to power at a time of extreme violence and corruption in the civilian government.

Furthermore, it is a myth that the US supported those regimes. It supported none. The US, without exception, sought weak, civilian governments worldwide that would permit US capital to invest with the least amount of hindrance. Military governments do not normally play ball. All military governments were attacked by the US, including that of South Korea, where General Park Chung-hee was killed by the CIA in 1979.

Men, under no circumstances, will kill children. It doesn't happen. From the air maybe where they can't be seen, but not directly. War propaganda has been using the “dead babies” line for centuries. Killing innocent people makes no sense for a nation at war, since it almost ensures their defeat. Winning over hearts and minds is essential, especially in a guerrilla war. Using the “massacre of innocents” is common for the left in almost every war between left and right. Therefore, it needs to be treated with skepticism.

This paper will analyze the evidence and context of two alleged massacres: that of My Lai in 1968 Vietnam and that of the Bodo League from 1950 to 1951 in Korea. The former was front page news in the US for years and is still well known. The latter is very obscure, but it serves to delegitimize anti-communist operations in Asia. The Bodo League massacre has been revived by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) in Korea, sponsored by the USA.

The evidence for a “mindless massacre” in both cases is very weak. How easy it is to judge others while in comfort. Even worse, especially in Korea, judging others while sitting in academic positions these “others” created in the first place. The military governments of Korea transformed a war-torn, third world backwater into a powerful, first world economy. None of the investigators of the Korean massacres would be in the position to do so had the military not taken over the country.

In both cases, the massacres were of few people, given the scope of the war, and there is no reason to think they were “innocent.” Over time, the numbers grew. Initially for the Bodo League, it was 100 or so, then “hundreds of thousands” later on. These were means of protecting the communists from American forces.

These “massacres” were walks in the park compared to communist massacres of enemy

soldiers, so even bringing them up is suspicious. My Lai especially is suspicious, since it was the killing of so few people in a war fought by irregular units. A guerrilla war is not conducted by regular soldiers, so the line between combatant and non-combatant is non-existent. Rules of war do not exist for guerrilla forces since they are not technically an army.

How many investigating these incidents have ever been at war? How many have been at war where their entire country is at stake? In Korea, the latter is certainly true. In Vietnam, those charged with the My Lai massacre were exhausted, decimated by casualties and fighting an enemy that did not wear uniforms. No mass killing in wartime would exist if the soldiers involved had been in any other position. They killed out of fear and terror.

The Bodo League Myth

The Bodo League was allegedly a “re-education” camp in South Korea for sympathizers with the North. It was said “many thousands” were slaughtered for no reason other than vague belief they supported leftist politics. No one was sent there randomly. Today's it's largely forgotten but since the Korean peninsula is front page news, it has been revived.

The South lived in fear of their much stronger neighbor for decades and still does, though the South now is far stronger. Therefore, the League certainly had the right to exist for that reason alone. In the North, enemies were just killed outright. While the “Bodo League Massacre” doesn't have the staying power of My Lai, it was big news at the time.

The Regime says the very gentle Syngman Rhee¹ slaughtered 200,000 communist sympathizers. There were a few mass killings from retreating South, which, under extreme panic, are to be expected. It might be noted that the US rebuilt the USSR after the German invasion.

The “killings,” it is always forgotten, were revenge killings after the Busan Massacre – among many others – where North Koreans executed hundreds of South Korean sympathizers. Both North Korea and North Vietnam had terrorism as part of their stated agenda, so massacres should be expected as a matter of policy. One could be punished for not killing sufficient people. Also, given the communist belief that the human body is merely a bundle of nerve endings with no soul or spirit, killing cannot be seen as an especially evil act. The ideology of Marxism glorifies killing in the name of the revolution.

There have been a few admissions from South Korea, but all alleged “massacres” were, at most, revenge killings and no more than 100 or so at the most. None were “innocent civilians.” Each had been part of a Marxist militia like a Korean Viet Cong.

The Ganghwa massacre was the killing of 124 Korean “Viet Cong” by panic stricken South Korean soldiers in 1951. It was not a “massacre” and it was not “10,000” people as the Regime says. Wikipedia, where most people get their information, reports that “South Korean soldiers” “killed from 212 to 1,300 unarmed civilians.” That's a huge spread. A range this size means they don't know anything.

The Korean “Truth and Reconciliation Commission” was an American sponsored movement in Korea that forced these issues be “exposed.” It was the creation of the US Institutes of Peace and highly biased towards the left. One of the members of the commission was Professor Dong-Choon Kim whose published work leans to the liberal side. Dong-Choon Kim, the President of the commission, believes in the restoration of unity between the two Koreas and is a well known leader of the liberal factions fighting the military government in Korea. He was also president of a US funded People's Solidarity for Participatory Democracy, where the name really says it all.

Lee, Young Jo was another President early on in the Commissions work, a professor

educated at Harvard. He was President of the Institute for Market Economy and Democracy, about which this writer can find nothing online. He was also President of something called “Citizens United for a Better Society,” an organization promoting globalism. Park Tae Gyun is another Harvard man, suggesting this is an elitist movement. He is also a confirmed liberal. Soon Kwon Hong is yet another Harvard man. There are almost 300 members of the Commission's staff and they employ the services of a PR firm. To spend a small fortune for a PR firm means this is a propaganda movement.

