

1968

Law and Vietnam

W.R Thomas

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-review>

Recommended Citation

Thomas, W.R (1968) "Law and Vietnam," *Naval War College Review*: Vol. 21 : No. 7 , Article 13.
Available at: <https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-review/vol21/iss7/13>

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at U.S. Naval War College Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Naval War College Review by an authorized editor of U.S. Naval War College Digital Commons. For more information, please contact repository.inquiries@usnwc.edu.

Gaulle. According to the author, who claims *not* to be a Marxist-Leninist but who can be construed only as a dedicated Maoist in its most religious sense, Mao and Red China have accepted the challenge and are scientifically winning the battle with capitalism. Using statistics--most of which are educated guesses or calculated opinions--China is making unbelievable strides in agriculture, industry, trade, living conditions, social welfare, population control, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. All of this has been accomplished without coercion except for maybe the few hundred thousand physically eliminated in rectification campaigns; and it has been done in a most democratic fashion--all can criticize as long as they don't criticize Mao. Although the book is heavily pro-Red Chinese in nature, one does not have to go far beneath the surface to recognize that tremendous struggles have taken, and are taking place within the major power factions of that nation. The Communist Chinese Party, the People's Liberation Army, and the bureaucratic structure are only some of the protagonists. Needless to say, the peasants and the youth have become the major pawns in the game. In spite of its almost complete lack of objectivity, the book does provide significant insight into the patterns of the Red Chinese mentality, and for that reason it is highly recommended for the military officer who is interested in how the opposition thinks.

A.J. ASHURST
Commander, U.S. Navy

Hull, Roger H. and Novogrod, John C. *Law and Vietnam*. Dobbs Ferry, N.Y.: Oceana, 1968. 211p.

No one should attempt either public debate or private dialog on the Vietnam conflict without reading this book. Mr. Hull and Mr. Novogrod carefully outline "the ease with which Hanoi and Saigon can substantiate their legal positions." The authors accomplish this, in a most

analytical way, by discussing the contrary viewpoints of each side, the violations of international law (as individually interpreted), the indefinite wording (by intention) of the Geneva Accords, and the irrelevancy of trying to substantiate international law in the language of international politics. It is not that a treaty was violated, but that it was never signed by the opposing parties; it is not even that signatures would have assured compliance, for the provisions were too vague to be seriously considered; and it is not that more specific provisions would have brought peace, for there was no reasonable enforcement clause in the written contract. In short, the overly publicized and almost universally misunderstood Geneva Accords are often used, incorrectly, to substantiate points of view which can be, at best, only emotional. Few people seem to realize that the Geneva Accords were made up of two parts: a bilateral Agreement, signed by only France and North Vietnam, and a Final Declaration, signed by no one at all. (In addition, the United States and South Vietnam orally *dissented* in both cases.) Specific parts of the Agreement were technically violated--from the first--by almost everyone involved in the Vietnam partition. This book successfully outlines the degree of guilt for the many parties and the subsequent charges and countercharges which resulted. The authors also conclude that no one (especially Ho Chi Minh) ever took the Geneva Accords seriously.

W.R. THOMAS
Commander, U.S. Navy

Neu, Charles E. *An Uncertain Friendship: Theodore Roosevelt and Japan, 1906-1909*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967. 347p.

Professor Neu's book is a splendid one, but it has a strike against it when first confronted by one familiar with the literature of the Theodore Roosevelt period. He will probably comment: