

# The Vietnam “War”



*by Miles Mathis*

*First published July 20, 2025*

*As usual, all historical mainstream quotes are from Wikipedia unless otherwise noted.*

Before we get to this big one, I want to comment very briefly on a recent story. [It was widely reported a couple of days ago on the conservative/alternative sites that a “liberal” guy](#) got out of his car at a Turning Points USA rally in Tampa and rushed the crowd, flexing and yelling.



I suspect this was manufactured and that this Trevor Smith is another military actor, but the conservative sites are using it to demonize such people and cheer at his apparent comeuppance. But if the video was not staged, Smith actually **has grounds for a lawsuit**, since his actions are neither the most outlandish nor the most illegal here. Smith is paused on the sidewalk at some distance from the crowd when we see a cop run up and push Smith roughly without saying a word to him. He falls and may have injured himself. That's assault and battery. Smith does not resist arrest, but for some reason the cop attacks him again, throwing him to the ground. We are told Smith has been charged with disorderly conduct, DUI, and resisting arrest, but the video shows otherwise on the last.

Smith was being a jerk, but the correct response to that would be the officer telling him to stop and get back in his car. Or to arrest him for disorderly conduct, which does not require an attack upon his person. All it requires is saying, “You are under arrest, please come quietly”. Smith had physically attacked no one and was not armed, he was just posturing, and that does not give the officer the right to attack him for no reason. So if you believe this stunt was real, you should be more concerned by the actions of the officer than of Smith. Do you want some cop attacking you physically and injuring you next time you step out of line in a minor way, and then falsifying charges against you? I didn't think so.

---

At almost 62, I am about a half generation too young to have been involved directly in the Vietnam War, but like the rest of us I have been studying it on and off for at least 50 years. Meaning I have been propagandized concerning this War and asking myself if what I have been told is true. I have seen dozens of promoted movies about it, read articles and books about it: the usual. You can't be a US citizen over 40 and not know way more than the basic story here. I hit this topic a few years ago with [my paper on \*Apocalypse Now\*](#), showing you what wet agitprop that always was, straight out of the Pentagon. But the same could be said of all the other Vietnam movies, including *The Green Berets*, *Platoon*, *Full Metal Jacket*, *Deer Hunter*, and all the rest.

I will start by reminding you that—like the Korean “War”—the Vietnam “War” was just a continuation of WWI and WWII, and that my guest writers and I [have proved much of those wars was a fraud](#). So as a matter of logic we should expect the same thing here, with an acceleration of the fraud.

I think the best way into this fraud is through Russia. Yes, Russia. Perhaps the strangest thing about the entire Vietnam War story is that we are told that in the end Vietnam became a Communist country under the protection and influence of . . . Russia. **Russia, not China**. The US allegedly left, spending nothing on rebuilding, with Russia coming in and investing billions after 1975. You should key on that because it makes absolutely no sense. Before the war, Russia didn't even have a foot in Vietnam. It was run by the French back to the 1880s, of course, and Japan also controlled parts of it. At the end of WWII and the defeat of Japan, the Japanese mostly left, and France also left, turning their part over to the Anglos in the **Potsdam Agreement**. According to that major treaty, the Allies led by the US and UK would control the south while the **Chinese** would control the north.

**In August 1945, the Allies had decided to divide Indochina at the 16th parallel to allow Chiang Kai-shek of the Republic of China to receive the Japanese surrender in the north while Britain's Lord Louis Mountbatten received their surrender in the south. The Allies agreed that Indochina still belonged to France.<sup>[122][123]</sup> But as the French were weakened by the German occupation, British-Indian forces and the remaining Japanese Southern Expeditionary Army Group were used to maintain order and help France reestablish control through the 1945–1946 War in Vietnam, south of the 16th parallel.<sup>[124]</sup>**

Hmmm. Nothing about Russia there. And France is just a diversion, since they had obviously sold their interest in Vietnam to the Anglos at some point. Note that the south is run by the English Lord Mountbatten, not by any French general or governor. We know that Japan is a similar diversion, not only from previous research showing [Japan was always a catspaw of the Anglos](#), but from that sentence at Wiki, which as usual makes no sense. If the Japanese were being expelled, why would the Japanese Army be used to expel itself? You will say the Japanese army had been taken over by the Allies, which

is true, though I have shown you that had happened even before WWII started. [The entire war against Japan was also staged](#), and this is just further indication of it from Wiki.