Lee Ju-cheon, a history professor at Wonkwang University has condemned the Commission as a “leftist front” and are not “unbiased scholars.” “Many of the commissioners are people who have a historical vendetta against the South Korean government,” says Shin Ji Ho, a member of parliament for the Grand National Party.

It should be noted that South Korea was not always an ally of the US. General Park Chung-hee took over South Korea in 1961. The son of a poor farmer, the general demanded the economic elites invest in the nation to face prison. He threw the US bankers out of Seoul with a new currency the state minted. He ruled from 1961 to his assassination in 1979. In this time, Korea went from one of the world's poorest countries to one of the world's wealthiest. He was a national socialist and cited Bismark, Hitler and Napoleon as his role models. He transformed South Korea without liberal capitalism or the support of the US.

When Park found tunnels under the DMZ the North had dug, the US refused him assistance. When Northern commandos attacked the Presidential palace in 1968 and almost killed him, it was Park the US condemned. As Kim il-Sung went to the Chinese for support for an invasion, the US announced its withdrawal of its army from the DMZ. Kim was convinced the US would not risk another Asian war. Park's rapid centralization of power and state of emergency was viciously condemned by the US government, leading them to create the liberal organizations mentioned above.

Park even sent 300,000 soldiers to fight in the Vietnam war on the American side. His commander there, Gen. Chae Myung-shin, the world's expert in guerrilla warfare, was ignored by American commanders. Gen. Chae was convinced the US was supporting both sides.

Almost daily, Gen. Chae was accused by the US for “massacres” of friendly, pro-South villagers. He discovered the VC was dressing in Korean uniforms and killing “traitors.” This was very typical of the VC regardless. The US ignored this and called him a “war criminal.” Chaing Kai-shek of Taiwan offered assistance in both Vietnamese and Korean wars, only to be ignored by the US. Soon, Carter was to recognize Communist China and reject the economic dynamo of Taiwan. This is anti-communism?

The rules of engagement for the ROK forces in Vietnam were simple: “To the enemy, be courageous and fearless. To the Vietnamese people, behave with kindness and warmness. To our allies, show them we are well disciplined and reliable.”

Gen. Park, the savior of Korea and the hammer against the communists, was murdered by the head of the Korean CIA in 1979. The assassin said, before he was hanged, that he had full American support for this action. He had been speaking with the American ambassador just three hours before the killing. He also said the US created the liberal groups that had convulsed the country in riots that almost brought down the government that had given them everything.

Once Park was dead, Korea became more dependent on the US. The new leadership was eager to condemn the Park government. Here's part of the Report:

The Hampyeong Massacre - Verified on July 3, 2007

Eighty-four petitioners appealed for truth verification for 249 civilians massacred in Hampyeong County (now Gwangju City) by the South Korean army from November 20, 1950 to January 14, 1951. The Commission found that during the process of subduing red guerrillas, the South Korean army massacred the civilians without given them a trial. The Commission verified that the military killed 249 civilians and wounded nine others. It recommended that the government offer an apology, conduct memorial services, and revise the relevant records and documents.

A massacre occurs all at once. It can't go for three months. Here, South Korean soldiers were fighting irregular Communist forces sponsored by the North and the USSR. As guerrillas, there is no way to differentiate them from civilians, so nothing could possibly be "verified." All this says is essentially, in the conduct of a war against an enemy without uniforms, a war of utter national survival, a bunch of civilians were killed. The most they can say is that "the military" killed 249 people who might have been non-combatants. They offer no reason as to why such an extreme course was taken.

Here's another:

The Fabricated Espionage Charge against Lee Jun-Ho and Bae Byung-Hee - Verified on December 19, 2008, Lee Jun-Ho and his mother, Bae Byung-Hee, were accused of abetting a North Korean spy's espionage activities. Lee was sentenced to serve seven years, and his mother was sentenced to serve three years in prison. They appealed for truth verification to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission on May 17, 2006. The Commission found that they were illegally arrested and detained by the Seoul Metropolitan Police. Hereby, the Commission ascertained that the truth was verified and recommended that the government offer an official apology, restore the victims' honor, and hold a retrial.

Offer a "retrial?" Then nothing has been verified. A "retrial" for something that occurred in 1950 is impossible. In no way could this Commission "verify" anything. How easy it is to judge from a position of comfort? Have any Commission members been in a fight for their lives? Have they seen hundreds of civilians killed by the Communists? Since the South did not use guerrillas, Northerners knew what a combatant was. The South didn't have this luxury. Neither did the US or ARVN in Vietnam.

The Commission sought to "verify" events of the Korean War (among other things) in 2007, long after most of the participants were dead. Of course, "memories" at this stage are unreliable. Of about 14,000 "petitions" from anyone with a complaint against the government, a total of 14 were declared "unfounded." This is highly unlikely. Those supporting Marxism in the South had every incentive to seek revenge against the US and Seoul once this Commission was announced. This fact was not mentioned or considered.

