

To cite this article: Nguyen Le Thuy (2022). CHARACTERISTICS IN STRATEGIC GUIDELINES AND APPLICATION OF THE MODEL OF A NEW COLONIAL INVASION WAR OF AMERICAN IMPERIALISM IN VIETNAM (1954-1975), International Journal of Education and Social Science Research (IJESSR) 5 (4): 160-168

CHARACTERISTICS IN STRATEGIC GUIDELINES AND APPLICATION OF THE MODEL OF A NEW COLONIAL INVASION WAR OF AMERICAN IMPERIALISM IN VIETNAM (1954-1975)

Nguyen Le Thuy

Vietnam Women's Academy - Vietnam

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.37500/IJESSR.2022.5412>

ABSTRACT

The Vietnam War by the US took place in the general characteristics of the times and in the midst of comparing forces in the world as well as on the battlefields of Vietnam and Indochina to their disadvantage. Because this is a war of new colonial aggression, it is governed by two basic characteristics: invasion and neo-colonialism. Therefore, in the process of directing the strategy and implementing the method of war in Vietnam, the US has fully demonstrated those normative characteristics.

KEYWORDS: Rules; Strategy; Methods of war; New colonists; American Imperialism.

1. INTRODUCTION

Practicing the "global counter-revolutionary" strategy, the US blatantly jumped in to invade Vietnam and Indochina with a war of neocolonial invasion in order to reverse the common development trend of Asia and the world. They asserted that their enormous military and economic forces could crush the national liberation movement and block the advance of socialism anywhere in the world.

During 21 years (1954 - 1975), five successive US presidents drew up plans to carry out the plot of "destroying Vietnamese people's patriotic movement, annexing and dividing permanently the South of Vietnam, turning it into a new-style colony and US military base, setting up a defense to prevent socialism from spreading to Southeast Asia...". To carry out that conspiracy, the US frantically implemented war strategies and used methods of wars of neo-colonial aggression in Vietnam.

1. Using a comprehensive strength to focus on countering the revolutionary movements of Vietnam and Indochina in order to impose a new colonial policy. However, in a weak position, they went from passive to passive. The more they removed, the more secretive they became. The more they fight, the more they lost.

With the view of a comprehensive war, the US applied the experiences of the war against the revolution and the national liberation movement that they had carried out, closely combining with the most modern achievements in military science at that moment. They have concentrated the direction of the

highest command with the "best minds", the "best generals", the "smartest and most talented people" and a huge war machine. They mobilized from the homeland into the war with the most modern human strength, material, and technical equipment, and thoroughly exploited and used the potentials of the local rear and of the vassal countries to ruin Viet Nam's revolution. The US launched into the Vietnam battlefield "an expeditionary army of more than 600,000 soldiers from American troops and five allied countries of the US (South Korea: 50,000, Thailand: 13,000, Australia: 7,000, Philippines: 2,000 and New Zealand: 600) as the core for more than 1 million soldiers of the Republic of Vietnam government. Particularly for the US combat troops, at their peak, they mobilized 70% of the army, 60% of the marines, 40% of the navy and 60% of the air force. If the number of troops stationed at US military bases in Thailand, the Philippines... and on the 7th Fleet that fought in the war to invade Vietnam was included, the number is more than 800,000 people." During the whole war, the US mobilized up to 6,600,000 numbers of soldiers to take turns to fight and dropped 7.8 million tons of bombs on the Indochina battlefield, more than 3 times the number of bombs used by the US in the Second World War (2.1 million tons); cost 676 billion dollars (while the Korean war, the US only cost 54 billion dollars, World War II was only 341 billion dollars). At the same time, the US government also mobilized up to 22,000 factories with nearly 6 million industrial workers, more than a third of scientists and 260 universities to participate in war strategy research, manufacturing and weapons and means of war to serve on the battlefields of Vietnam and Indochina.

