

The Silent War

A war has been raging in Africa for years without as much as being placed on the agenda of the Security Council. It is a bitter war, in which people are slaughtered en masse not on the basis of political alliances, but on the basis of racial identity alone. Between 1963-1966, a mere three years out of the war's full decade, more than half a million Negroes have been killed, according to United Nations estimates.

Of all the members of the United Nations one might perhaps have expected the numerous Arab delegations to be the most vehement ones in reminding the world of the tragedy in progress and in demanding that it be brought to an end. Their special concern should have been aroused by it being a war in Arab territory. It should also have been prompted by consistency, for certainly the Arab governments have an impressive record of vocally championing self-determination especially for their geographic realm.

The reason that the war in Sudan is accepted from that concern is that there the massacres are being committed by Arabs themselves. Indeed, the troops engaged in exterminating the black population of the Sudan's south are those of a "progressive" Arab government, one that is befriended by UAR President Nasser himself. The vast bulk of the Sudanese army is engaged in indiscriminately wiping out those black populations of villages which had managed neither to flee nor to defend themselves.

The only force on which the Sudanese Negroes can count to protect them is their own defense organization, *Anya nya*. Not even Sudan's black neighbor states, Uganda, Kenya, the Congo, the Central African Republic, and Chad, seem gravely concerned about the massacres. Either they are too preoccupied with their own political and other weaknesses to concern themselves with what's going on in the Nubian Desert, or, as in the case of Uganda, they are so anxious not to antagonize the Arab delegations to the United Nations that they cruelly close their borders to black refugees fleeing their Arab pursuers. It is also due to U.N. alliance expediencies that other non-Arab Asian and African governments keep virtually silent about the genocide in progress.

It is particularly disheartening that in the post-Hitler era political considerations should suffice for joining in what is in effect a worldwide conspiracy of silence in the face of a racial war of extermination. Perhaps only the Gypsies were killed off by the Nazis with such utter quiet and indifference on the part of the rest of humanity.

The non-Islamic Negroes of the Sudan have no government to speak for them.



Khartoum, Sudan: Negro Sudanese seek refuge from pursuing Arab mobs.

—UPI Photo

But what of the consciences of other people? Is there no government anywhere that would be willing to take even if only a diplomatic initiative in behalf of a massacred population, in the absence of a client relationship? Among all the justly angry voices against apartheid and colonialism, isn't there one to speak out of plain human concern even if without a particular political incentive? Among all the socialist governments isn't there at least one to react to genocide without the traditional cynicism of diplomacy, but with an uncorrupted socialist conscience?

If international alliance politics can cause such utter indifference to mass crimes, then our entire generation is an accessory. One had hoped that to be impossible after the ugly lesson of the so-recent Nazi period.

MINORITY of ONE
JAN. 1968

"Good" Massacres in Indonesia

The CIA does not seem satisfied with its glorious successes in Indonesia, where it not only replaced an undesirable government but also managed to inspire over a million murders of people inimical to the pro-American coup. When the Chinese parade some disgraced official through their streets, the humanitarian sensitivities of the American press are aroused, but when political suspects in Indonesia are killed off by the million, this is taken as proof of the new rulers' devotion to "freedom and democracy." Alas, with America's provocations of China ever bolder and more direct, anti-Chinese hysterias have become desirable throughout Asia. Hence that the Indonesians are fed, through not-so-mysterious channels, any and all myths that

prolong the impunity with which political unreliares and all persons of Chinese descent can be massacred.

A Reuters dispatch of November 17th from Pontianak, West Borneo, tells a blood-curdling story:

Whipped to fury by kidnappings and murders by Chinese guerrillas, primitive Dyak tribesmen have struck back with beheadings, cannibalism and plunder that has brought ruin to the Chinese population over a wide area. The killings are continuing.

Hundreds of Chinese homes have been burned or wrecked and hundreds more have been boarded up and abandoned. . . .

Dyak tribesmen, who were headhunters only a generation ago, are scouring the jungle with long knives and home-made muzzle-loaders . . . They have looted and plundered Chinese markets . . . those Chinese who fled have in some cases been massacred by roving bands of Dyaks from other villages.