There is very little in the Commission report about their methods for evaluating evidence. This is part of what little is said about it:

Witnesses are categorized according to what they witnessed, including for example, the arrest, the incident or sacrifice, the collection of bodies, or the burial of bodies. In addition, multiple statements by those who only heard about the

incident, including friends and relatives are adopted.

Firstly, witnesses almost 70 years after the event are not to be trusted. Second, this goes double for highly charged, emotional events spoken about constantly. Third, they admit here that hearsay is evidence. None of these witnesses were cross examined. Even more:

There are few testimonies, evidence, or official government statistics that can help substantiate the number of victims and the scope of damages. The Commission has had no choice but to quote the research results by civil organizations. In reality, it is still quite controversial however for the Commission in officially using the findings from these research results.

This is because NGOs are normally leftist and have an agenda. This is why they are “controversial.” By admitting this, their lack of scruple is clear. Even worse, they claim to know the motivations of those who were killed:

The incidents investigated by the Commission involved mass killings of villagers accused of collaborating with guerrillas. While the villagers may have collaborated, they only did so by providing accommodations and meals or transporting baggage, which was necessary to avoid being killed by guerrillas. At that time, villagers who lived in the same mountainous regions as the guerrillas were hiding in had little choice but to cooperate with the Korean Army during the day and with the North Korean Army at night.

This means the Report is not to be trusted. How can they possibly know this? How can they possibly know this was the motivation of the villagers? Could they not be just sympathizers with the North? Why would Southern forces kill sympathetic civilians? The moment the inner workings of the mind – and from 70 years ago – are stated with such confidence, then the reader can be assured the report is propaganda. The Report has no idea what happened back then.

The My-Lai Myth

The myth of the massacre at My Lai was created by the American press. The initial investigation into the incident was created by the reaction to Seymour Hersh's article on the subject, creating an artificial outcry. While the media was against the war, the American public were not. That needed to change. The “massacre” was an excellent pretext.

Hersh broke the story in 1969, but his extended article on the subject didn't come out until 1972. Hersh was frustrated with the pro-war attitudes of the American public. It is not true that the US military sought a news blackout of the massacre. It was available to all from day one. It was the newspapers that did not think it was a genuine massacre.

Public opinion was on the side of the Army. After the judicial verdict of the defendants was front page news, a polling company conducted a telephone survey of just over 1000 people on April 1 1971. Only 9% wanted to see the life sentence of the “killers” upheld. 51% wanted him freed immediately and just under 30% wanted his sentence reduced. Only 7% agreed with the conviction, and this in the face of endless media propaganda. Louis Harris and Associates polled 1600 adults across the country and found that 70% disagreed with the court martial verdict while 11% were unsure.

Hersh wrote in 1972 “Again, it is impossible to determine how many Vietnamese citizens were killed as they huddled inside their bunkers during Bravo Company’s march to the south. The G.I.s burned and destroyed almost every home they came to.” This might well have been the reason for the public's rejection of the attacks on the Army concerning this event. The over-the-top rhetoric and moralizing lectures suggested a weak case.

Hersh at the time was a struggling freelance reporter. He was also very liberal and vehemently opposed to the war. The My Lai article both galvanized the anti-war movement and earned him a Pulitzer Prize, despite the fact that none of these allegations were proved in court. After this, his career took off at an extraordinary pace. Writers such as Edward Epstein have condemned Hersh for being self seeking and for relying heavily on anonymous sources for much of his work. The truth is that there was no My Lai massacre.

The Battle of Hue began on January 31, 1968, and lasted for almost a month. Mass graves were uncovered everywhere. The bodies were from all ages and sexes and amounted to about 5,000 people. This is about 15 percent of the population of the town. The Army of South Vietnam (ARVN) released the names of 4062 victims.

As if normal for communist movements, this was a “cultural revolution” as the Party sought the destruction of all entities that might offer resistance to their movement. Anyone remotely friendly to the USA was killed as “traitors.” ARVN “revenge squads” had been formed, as the US press tells the world, but no one says why this is a problem.

According to a well known historian of the war, Stanley Karnow, “Balanced accounts have made it clear, however, that the Communist butchery at Hue did take place—perhaps on an even larger scale than reported during the war.” The truth is that very little was reported on the war except American defeat.

The North Vietnamese Political Directorate issued orders for the occupation of South Vietnam. It reads in part

Annihilate all spies, reactionaries, and foreign teachers (such as Americans and Germans) in the area. Break open prisons. Investigate cadre, soldiers and receptive civilians imprisoned by the enemy. Search for tyrants and reactionaries who are receiving treatment in hospitals. . . . Motivate the people in the areas along the River to annihilate the enemy.

It might be mentioned that a Sargent of the now infamous Charlie Company had just been killed by a landmine. These were set by villagers all the time with supplies given by the Viet Cong. Women and teenagers were often used for this purpose. The fact that one is female does not mean she is a “non-combatant.” The Regime reported that there were no Viet Cong in the area of the massacre, yet helicopter gunships were firing on their positions a day before the killings took place, right near the village.