It can be seen that the Vietnam War was comprehensive and typical in all aspects, on a large scale, in barbaric and malicious nature. In terms of the military alone, the US used a huge force in the biggest war since the Second World War, including all modern weapons and techniques, except atomic weapons. They also sent talented generals and diplomats into the battle.

Relying on the position and power of imperialism, the US tried to make full use of the huge war inciting propaganda machine, launched political, psychological and diplomatic attacks and created an equally effective force to further support the military power to isolate the Vietnamese people on the front of world public opinion. With such comprehensive total strength, the US waged an extremely fierce battle with the synergy of the revolution and the Vietnamese revolutionary war. They used different ever-changing and increasingly malicious, brutal, cunning methods and tricks. In the condition that the war potential was still strong, the henchman apparatus that mainly conducted the war has not been disbanded, the US was never resigned to each defeat. They always found ways to fully exploit the elements of surprise and Vietnam's loopholes to launch crazy and increasingly fierce counterattacks. In order to support the war in the South of Vietnam and threaten the South of Vietnam, which they considered the source of the revolutionary war, cut off all support from the North to the South, expanded the war to the whole of Indochina were inevitable developments in the common strategic scheme. In the process of applying methods and tricks to the war, the US was malicious, cunning and pragmatic. If one strategy failed, they replaced it with another strategy. If one method or trick failed, they replaced it with more sophisticated, sinister and comprehensive methods and tricks. The US expended a huge budget than that of World War II and practiced the most pernicious counter-

revolutionary strategies, including 4 strategies, 5 Presidents, 8 defense ministers and 4 commanders-in-chief of the US combat troops in the battlefields of South Vietnam.

However, what they did not expect was that they had encountered a resilient and indomitable opponent, the heroic Vietnamese nation under the leadership of a genuine Marxist Party. Therefore, the US was wrong at the root, failed from the beginning and passively continued. They were forced to escalate step by step, implementing the latter strategy on the basis that the former has failed but the latter failure was greater than the former. Starting from the Dong Khoi movement at the end of 1959 and early 1960, the Southern revolution changed from a position of preserving forces to an offensive position, defeating the unilateral war strategy of the US. By the end of 1964, the partial uprisings that took place after the Dong Khoi movement developed into a revolutionary war, both military struggle and political struggle, combined with fighting the enemy in the mountains and forests along with the fierce struggle movement in urban areas throughout the South, pushed the fascist Ngo Dinh Diem regime - the tool to implement the new American colonialism to the brink of collapse and destruction and ruin the special war strategy of the US.

In order to save the critical situation, the US continued to climb a new ladder in 1965 - deploying a local war strategy in the South and opening a destructive war by air and navy against the North of Vietnam. In January 1968, while the war was at its highest stage, the Central Committee of the Party proposed a policy of launching a general offensive and a simultaneous uprising throughout the South. This was a decisive blow to their will to invade, bankrupt the local war strategy, force the US government to de-escalate the war and accept to sit at the negotiating table at the Paris Conference. However, with its extremely stubborn and belligerent nature, the US was not yet resigned to defeat. From 1969, they turned to the implementation of the Nixon Doctrine and deployed the strategy of Vietnamization of the war in South Vietnam. To counter the enemy's new war strategy, Vietnam's army and people launched a strategic offensive in 1972 throughout the southern battlefield to an important part in the rural pacification program of the US and the Republic of Vietnam government. In the North, Vietnam's army smashed the strategic raid by B.52 aircraft on Hanoi and Hai Phong in late 1972 and forced the US to sign the Paris Agreement.

2. The new American colonialist war method in Vietnam was “pacifying the people” and “finding and destroying the military force of Vietnam”.

The US considered that a prerequisite for defeating the revolutionary war in Vietnam is to destroy the military force of Vietnam. With the idea of guiding the strategy of "fight fast and win quickly", American military strategists believe that a conventional war must be waged, forcing the enemy to accept a regular war. Therefore, "finding and destroying" the enemy's armed forces is a strategic goal that determines victory and is also the main method of combat.