Such reports inspire neither U.S. officials nor a preponderance of American editors to question the humanity of the regime that now prevails in Indonesia. On the contrary, they contribute to its getting a good press in America.

The British correspondent's retrospective reflection is particularly telling in its implications:

In most parts of West Borneo, the Dyaks had lived peacefully for years among the Chinese who supplied them with food between harvests in exchange for rice and rubber. Now the Dyaks are helping themselves from the Chinese rice fields. (*Ibid.*)

How the change in the relations between the two ethnic groups has come about most likely has an answer in the fact that least of all are the CIA's activities exhausted in channelling hidden subsidies to "innocent" American and non-American organizations. With all the disclosures about CIA conduits in the last year or so, one may tend to forget that that agency's number one business is not finances but murder and subversion.

"The killings are continuing," says the British reporter.

time to grow strong in defeat and must choose its own moment for the next military round. . . ." (*The New York Times*, November 24, 1967.)

Nor is continued Arab belligerence merely verbal. Nasser could, in the same speech, proudly point to the sinking of the Israeli destroyer *Elath* as an example of "what we can do." And as for Hussein, even while in Washington he was faking adherence to co-existence, his troops were providing cover across the Israeli armistice line for retreating Arab saboteurs. As for the Syrians and Algerians, their belligerence too is not merely political. Not only have they rejected the Security Council resolution out of hand, and not only do they reject any idea of a political settlement, but they are actively attempting to raise anti-Israeli guerrilla activities to a full war scale. From Beirut it was reported that "since the June war the Syrian Government has been giving training to members of the 10,000-man Palestinian contingent in the Syrian army in preparation for anti-Israeli terrorism." (*The New York Times*, November 24, 1967.) Moreover,

This report substantiated a recent assertion by Ahmed Shukairy, the head of the Cairo-based Palestine Liberation Organization, that Palestinians were being trained in guerrilla warfare in Algeria and in another Middle East country, which he declined to name. (*Ibid.*)

From Cairo came this report:

Arab Defense Ministers and Chiefs of Staff are expected to meet next month in an effort to coordinate military planning for an eventual "second round" of fighting with Israel, usually reliable sources reported today. (*The New York Times*, November 29, 1967.)

No doubt, when the so pre-announced fighting materializes, someone will move in the Security Council that Israel be condemned as the "aggressor" . . .

The Supremacy of Survival

All these belligerent Arab professions and preparations are particularly ominous because they would have been unthinkable without Soviet encouragement. Not only has the USSR been championing the Arab cause politically, but her military encouragement of the Arabs exceeds anything offered embattled North Vietnam. The vast Egyptian and Syrian arsenals, lost in June to Israel, are being restored in record time, probably even before methods of payment could be agreed upon. Soviet warships have been docking in Egyptian ports, and Soviet warplanes have been flying in Egyptian skies. Most ominously, many thousands of Soviet military instructors and technicians are reliably and undeniably reported to be with the Egyptian and Syrian (and Yemeni) armed forces.

Such being the Soviet policy in the Middle East, a final peaceful settlement is out of the question. To be sure, the regional problems in dispute are so complicated and involve interests so directly contradictory that a peaceful solution would require goodwill, concessions and adjustments on the part of every government in the region, as well as of several big powers. But no matter what anyone else might do, if Soviet leaders are determined to invite Arab gratitude by feeding Arab chauvinism, there will be a great deal more fighting in the Middle East. The politi-

cal picture of the area is becoming quite one-sided, with the USSR emerging as the main, if by no means only, obstacle to peace. This is a rather new, and regrettable role for the country whose record of the past 50 years was one of consistent devotion to peace, and whose peacefulness was in inverse proportion to malicious Western attributions of belligerence. Only in the short run can diplomatic advantage accrue to the Soviet Union from military incitement of the Arabs. In the long run, a Soviet venture into the diplomacy of seeking influence through dividing others cannot produce better historic results than it has produced for its veteran Western practitioners.