Captured Viet Cong documents boasted that they “eliminated” thousands of people and “annihilated members of various reactionary political parties, henchmen, and wicked tyrants” in Hue and elsewhere. One unit reported that it slaughtered “thousands of people.” Another report from a communist unit stated exactly 2,867 murdered and others go even higher. A captured Viet Cong report, mentioned in both Guenter Lewy's book and Peter MacDonald's 1993 book *Giap*, says they “eliminated 1,892 administrative personnel, 38 policemen, 790 tyrants,” anyone pro-South in the area. This was a matter of policy. This was well known to US and ARVN soldiers at the time.

The My Lai massacre was a revenge killing and was not American policy. Hugh Thompson testified against "Charlie Company" for his own glory, claiming he saved many innocents from being killed. He stated that he saw an "unarmed woman being kicked and shot at point-blank range by Captain Medina." The latter said she had a hand grenade. There is no reason to believe she did not, though Medina admitted she was unarmed later. Women were often using such weapons at approaching US troops because they were unlikely to be seen as a threat. The purpose was to create an emotional outrage because she's female, forgetting the female role in killing ARVN and GIs.

General William Peers, issuing a report on the matter, stated:

Also in the first half of April, VC propaganda alleging that US forces had killed 500 people in Son My Village in the middle of March came into the hands of COL Toan and LTC Khien, the Province Chief of Quang Ngai Province and, possibly somewhat later, into US hands. Both COL Henderson and MG Koster appear to have discussed the District chief's report and the VC propaganda with COL Toan and LTC Khien, and apparently with LTC Guinn, the US Deputy Province Advisor.

Therefore, there is reason to believe that the propaganda of the VC served to whet Hersh's appetite. Clearly, the VC needed to cover up their own crimes. VC propaganda also seems to have served as the foundation of the whole investigation. Mr. Ron Ridenhour is cited by Hersh as the foundation for the investigation, since he was a soldier who contacted the US high command accusing soldiers of atrocities. Hersh says he speaks of My Lai. He doesn't even mention it. Thus, Hersh is a liar.

The VC radio broadcast stated:

A sweep operation was conducted on 15 Mar 68 recently in SON TINH. Crazy American enemy used light machine guns and all kinds of weapons to kill our innocent civilian people in TINH KHE Village (SON MY (V)). Most of them were women, kids, there were some just born babies and pregnant women. They shot everything they saw, they killed all domestic animals, they burned all people's houses. There were 26 families killed completely - no survivors.

Colonel Henderson, Captain Ernest L. Medina's commanding officer, issued a medal after the battle, proving that the officers were convinced this was a Viet Cong village and a threat. Once he realized Medina was in trouble, he quickly reversed himself and said "the conscious massacre of defenseless babies, children, mothers, and old men in a kind of diabolical slow-motion nightmare that went on for the better part of a day, with a cold-blooded break for lunch." It was not true. No soldier kills babies, it doesn't matter how tired they are. Many of these men had families of their own.

The initial reports of the incident says that "128 VC and 22" civilians" were killed during a "fierce fire fight." How anyone knows the difference between a VC and a civilian is a mystery. It was clear that helicopters were supporting the unit near the village. They were not firing at nothing. Outside of the very elderly and young children, VC policy was to draft anyone they could into service. They used women and teenagers frequently.

After Hersh, Time and Newsweek ran the story of an American "massacre" on the

strength of pictures of bodies of people in front of a home. No one knows where this picture was taken, but the emotional damage was done. ABC News said the “US committed genocide.” The military began to panic. Gen. William Peracy, doing damage control, stated:

[The 1st Battalion] members had killed at least 175–200 Vietnamese men, women, and children. The evidence indicates that only 3 or 4 were confirmed as Viet Cong although there were undoubtedly several unarmed VC (men, women, and children) among them and many more active supporters and sympathizers. One man from the company was reported as wounded from the accidental discharge of his weapon. . . . a tragedy of major proportions had occurred at Son My.

There was no evidence for this claim. There is no way to “conform” VC membership because they didn't wear uniforms. Soldiers in Charlie Company were now in serious trouble. It was in their interest to talk about how evil Medina was and how they tried to stop the killings. Colin Powell, with a long career ahead of him, said that “his unit” was “responsible for the massacre,” but said he was late and did not show up until after the killings. PFC Michael Bernhardt claimed to witness the events as a member of the unit, but then admitted that he wasn't there later on. He heard it all second hand. Saving their own skins and offered immunity, they threw Medina under the proverbial bus.

During the trial, Medina was asked why he didn't report his killing of a woman during the attack on the village. He gave these reasons:

Number one, sir, I did not expect to find any noncombatants in that area; I expected to go in and do combat with the Forty-Eighth VC Battalion. The woman – I was shocked. It was the first human being that I had shot and I assumed that I did kill her. The four reasons that I did not report the shooting of any innocent or noncombatants at the village of My Lai four and the reason that I suppressed the information from the brigade commander when I was questioned are as follows: Number one, I realized that instead of going in and doing combat with an armed enemy, the intelligence information was faulty and we found nothing but women and children in the village of My Lai four, and, seeing what had happened, I realized exactly the disgrace that was being brought upon the Army uniform that I am very proud to wear. Number two, I also realized the repercussions that it would have against the United States of America. Three, my family, and number four, lastly, myself, sir.