In the process of dealing with Vietnam in the South, the US gradually realized that the combination of “pacifying the people” and “finding and destroying the military force of Vietnam” was an inevitable

rule in the direction of the strategy and also the main mode of operation of the war of aggression they carried out in Vietnam. In terms of each aspect, “pacificating” and “finding and destroying” are two modes of operation with relative independence. The use of any period depends on the characteristics of each strategic stage of the war, especially depending on the comparison of forces on the battlefield. The US believed that pacification was an offensive strategy, “a territorial war”, a “defensive-offensive” combat method with many forces, mainly the Army of the Republic of Vietnam but also sometimes both American troops and vassals participated and coordinated many programs under the unified direction and command of the US and disguised themselves from the central government to hamlets and communes, taking hamlets and communes as the main battlefield. The purpose of “pacification” is to maintain and expand the control area, especially in densely populated and rich areas, to break all attacks of revolutionary forces, to build and strengthen the gripping apparatus, bringing into play the effectiveness of the central government, ensuring control over the people.

To achieve the above-mentioned purpose of “pacification”, the specific goals of the US are: Winning people and keeping people, gaining land and keeping land, but under certain conditions, winning people and keeping people is the top goal, while gaining land and keeping land can only be concentrated in key areas. Next is to destroy the infrastructure and paralyze all main force's activities, prevent and repel the main force's activities, making the revolutionary forces lose their offensive ability or cannot perform their intended plan.

The enemy's pacification forces closely combined, deployed widely in all three strategic areas including urban, rural and mountainous, forming a position of mutual support, between the inner and outer rings, between the main force and the locality, between pacifying and mobile occupation. The defense structure of the forts, subdivisions, district capitals and strategic hamlets is the backbone of the mass clamping system to support the “pacification” program. The area of pacification took place across three strategic regions: urban, rural and mountainous including the liberated zone, the disputed area, and the controlled but focused area. To ensure the concentration of effective use of forces and the application of appropriate forms of raiding, the pacification area was divided into a security area (which is tightly controlled by them), a consolidation area (ie a disputed area), liberated and border guard zones. The process of pacification operations of the US and the Republic of Vietnam is a process of promoting the synthesis of measures and tricks of all elements of the pacification force under the motto: slow, sure, sweeping and pacificating, forming a continuous position.

Because of the special nature of the Vietnam War with many political factors, at the same time, the US and the Republic of Vietnam had to apply the strategy of “two pincers”, a close combination of “pacificating” and “finding and destroying” to gain victory. On the one hand, depending on the requirements of the strategic mission, the main forces of the US and the Republic of Vietnam launched attacks to destroy Vietnam’s concentrated armed forces in order to “break the backbone of the Viet Cong”, causing the political forces of the masses to lose the core of protection and support for survival and development. On the other hand, they promoted the program of pacification to win the people by

“slapping all the water in the pond to catch fish”, destroying our political infrastructure, the efforts of the revolutionary bases and the guerrillas, eliminating the origin and development of our armed forces of the three armies. A military offensive and counterattack on our rear base, the annihilation of the main force, destruction of treasures, and destruction of our preparations for attack were effective support for the completion of the pacification program. On the contrary, when the pacification program developed smoothly, it created conditions for the withdrawal of main forces to concentrate for a decisive military offensive.

At each strategic stage, the combination of “pacifying” and “finding and destroying” was closely combined on an increasingly large scale and increasingly evil nature. After each defeat, their “pacifying” tricks became more cunning and brutal, and at the same time, “finding and destroying” measures were also combined with the increasing size of divisions, corps, the density of bombs was increasingly fierce and dense. However, due to the impact of the people's war, on the battlefield, the US encountered insurmountable contradictions. When it was necessary to concentrate efforts to deal with our main attacks, the pacification plan was destroyed. When putting efforts into pacification, the remaining forces could not cope with the attacks of Vietnam's main forces, making the already confused and passive enemy even more confused and passive. The state of tug-of-war between the enemy and us had a regularity between sweeping and anti-sweeping, pacifying and breaking pacification, persisting on small, medium, large and increasingly drastic scales. With the synergy of the people's war, fighting the enemy in all three strategic areas, with all three attacks, our people's war method limited the method of “pacifying” and “finding and destroying” of the enemy.