Lord Mountbatten is another clue there. Look at that long face. He was the maternal uncle of Prince Philip—husband of Queen Elizabeth—and second cousin of George VI. Also the great-grandson of Queen Victoria. He was actually a **Battenberg**, of the German Dukes and Princes of Hesse, and a Prince himself. Not a Lord, a Prince. His mother was Princess Victoria of Hesse, making him a Hohenzollern as well and linking him to the Kings of Prussia. So, a top commander of the Phoenician Navy, as you can tell from his admiral uniform. He was the **First Sea Lord**, which is apropos since he comes from the Sea Peoples. Two years after heading the fake partition of Vietnam, he became the Viceroy of India, reminding you once again this is all about the British Empire. As usual he faked his death, I guess for insurance money, the family claiming he was assassinated in 1979 by the IRA. Right. Can't be true, since the [IRA is also a British construct](#).

But my point is Russia was not even a player before the war, so how did they come out the end of it in control of Vietnam? You would expect Communist Vietnam to be a puppet of China, which huge country was right on its northern border, not Russia. Well, Wiki drops a big clue there as well:

**From 1944, the US [Office of Strategic Services](#) (O.S.S.) provided the Viet Minh with weapons and training to fight the occupying Japanese.**[\[77\]](#)[\[78\]](#)

That's Ho Chi Minh above, in that picture under title, with the OSS in **1945**. He is the one with bandy legs and a goatee. **Aha, so they just admitted the CIA invented and financed the Viet Minh, including Ho Chi Minh!** Which means the US was behind the north as well as the south. Ho Chi Minh was our puppet from the start, all the way back to 1941 and before. Remember, he was always very pro-American, quoting from the US Declaration of Independence. He had a French education and lived in Paris, **being a founder of the French Communist Party there in 1920**. His brother was in the French army and his father was an Imperial magistrate for the French.

Previously, it was believed that Thành (Hồ) was involved in an anti-slavery (anti-[corvée](#)) demonstration of poor peasants in Huế in May 1908, which endangered his student status at *Collège Quốc học*. However, a document from the [Centre des archives d'Outre-mer](#) in France shows that he was admitted to *Collège Quốc học* on 8 August 1908, which was several months after the anti-*corvée* demonstration (9–13 April 1908).

Note the date, which is aces and eights. Beyond that, this is just to admit that they later falsified Ho's early bio to make him look like a revolutionary. He never was. He was a Western puppet from the cradle, [like Castro](#) and many others we have looked at.

**While working as the cook's helper on a ship in 1912, Thành (Hồ) traveled to the United States. From 1912 to 1913, he may have lived in New York City (Harlem) and Boston, where he claimed to have worked as a baker at the Parker House Hotel.**

Yes, and when did he arrive in Langley? Just kidding, Langley wasn't around then, but US Intelligence was, so we can be sure Ho was here for his training. And why do they keep calling him Thanh? His birth name was Nguyen Sinh [Cung](#), but we are told his father gave him the name *tat Thanh* at the age of ten as part of Confucian tradition. Sounds like the usual misdirection. Thanh was his sister's name—so I suppose it was his mother's name. It looks like we are being told his maternal line without giving his mother's full name, which is conspicuously missing. I note the maternal line appears to be very important, indicating Jewish lines, and I also note he lived under many aliases, like everyone else we have studied. Why would these rulers of countries need fake names? Think [Stalin](#), [Lenin](#), and Trotsky, for example, who all lived under fake names. CIA code names, I guess.

Does [Cung](#)=Cohen? That would be my first guess, so we will see how it goes. We already have a hint there, but I bet you missed it. He worked as a [baker](#). Add an “n” to get banker, as usual. Telling me his father probably worked in treasury, as a secretary of the exchequer or something like that. The Parker House had no record of anyone by his names working there, proving he was doing something else while he was here, and lied about it.

You see, you just have to read more closely.

This confirms that again:

**He was also influenced by Pan-Africanist and black nationalist Marcus Garvey during his stay, and said he attended meetings of the Universal Negro Improvement Association.[22][23]**

Both those places were Intelligence fronts, so we may assume Ho was as well. He is doing exactly what we would expect an agent to do.

He then moved to London, as an Anglo agent would, again lying about it by claiming he worked as a pastry chef in Haymarket. But he was there for around six years, so he must have been doing something. Who was underwriting all this, and why?

Well, we can tell by what happened next. He moved to Paris in 1919, immediately becoming the head of Vietnamese “Patriots” there. How did he manage that? He was still in his twenties and had no resume except “baker”, but somehow he stepped right off the boat into the waiting arms of superwealthy spook Tay Ho, whom we now also suspect of being an Anglo puppet. Tay Ho assigned Ho to be the face of the Patriots and their spokesman. Less than a year later Ho was a delegate at the



Tours Congress and Third International, which we have already proved was a front for the Imperialists/Capitalists. Another year later he was sent by spook Dmitry Manuilsky to the Soviet Union, where Ho became a high-ranking member of the Soviet Comintern. [Which reminds us of John Reed of Reds fame](#), doesn't it? Wow, this ex-baker really knew how to make contacts, right?