The odd aspect of this was the assumption that gender implies her combatant status. Young and older women, as is well known, were regular combatants in the Viet Cong. Medina assumed that, regardless of the necessity of the killing, Americans would be outraged that a woman was killed, not that she was an innocent victim. The “disgrace” concerned his admission to the killing of the woman he thought was armed. She was not. He did not admit to a massacre, just making a terrible, but understandable, mistake.

Richard Nixon, knowing what the US media was, rejected the claims and had Medina and Calley released from jail and pardoned them later. Captain Medina was soon acquitted of all charges. Nixon knew this was a media invented story. Those claiming to have been there were all

offered a deal: testify and you won't get into trouble. Because of this, their testimony should be thrown out.

Lt. William Calley had initially been convicted for killing 22 “civilians,” he was later released, partly due to immense public pressure on the system to pardon him. Robert Elliot, federal judge, condemned Calley's trial as a “farce.” Partly, it was because the media had been spreading ever changing and lurid stories of a massacre such that a fair trial was almost impossible. Further, that several defense witnesses never received their subpoena harmed the case. The South Korean forces helping the US in Vietnam mocked the whole affair, saying that revenge is “natural” in wartime and legitimate. Amazingly, dozens of “massacres” were discovered and blamed on the ROK forces immediately afterwards. Calley was freed and his conviction reversed.

Even if the charges were true, they could not be war crimes. There were no “rules of war” for guerrilla fighters at the time and only in 1977 were any drawn up. They state:

[guerrilla] combatants are obliged to distinguish themselves from civilian populations while they are engaged in an attack or in a military operation preparatory to an attack. Recognizing, however, that there are situations in armed conflicts where, owing to the nature of the hostilities, an armed combatant cannot so distinguish himself, he shall retain his status as a combatant, provided that, in such situations, he carry his arms openly:

- (a) during each military engagement; and
- (b) during such times as he is visible to the adversary while he is engaged in a military deployment preceding the launching of an attack in which he is to participate.

Thus, even if the killings occurred after 1977, they still would not be considered war crimes, since the VC did not carry weapons openly and often refused to wear any distinguishing marks. The men of My Lai broke no law and even if they did, the guerrilla fighters in Vietnam would not be protected by it regardless, since they did not do what the law (later) required. They were not protected under the rules of war. Any “massacre” was their fault. Women and “children,” that is, 16 and 17 year olds, were combatants all the time. A military dissertation stated:

The Massacre was clearly an act of unjustifiable murder precipitated by a number of factors, not the least of which was simply a feeling of frustration on the part of the soldiers engaged in that war. Constantly exposed to the ever present danger from “peaceful civilians” who were occasionally women and children booby-trapped with explosives, the soldier was never sure of his foe. Furthermore, the fact that Viet Cong were known to be operating in the area and, in fact, had opened fire from this locality on many occasions, certainly added fuel to the fire (Whitson, 1984).

The author contradicts himself. If that's all true, then its not murder. Murder is a willful act. The writer here just admitted that these killings were not willful at all. It's mere virtue signaling on Whitson's part. If “the soldier was never sure of his foe,” then it was certainly not murder. It was not even immoral. The VC is responsible, not the US.

Hersh was a fraud then and now. He admitted to lying on more than one occasion. *The New York Magazine*, a long time publisher of his works, wrote:

When Hersh was pursuing the My Lai story, he tracked down the lawyer of William Calley Jr., the man later convicted of participating in the 1968 massacre of Vietnamese civilians. Hersh intentionally inflated the number of deaths for which Calley was charged, in order to get the attorney to tell him the correct number, 109. A few years ago, Hersh told a crowd at Duke, “a word for what I did—an actual word, it has three letters—it’s called ‘lie.’”

He is under immense pressure to do just that. His career – and his millionaire status – rests on his exposing the US military on a regular basis. If he's not doing that, he's not interesting. Speaking with the same magazine above, he admits: “I’m not working with guys outside the system,” he tells me. “You do understand that, don’t you? I'm not outside the system in what I do. I’m really not.”

This is a shocking admission few will understand. What millionaire, one feted at cocktail parties the world over, is “outside the system?” In stating that he's an establishmentarian, he's saying that there is a faction of the ruling class, or even the ruling class itself, that supports and protects him. In many other countries, he would have been killed long ago. Today, after destroying the credibility of the US military, he's a celebrity. He must be protected by some powerful forces. He's no rebel – real rebels are usually dead or in prison, not living in mansions and getting endless positive media coverage.

Hersh was frustrated at the American public. They supported the war. The media tried to spin this by wording their polls this way: “In view of developments since we entered the fighting in Vietnam, do you think the U.S. made a mistake sending troops to fight in Vietnam?” Almost every single poll of the era, strangely enough, worded the question that way. This is not measuring support for the war, only how it was fought.