The contradiction between dispersion and concentration of forces is a regular feature of all senseless wars. At the beginning of a war, the imperialists always used the strategy of “fighting quickly, winning quickly”, choosing a favorable opportunity, concentrating all military forces and rushing to destroy the armed forces and headquarters of the enemy to win a decisive victory. When “fighting quickly” but unable to “win quickly”, they were forced to occupy land to win people, plundering talents and material resources to supply war needs was an indispensable requirement. This was clearly and specifically demonstrated in the war strategies that the US carried out in South Vietnam. In 1960, when Kennedy was elected US President, the global strategy of “massive retaliation” was bankrupt, so it had to accept a new global military strategy called “flexible response”. In the immediate future, the US applied a special war strategy by using “10 regular divisions of the Army of the Republic of Vietnam to launch thousands of sweeping operations to destroy the armed forces, suppress the political war, determined to put 14 million South Vietnamese compatriots in 16,000 strategic hamlets”. However, in the face of the increasingly powerful attack of our concentrated armed forces, the Army of the Republic of Vietnam - the main violent tool to carry out special wars, equipped by the US with modern weapons lost. Special war went bankrupt. In order to save the situation in South Vietnam, shortly after replacing Kennedy as President of the US, Johnson decided to deploy a local war strategy instead of a special war strategy. Accordingly, American combat troops and troops of allied countries were quickly brought into South Vietnam. With overwhelming superiority, the White House and Pentagon rulers

believe that “within 18 months, America will win”. But the US intensified and expanded its war of aggression in a losing, passive position, following a strategy fraught with contradictions. It was a contradiction between the war's purpose, which was to save the new colonial regime, and the invasion method based on the old colonial style. Although they were equipped with modern equipment, their fighting spirit was weak due to the position of defeat and the senseless nature of the war. That situation did not allow the invaders to use at will the economic potential and military force of the US.

With the great comparison of forces between us and the enemy, the Party launched a comprehensive and all-people war and with the growing momentum of people's war, including guerrilla warfare and regular war, a state of conflict between the dispersed occupying force and the concentrated maneuvering always took place, which was always becoming more and more acute, which the enemy could not overcome. It was the inevitable result of a new method of waging a war of colonial aggression by the US against the synergy of our highly developed people's war.

3. The rule of “fight quickly, solve quickly” and “gradual escalation”

In colonialism's invasion plans, “fight quickly, solve quickly” is the consistent guiding ideology of wars. Even though they were forced to “fight for a long time”, they still did not give up the idea of “fight quickly, solve quickly”, because the longer they had to fight, the more the enemy fell into a bog, revealing many of their weaknesses and to be able to “fight for a long time”, the inevitable and regular path of the imperialists was to “use the natives to fight the natives”, “to raise the war with war”.

In the old colonial invasion war, the French expeditionary army was the main force to wage the war. When the war had to be prolonged, the source of additional troops in the home country was dwindling, the French expeditionary force had to augment with dependent forces and gradually developed the puppet force “the Vietnamese fought the Vietnamese”, especially at the end of the war. In the new colonial invasion war, from the beginning, the US relied heavily on the three-legged position of “strong puppet army, stable puppet power, prosperous economy”. The puppet army was the core force to wage a new colonial war with the ambition to quickly crush the revolutionary forces under the label of “pseudo-state”. Failure and being forced to massively send American expeditionary troops into the war was a completely passive policy with the ambition to save the puppet troops, the puppet power from rapidly collapsing but still losing and getting bogged down. In order to avoid a visible defeat, to ensure that the American expeditionary force withdraws from the war with honor, the US must inevitably try to strengthen and develop the puppet forces, and assign responsibility to the puppet troops to continue the war. The “Vietnamization” war was essentially “changing the skin color on corpses”, using puppet troops instead of American troops to prolong the war with the plot to keep South Vietnam in the new colonial orbit.