But let's skip ahead.

In April 1945, Ho met with the OSS agent **Archimedes Patti** and **offered to provide intelligence, asking only for "a line of communication" between his Viet Minh and the Allies.**<sup>[55]</sup> The OSS agreed to this and later sent a military team of OSS members to train his men.

That's straight from mainstream history, so I don't see the weak link here. Why do they still teach us that Ho was the enemy? Why would they admit that on the current Wiki page while simultaneously telling us the Vietnam War was about fighting Communists led by Ho?

You will say I was talking about Russia but diverted into all this about Ho. Why? Because it isn't a diversion. I am showing you Ho was a catspaw, and Russia is just one more catspaw. Ho was a puppet in the war and so was Russia. Russia wasn't giving Vietnam billions after the war, **we were**, but we were sending it through Russia as a sort of money laundering, so that it wasn't so obvious. Because of course Russia is our catspaw as well, and has been since at least 1917. Russia has never been our enemy and isn't now. It is all the usual military vaudeville. Russia hasn't even been independent since 1917, being ruled behind the scenes from the West.



Which means. . . have you got it yet?

They now admit the Gulf of Tonkin event was staged, so . . . . Why not the whole war?

**We didn't lose the Vietnam War.** We didn't even win it, since it was never a war. That is why I have "war" in quotes. It was simply a military occupation by the Allies, mainly the US, after WWII, hiding behind France, Japan, China, and Russia. It was never a war since we were never fighting anyone but ourselves. The whole thing was staged, just like *Apocalypse Now*.

Just think about it: if someone asked you who we were fighting in that war, you probably couldn't answer. Most people can't, because we have been told so many conflicting things. We were fighting Communists, but were they from China or Russia? As you see, at different times it was both, which

makes no sense, since China and Russia aren't allies according to the postwar scripts. They were bitter enemies. Another story is that this was a war between North Vietnam and South Vietnam, and we just got in it to **liberate** the South Vietnamese from the Communist North—which was Chinese before the war and Russian after. But that also makes no sense, since why would we spend thirty years and trillions of dollars to liberate a tiny backwards country, getting nothing from it? It would be like being told China spent thirty years and trillions of dollars trying to liberate Haiti from the Dominican Republic, just to be nice.

You may also wish to look up who is invested in, and runs, Vietnam now. I will give you a hint: It isn't the Russians. Vietnam was never a satellite state or protectorate of the Soviet Union or Russia and isn't now, despite the billions Russia allegedly invested there. It also isn't a satellite state of China. After 1986 they began admitting Vietnam was a **market economy**, though they continued to call it Communist to continue the old con. But it can't be both. If it is a market economy it can't be Communist, by definition.

**Although the authority of the state remained unchallenged under *Đổi Mới*, the government encouraged **private ownership** of farms and factories, **economic deregulation**, and **foreign investment**, while maintaining control over strategic industries.**<sup>[194][195]</sup> **Subsequently, Vietnam's economy achieved strong growth in agricultural and industrial production, construction, exports, and **foreign investment**, although these reforms also resulted in a rise in **income inequality** and gender disparities.**

They forget to tell you who these foreign investors were, but they weren't Russian or Chinese. They were Anglo-American, of course.

**Although Vietnam remains officially committed to **socialism** as its defining creed, its economic policies have grown increasingly **capitalist**,**<sup>[256][257]</sup> **with *The Economist* characterising its leadership as "ardently **capitalist communists**".**<sup>[258]</sup>

Capitalist communists, eh? Stirring your brain, as usual.

But why fake it like this? If we wanted to take Vietnam as part of our world empire, why didn't we just do so after WWII? Why all this hoo-ha about liberation and Communism? One, because it didn't fit the postwar script, by which the British Empire was being mothballed and the US was now the guardian of the free world. The age of empire, conquest, and colonialism was supposedly over, with the British Empire allegedly a thing of the past. See Lord Mountbatten above, allegedly dismantling the Empire while actually just taking it underground. So it wouldn't look too good if the US, after **quashing the fake tyrant Hitler**, suddenly began taking over the entire world. It would be a hard sell at home to start with, not to speak of contradicting all the war propaganda of the previous two decades. So they had to come up with this wild script in which this brutal subjugation of an entire country was sold as a democratic war for its liberation. The US Army did go in there—I am not claiming they didn't—and they no doubt “liberated” a lot of local people of their freedom and lives, but it wasn't a war since the Vietnamese were basically helpless. They had no army capable of fighting us, so it would be like us going to war again with our own Natives, napalming the reservations to liberate them from nefarious Canadian influence or something.