One might think it was a mistake while being pro-war. Extremely biased media converge and the violence of the anti-war movement would turn the hardest hawk against the war, if only because it brought out these protests and social division. A divorced man thinks his marriage was a mistake because it ended in divorce. This doesn't mean he hated his marriage. It's deliberate manipulation.

The violence of the anti-war movement suppressed any positive support for the war in polls. Why is there no anti-war movement against Iraq? The absence of an anti-war movement might be to blame for support for the war in Iraq, one about which the average American, even the average educated American, knows nothing, though the same could be said of Vietnam.

The worship of the military is a very new phenomenon. The support for The Afghan war, however, as of 2017, remains at about 20%. Opposition to the war is between 80 and 90%, depending on the poll, yet an anti-war movement is non-existent. This suggests anti-war movements of the Vietnam magnitude was artificially created.

The Tet Offensive was a victory for the US and AVRN, but the American press depicted it as a defeat, fully aware of the lie. The Rand Corporation wrote that “the press gave the impression that the VC and NVA had struck a successful blow against US and ARVN forces.” During World War II, all pictures of US casualties were banned until Iwo Jima in 1945. In Vietnam, pictures of dead GIs were everywhere.

The communist forces slaughtered civilians at the Hue Massacre, though few media

outlets covered it at the time. Westmorland stated that the NVA was incapable of launching large-scale operations at the National Press Club in December of 1967. He was aware that the CIA said otherwise. It is true that the North Vietnamese economy had collapsed, but their supplies from China and Moscow did not slow.

One of the reasons that the NVA launched its attack was that General Thieu had a free press. Owned by westerners, they condemned Thieu and gave the impression – quite deliberately – that the Thieu government ruled over a chaotic country and an army that had no combat effectiveness. Neither of those propositions were true. If anything, they were true of the North (Stanton, 1985).

No one bothered to mention that the defeat of the NVA was accomplished almost entirely by the ARVN. Westmorland stated that the attack on the South by 85,000 troops was a “mere diversion” and the Marine supply base at Khe Sahn was the real objective. No serious military man would take this position and therefore, it was a deliberately planned means to sow confusion (Blood, 2005). Later, it was alleged that Westmorland deliberately under-estimated NVA numbers to boost US troop morale. Major General Joseph McChristian and Colonel Gains Hawkins both stated that this was true.

The New York Times deliberately spread the news that the attack on the US Embassy in Saigon was proof that the NVA was about to take the city. They spun the narrative to suggest that, because they could get to the embassy, they must have taken at least part of the city and certainly the surrounding area. When Thieu declared martial law, the press reported this as the “last gasp” of a failed South Vietnamese state. On February 5 1968, the front page of the Washington Post said that the war was lost and that Saigon had fallen. All American periodicals were strewn with pictures of dead American soldiers.

On February 1, General Nguyen Ngoc Loan, head of the National Police in South Vietnam, publicly executed a VC officer who was, as always, in civilian clothing. The photo was taken by ET Abrams and sent to the American press with the caption: “Vietnamese soldier kills innocent civilian.” It won the Pulitzer that year (Blood, 2005).

The truth is that the executed officer, Nguyen Van Lem, led a small unit to attack the armor section of the camp at Go Vap, near Saigon. Succeeding, he arrested Lieutenant Colonel Nguyen Tuan with his family, forcing them to fight for the North. When they refused, they were executed. This means that six children were executed by this man and his wife. His 80 year old mother was killed by him personally by slicing her throat. Lem admitted to this crime and said it was his duty. Thus, he was shot. Therefore, it was a deliberate lie to sabotage the US war effort. After the war, Loan received a public apology from Adams, though it was far too late.

The Tet Offensive sputtered quickly. The NVA and allies suffered heavy losses, around 40,000 dead, while the US only suffered about 1200 dead. Official NVA numbers put their dead at 47, 267. The US media responded by the invention of the “My Lai Massacre.” The Hue massacre was non-existent to the American press.

The “uprising” against the South never occurred and, in fact, the ARVN fought very well. There was no morale in Hanoi, but the US media bolstered it by depicting the offensive as a victory (Clifford, 1991). General Tran Do, North Vietnamese commander at Hue and a war criminal, stated:

In all honesty, we didn't achieve our main objective, which was to spur uprisings throughout the South. Still, we inflicted heavy casualties on the Americans and their puppets, and this was a big gain for us. As for making an impact in the

United States, it had not been our intention—but it turned out to be a fortunate result (Quoted from Lung, 1978)

Of course, he means that the American press served as their propaganda outlet in the west. Worse, the western-owned South Vietnamese press spread the word that the ARVN was on the brink of collapse. This shocked the South Vietnamese population and they began to withdraw their support for Saigon. Lyndon Johnson failed to convince Americans of the loss at Tet because the press very authoritatively supported NVA war aims. Walter Cronkite made this very clear on February 27 when he personally came out against the war on national television based on press reports of a Tet defeat for the US. This proved that the media control politics, not reality or politicians. By the end of March, those calling themselves hawks in the public fell from roughly 75 percent to just over 50 (Hammond, 1988).