In order to defeat the strategy of “fight quickly, solve quickly”, our Party has set out the motto of guiding the strategy of long-term fighting and winning step by step. That motto failed the enemy's ideology of “fight quickly, solve quickly”, forcing them to respond passively, prolonging the war. The

longer the war lasted, the more bogged down they became, the more clearly their weaknesses were revealed.

President Ho Chi Minh said: “The enemy plotted a lightning strike. They wanted to fight quickly, win quickly, and solve quickly, so our Party and government raised the slogan “Long-term resistance” So from the very beginning, our strategy won the enemy’s strategy.

In the war of aggression in Vietnam, “fight quickly, solve quickly” but “gradual escalation” was a feature that came from the weakness and passive position of the US on the battlefield. Fear of being bogged down “in a tunnel with no way out”, being opposed by anti-war movements in the world and even in the US, fearing the possible reaction of countries in the socialist camp the US still had to hesitate, fight and probe, threaten and escalate step by step. Only after taking advantage of the détente between the major powers and the Chinese-American compromise, the US dare to risk escalation a step higher, expanding the war to Cambodia and Laos, but still afraid of “escalation again in the North”. However, due to subjective thought, underestimating the opponent, thinking that just “one more escalation” was enough to subdue the opponent, the US saw no results but continued to escalate the next step.

Johnson applied the theory of escalation perfectly, especially after the failure of the “special war” strategy. With the guiding thought of the strategy of “step-by-step deterrence”, Johnson took measures to escalate according to the rule: failure - escalation of troops - failure in the South, escalation to attack the North - continued to fail, continued to escalate to higher levels. Step by step escalation, the US was accompanied by deceptive negotiating conditions to avoid the ax of public opinion until their will to invade was hit with a heavy blow, and there was no way to save them (1968). Taylor - who advocated escalation of the Vietnam war had to admit that the policy of gradual escalation not only did not limit the risk of prolonging and expanding the war as intended but also made the war drag on longer and carried the risk of expansion. Moreover, it violated the military principle of surprise and concentration to hope for quick victory with minimal losses.

With a subjective mindset and underestimating the enemy, the US were surprised by the 1959-1960 Dong Khoi climax, and during the 1968 Tet Offensive and Uprising, they were even more surprised and surprised by the heroic and resilient spirit of the North Vietnamese army and people fought back fiercely and defeated all the strategic objectives of the destructive war by air and navy. Our 1972 strategic offensive has dealt another surprise blow to them in terms of attack direction, scale and intensity. They even thought that they could massively attack the North with the air force, Navy and blockade the North within 2 months. And the US was forced to soon stop before the daring, fast attacks of our army and people in the spring of 1975.

4. The combination of military, politics and diplomacy to conduct peaceful negotiations on strengths

The combination of military, politics and diplomacy to conduct peaceful negotiations on strengths is one of the rules in planning and practicing the American war strategy in the South. That reflected the aggressor's basic political weakness. It also showed the cunning but very pragmatic nature of an imperialist oligarch waging war of aggression against the new colonialists to deceive Americans and the people of the world. This is also a trick of “deterrence” in terms of military, political deception and economic bribes to create illusions and peace in order to reduce our people’s will to fight, divide and isolate our people.

From the US point of view, negotiation is a trick combined with war escalation to win the opponent's strength and only negotiate seriously when all strategies and strategic measures have failed. The invaders were dealt heavy blows. The negotiation process is also the process of waging a fierce war on the battlefield to gain strength.