The Israeli leaders can least of all afford entertaining any illusions about the evolving situation. Great as is Israel's moral, and legal, obligation to contribute constructively to solving the tragedy of the Arab refugees and to otherwise meet the Arabs half-way, the opportunity for doing so hardly offers itself so long as the challenge to Israel's survival continues. For the duration of that challenge, Israel's policy will understandably be fully subordinated to her unusual security needs. Israel may thus find herself compelled to resort to ever less internationally popular steps. But, the choice between survival and popularity is not really a choice. Shooting terrorists from across borders, blowing up houses and villages used by them, evacuating village populations, and other punitive measures, are neither pleasant nor conducive to good public relations. Yet, so long as mortal danger hangs over Israel, a tragic priority of concerns must be applied, and with it a virtual *carte blanche* of such relative morality as is dominated by resistance to genocide.

Fair Trade: Japan for Bonins

Japan's ruling Liberal-Democratic Party is in serious trouble. Close cooperation with the United States, or more aptly, enthusiastic subordination to its political, military and economic interests, is a basic premise of its government. With most Japanese articulately opposed to America's war on Vietnam, resenting the use of their country as an American launching base, and otherwise having had more than enough of U.S. tutelage, this is a rather flimsy premise from which to govern. It therefore became necessary for Premier Eisaku Sato again to go to Washington in the hope that he would obtain there such political concessions as might convince his countrymen that continued reliance on the United States is worthwhile. Specifically, Premier Sato hoped to obtain some promise on the return of Okinawa to Japanese rule.

The leftist opposition parties had no illusion about the prospects of Mr. Sato's mission. They opposed the escapade, and the

Premier did not take off from Tokyo's airport before massive battles had been fought between police and demonstrators.

The opposition was right. Its prediction about the futility of gently asking an imperial power to forfeit its spoils, especially when strategic real estate is involved, proved clairvoyant. Premier Sato returned to Tokyo empty-handed; worse, he returned with a bad check in his pocket. Instead of the Ryukyu Islands, he extracted a promise of negotiations concerning the Bonin Islands.

The Ryukyu Islands, of which the largest and most important island is Okinawa, have a combined land area of 848 sq. miles and a population of one million. They are under U.S. military administration. Okinawa, located only 350 miles from the Chinese mainland and near Korea, Taiwan and the Philippines, has become the main American military base in the Far East, fulfilling an important logistic role in the Vietnam war as well as in aerial surveillance of China. As much as 25% of the combined area of the Ryukyu Islands are sites of U.S. military installations. So great and lasting is the importance American strategists attach to the Ryukyus that the military administration has for years been attempting to encourage separatist sentiments that would end the local population's Japanese loyalty and identification.

The Bonin Islands present quite a different picture. The combined land area of the 27 islets is 40 sq. miles, and they are practically uninhabited. They are virtually worthless and the only use the Japanese have so far thought up for them is tourism.

These are the islands, not the Ryukyus, which the United States is willing to discuss with the Japanese. Even while magnanimously granting Premier Sato this "concession," his Washington hosts extracted from him the much more valuable acquiescence in registering, in a joint communique, the alleged presence of "threats from Communist China." No wonder that, upon his return to Tokyo, the Premier and his "achievement" were severely decried not only by the opposition but also by many influential personalities and newspapers that had never criticized him before.

In point of fact, Japanese subservience to the United States has run its full course bringing the country into a dead-end alley. Its continuance can only be fatal. Japanese subservience has been making a significant contribution in encouraging American aggression in the Far East. But thereby it also exposes Japan to the danger of incalculable Chinese retaliation, in case of a Sino-American conflagration. In case of war, not the territorial United States, but U.S. bases in the Far East, and their host countries, may absorb punishment for America. That is precisely why the risks involved in a war with China seem acceptable to Washington's war gods: they rely on America's Far Eastern allies to pay the price for U.S. belligerence. That they should be able to count on the acquiescence of any Japanese reflects a tragic absence of elementary patriotism from the calculations of Tokyo's power establishment.