It is very difficult to sell hundreds of thousands of troops to an area that few in the US could point to on a map. When you add media coverage and the deliberate suppression of VC atrocities, it's a miracle the support for the war was as high as it was. Clearly, polls radically supporting Medina and Calley speak a very different story. However, approval numbers have nothing to do with the war itself, and everything to do with what it created at home. The defeat of McGovern in the 1972 Presidential election by the largest margin in US history proved support for the right. Humiliated, the left invented the absurd “Watergate” story in revenge.

It is this author's opinion that the My Lai massacre did not occur. This is in part because a) Medina himself was found innocent by a court under immense pressure to convict him; b) Calley's conviction was condemned by a federal judge and he was set free; c) there is no good reason to slaughter old men and babies under any circumstances, it is violently against human nature regardless of context; d) Seymour Hersh has been caught in many lies and was vehemently against the war as well as searching for “the story” to jump start his flagging career; e) most of the witnesses had signed deals promising them immunity; f) the VC were using this propaganda technique for some time and had reason to cover up their own crimes; g) the initial reports of the incident were the opposite of what we've come to believe. It was seen as a great combat victory. No one involved with these killings went to jail for long. The pressure to convict these men was immense and violent.

The Korean “massacre” was really a group of alleged killings of those thought to be civilians in the heat of a losing battle. Almost all were Marxist sympathizers since there is no good reason to turn allies into enemies. They were irregular forces, so the argument for Vietnam applies here too. The Commission is utterly biased and useless. It proves nothing. It is impossible for comfortable academics and bureaucrats to judge the actions of terrified men looking defeat and imprisonment in the face.

A massacre of innocents requires a huge amount of evidence to establish, more than other sorts of crime. If you accuse John D. Rockefeller of robbing a bank because he needed the money, one might be justified in laughing. Killing innocent people in your own country means that the population will soon turn on their tormentors and hence, the criminal soldiers will lose the war. Since one can't assume an army is willing to do this, these “massacre” stories need to be seen with a great degree of skepticism.

These kinds of killings are so opposed to human nature since children are the epitome of innocence. No one will voluntarily kill an innocent. This is solely because they are innocent. It would be a random killing. They might kill someone they don't know is innocent, convinced they

were a combatant. This is another matter. Further, they can be killed from the air where pilots can't see the results of their actions. When gung-ho veterans can barely speak of the killing of real, armed and trained enemies, it is hard to see how soldiers could kill innocent people of their own nationality and hence, risk losing the war.

In Korea, they would be killing other Koreans. In Vietnam, getting the villagers to support the US was a paramount directive. Medina was told that these "villagers" were VC, regardless of their outward appearance. He was not even accused of killing old men and children, only the media said that. It was never a charge. "Children" could be 17 years old in American thinking.

The only reason someone might kill an innocent person would be that they're mistaken. Mistakes are made when soldiers are in fear for their lives. In Korea, they feared for their country. If they lost, their whole family would be liquidated. The Chinese proved that over and over again. This was policy in both China and North Vietnam. There would be no reason to waste a bullet on someone who doesn't threaten you. No one was randomly picked off the street and thrown into a camp as the left suggests.

The anger US soldiers felt towards many Vietnamese "civilians" is justified because they are as much a part of the VC movement as those in the black pajamas. There were no "innocent civilians" in that war because the VC didn't wear uniforms. There were no standard issue pajamas. They didn't use standard issue weapons. Therefore, the rules of war don't protect them. There's no such thing as a "civilian" in this case.

When an army refuses to identify itself as such, it is their fault alone for anything that happens. The VC did not identify themselves as VC like the NVA did. At the bare minimum, Medina's men did nothing wrong because nothing protects an anonymous, secret army. Because there was no motive to kill innocents, Medina was innocent. Frustrations at recent deaths could easily be taken out on real VC later on. No one knew whether those at My were actual civilians. It is merely assumed. Age and gender prove nothing, except the very elderly and young children. And the same goes for Korea. You can't massacre civilians when your enemy, or at least a faction of your enemy, refuses to wear a uniform. It's a common propaganda ploy and must be seen with the highest of incredulity.

This essay has sought to cast doubt on two "massacres." The first is almost totally unknown in the west while the other is well known to all students of the Vietnam era. The underlying purpose of the essay is to cast doubt on something else – that the west was in any way "anti-communist" during the "Cold War." This is a myth that is dying very hard.

The US, a global empire, will clash with any large state regardless of its ideology. An empire like that of the USSR will clash with everyone, including its fellow Marxists. The US has no problem with Marxism, since it accepts many of its doctrines. Rather, it was that the USSR was growing too large. Marxism dominates the American university, its assumptions underlie the capitalist ethic: materialism, atheism, progress, technocracy, linear history and so much else. The far left is institutionalized in nearly every institution in American society. Rock bands like Rage Against the Machine are corporate funded Marxist rallies. This is not an exaggeration, this is how they see themselves. Kids buy shirts with Che Guevara on them. This is "cool."

This is the very nature of the "PC" culture so many suffer under today. It's true that the American version has substituted non whites for "proletarians," but the Soviets had not the slightest interest in the welfare of its laboring population.