While Johnson was actively preparing to expand the war, massively sending troops to fight in Vietnam, on the forums he declared to seek peace and be ready for talks... Johnson pretended to be eager for peace, but in fact, it was just an act of hiding America's malice in the escalation of the war. When they were defeated in the Tet Offensive in 1968, the will to invade was shaken, the US decided to de-escalate the war on strategy and began to negotiate with us in Paris. However, the negotiations in Paris that lasted for nearly 5 years (May 1968 to January 1973) were only a public forum for the US to deceive public opinion. Until the “Vietnamization of war” strategy failed in our 1972 strategic offensive, the US actually negotiated to come to an effective agreement. Only after a heavy defeat on the battlefield did the US have a serious attitude at the negotiating table.

The nature of American imperialism was very stubborn, cunning, and flippant. Due to the irreparable failure, they were forced to negotiate and sign, but soon found ways to destroy the commitments. That is a typical practice of the normative nature of the imperialists in general and of the US imperialists in particular. After the Geneva Agreement (July 1954), France and the US tried to sabotage the agreement, forcing Northern compatriots to migrate to the South. While France evaded responsibility for implementing the agreement, the US overturned and sabotaged the general election. After the Paris Agreement (January 1973), the US immediately launched a campaign of “terminating the territory”, promoting pacification and encroachment, a cunning foreign policy to encircle and isolate Vietnam in the hope of bringing the war came to an end, American troops withdrew, but the new American colonialism still existed in South Vietnam.

Reality shows that, when assessing the imperialists, especially the US - the oligarch with their counter-revolutionary global strategy, there are always two possibilities in peace negotiations: either they commit to failure and strictly implement all the terms that were signed but this has never happened in the history of our nation's anti-imperialism, or they will seek to sabotage the agreement from the very beginning and become more and more blatant, proceed to abolish all commitments, re-create tension, prepare to return to war of aggression.

In the resistance war against the US, our motto of combining military struggle, political struggle with diplomatic struggle to win step by step is very correct. Victory on the military front on the battlefield has a decisive meaning and governs the diplomatic struggle and the diplomatic struggle must actively promote the effect of promoting political and military struggles.

CONCLUSION

Through 5 presidents, 4 successive strategies, different forces and measures, and increasing scale and intensity, the US turned Vietnam and Indochina into the focus of the global strategy with their counter-revolutionary demands. The war of neo-colonial aggression in Vietnam has become the largest war of the US since the second world war, exceeding the expectations of the White House and the Pentagon for a “limited local war”. The reality of the war shows that the more stubborn and reckless the US was, the more severely they failed in front of the strength of our army and people. When they failed, the crazier they were in war strategies and then they failed even harder. That was the inevitable process of development in the war of new colonial aggression by the US in Vietnam.

Lessons learned from historical reality is that in revolution and revolutionary war, we must master revolutionary violence at historical turning points, actively prepare in all aspects, and take advantage of all peace possibilities and cooperation but must be ready to deal decisive blows against the enemy. We defeated each of the enemy's main strategic measures, proceeded to defeat all strategic goals, smashed their will to invade, and finally forced the US to withdraw all its troops. The people fulfilled the goal of “fighting the US out” and focused on “fighting the puppets” which is an inevitable product as well as a rule of our military art.

REFERENCES

1. Communist Party of Vietnam (2011): Party Document on Anti-Americanism and National Salvation, Volume I, National politics Publishing House, Hanoi.
2. Communist Party of Vietnam (2012): Party Document on Anti-Americanism and National Salvation, Volume II, National politics Publishing House, Hanoi.
3. Communist Party of Vietnam (2000): Complete Party Document, Volume 8, National politics Publishing House, Hanoi.
4. Ho Chi Minh (1990): Chronicle of military events and documents, National Army Publishing House.
5. Le Mau Han (2006): General History of Vietnam, Volume III, Education Publishing House.
6. Vietnam Military History Institute (2015): History of the resistance war against the US, for national salvation 1954-1975, National politics Publishing House, Hanoi.