Every American is raised with the myth that the US and the USSR clashed during the

“Cold War” from 1946 to 1990. We're told that the US was threatened by Marxism-Leninism and sought to destroy it. This thesis has not the slightest relation to the truth. The significance here is that the American ruling class has nothing but contempt for anti-communist military governments throughout the world. Most American elites, especially years ago, had not the foggiest idea what “Bolshevism” was. They did know what it meant for a resource rich empire to grow too large.

Another myth is that the “US supported” anti-communist military and authoritarian governments in this Cold War era. This is also false. The US condemned each and every one while trading briskly with the USSR and China. From Marcos to Somoza, the US sought to topple any strong state and substitute a weak, “Wiemar” sort of system. Usually, the US maintains a wait and see attitude with military governments, and when they don't look like they will turn over power, they are rejected.

The connection with these two massacres is clear. The American ruling class was actively backing the USSR in the Vietnam war. The “ruling class” and the state are not the same. In the west, the ruling class is largely in the private sector, using the state only as its bodyguard. In the 1970s, the Frankfurt School of Social Science was lavishly financed by the Rockefeller Foundation. Each and every one of Herbert Marcuse's books acknowledges this.

As this author has written elsewhere, the US actively tilted towards North Korea against the government of Gen. Park Chung-hee, one of the most successful regimes in the history of world politics. It was only a generation ago where even moderate leftists saw the USSR as the wave of the future and actively defended her basic politics.

The consequences of this is, despite the fact that the men involved in the so called “My Lai” Massacre were acquitted, the press continues to wax maudlin about how wicked American intervention is abroad (against communists). On the other hand, only specialists in the field are aware of the VC policy of massacring civilians. Even if the US engaged in such a massacre, it was not a matter of policy. The VC bragged about it.

Regardless, there is no evidence for either the League Massacre in Korea or at My Lai. This has no relation to how the ruling class sees these governments and these wars. Without exception, communists are depicted as selfless idealists while military rulers are depicted as cynical tools of the landlord class. The truth is precisely the reverse.

Bibliography:

Whitson, JL (1984) In a dissertation The Laws of Land Warfare: The Privileged Guerrilla And The Deprived Soldier. CSC

Oliver, Kendrick (2006) The My Lai Massacre in American History and Memory. Manchester University Press

Department of the Army. Report of the Department of the Army Review of the Preliminary Investigations into the My Lai Incident, Volumes I-III (1970).

Jones, Howard (2017). My Lai: Vietnam, 1968, and the Descent into Darkness. New York: Oxford University Press.

“List of Civilians Massacred by the Communists During “Tet Mau Than” in Thua Thien Province ad Hue City” (PDF). RVN. Retrieved 25 April 2014.

Elliot, Duong Van My (2010). The End of the War. RAND in Southeast Asia: A History of the Vietnam War Era. RAND Corporation

Oberdorfer, Don (December 6, 1969). “Hue Red Report Found.” Milwaukee Sentinel. Retrieved 29 April 2014.

Vennema, Alje (1976). The Viet Cong Massacre at Hue. Vantage Press

Kim Dong-Choon (2012). Korea's Truth and Reconciliation Commission: An Overview and Assessment. Buffalo Human Rights Law Review 19

Kim Dong-Choon (2010). The Long Road Toward Truth and Reconciliation. Critical Asian Studies 25

The Truth and Reconciliation Commission, Republic of Korea. Report after Three Years, 2009 https://www.usip.org/sites/default/files/ROL/South_Korea_2005_reportEnglish.pdf

Peers, William Gen. The Peers' Report. http://famous-trials.com/legacyftrials/mylai/MYL_Peers.htm

My Lai Court Martial Page
<http://famous-trials.com/mylaicourts>

Sullentrop, Chris (2005) Sy Hersh Says It’s Okay to Lie (Just Not in Print). New York

Lorell, Mark (1985) Casualties, Public Opinion and the Presidency during the Vietnam War. Rand.

Hammond, WH (1988). *The United States Army in Vietnam, Public Affairs: The Military and the Media, 1962–1968*. United States Army Center of Military History

Hoang Ngoc Lung (1978). *The General Offensives of 1968–69*. General Research Corporation

Clifford, Clark; Holbrooke, Richard (1991). *Counsel to the President: A Memoir*. Random House

Blood, Jake (2005). *The Tet Effect: Intelligence and the Public Perception of War* (Cass Military Studies). Routledge

Stanton, SL (1985). *The Rise and Fall of an American Army: U.S. Ground Forces in Vietnam, 1965–1973*. Dell

- i His name is rendered more properly as Rhee Syng-man. My family owned a hotel in Ocean Grove, New Jersey and still to this day speaks of him. While at Princeton, Rhee stayed with them and was regarded as an extremely gentle, polite intellectual. The town has several plaques commemorating his stay in the town. He was doing his doctoral degree in international affairs at Princeton and completed what I think is a very unremarkable dissertation on anti-colonialism. When the “massacre” stories poured in from the American press, it was treated as a sick joke by those who knew him. Rhee was an Episcopalian and married a woman from Kansas. This doesn't mean he wasn't a Korean patriot. He was too gentle for Korean politics. Corruption was rampant from those he trusted and could not bring himself to punish. He was too good for the era.