The second and more important reason we didn't just take Vietnam after WWII is because it would be much more expensive and time-consuming to fight a fake protracted “war” than to just waltz in and take over, and this is what the defense contractors most desired. They didn't want an overnight

occupation, since not only would that look bad on the news, it wouldn't pay. With WWII over, they needed something new to justify decades of fat defense budgets. Which is exactly what the Vietnam "War" provided.

You see how simple it is once your brain turns on?


What about the napalm and agent orange and all that? Was that also faked? No, but it had nothing to do with flushing Charlie from the jungles. It was about clearing the land for industrialization by the capitalists, same as in Russia, the US, Brazil, and everywhere else. That should have always been clear with Agent Orange, which is an herbicide. There would be no reason to spray Charlie with an herbicide, since Charlie was not an herb. If you were attacking North Vietnam with chemical warfare, you would use gases that targeted humans, not plants. But it just reminds us the Phoenicians have been at war with all forests for the past three centuries as well, and still are. Pave paradise, put up a parking lot, you know.

According to a 2005 report conducted by the [Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations \(FAO\)](#), [Vietnam](#) has the second highest rate of [deforestation](#) of primary forests in the world, second only to [Nigeria](#).<sup>[1]</sup> <sup>[Needs update]</sup> The use of [defoliants](#) during the [Vietnam War](#) had a devastating and [long-lasting impact](#) on the country's forests and ecology,<sup>[2]</sup> affecting [14-44%](#) of total forest cover, with coastal [mangrove forests](#) being most affected.<sup>[3]</sup>


The population of Vietnam has quadrupled since 1950, and mysteriously didn't fall at all during this horrible war.

Population development in Vietnam since 1960

(Data in millions of inhabitants)



Annual growth rates in percent



That's from [worlddata.info](#), and that steady increase happened during steadily falling birthrates due to contraception, so something ain't right. The mainstream claims at least 2 million Vietnamese died from the war in that period, but we see not a blip of it there. I remind you [we saw the same thing in France, Belgium, and Germany during WWII](#), with population statistics not matching claims of war dead at all.

Some will say I hit the punchline early here, after only seven pages, but this isn't the first time I have

suggested Vietnam was staged. I have been hinting at it for years, and laying the groundwork, as you see from all the links above. Plus, after what I have shown you above, it is pretty obvious. Hard to believe I am the first one who got here, but isn't that the way it always is?

That said, I will continue on, to make a good show of it. Part of me wants to just sign off and let others find the next thousand pages of easy evidence, evidence that will fall into your lap now that your eyes are open, but another part of me wants to swim in that pool for a while myself, since the water looks very invigorating. I haven't even begun to circle all the clues on the Wiki pages for this, for a start.

Let's start by finishing off the quotes we already have above. How about that name Archimedes Patti, of the OSS? That looks promising, don't it? He just happens to have been a lieutenant colonel under Wild Bill Donovan, and was a Special Agent for the government even before he joined the army in 1941. He was Archimedes Leonidas Attilio Patti, from a Sicilian family. So they are selling him as Italian, but he is clearly peerage of some sort. We can tell just from the name. His wife was a Telford and they scrub his mother. There are Patties in the British peerage related to the Eyre-Maunsells, and through them to the Brownes, McCartys, Crosbys, Fitzgeralds and Herberts. See for example Sir Geoffrey Pattie, Privy Counsellor. The Telfords are also peerage, related to the Scotts, Dukes of Buccleuch, and the Kerrs, Marquesses of Lothian.

Again, from Patti's Wiki page:

However, Patti, from a distance,[[citation needed](#)] helped to organize, train, and equip the fledgling Vietnamese forces that Ho Chi Minh was uniting and marshaling against the Japanese, which later became known as the [People's Army of Vietnam](#). Patti worked closely with Ho Chi Minh and indeed commented on his early drafts of a Vietnamese constitution.

Translated: Patti was Ho's CIA handler.

Patti was introduced to Ho Chi Minh by Colonel Austin Glass, the OSS expert in Indochina.[[verification needed](#)] Patti met Ho Chi Minh on the Indochinese-Chinese border in late April 1945. Patti agreed to provide intelligence to the allies if he could have "a line of communication with the allies."

I point out that the CIA had been preparing the Vietnam War since before WWII even ended. As we saw above, Ho was our asset back to the 1910s.

On September 2, [1945] Ho Chi Minh declared independence, and some hours later, Patti had dinner with him.

Just a coincidence, I'm sure.

In the fall of 1945, French colonial forces had returned to Indochina on U.S.-manned [Liberty ships](#).<sup>[12]</sup>

Patti left Hanoi in late September 1945 after French allegations that the Americans had been fomenting a revolution.<sup>[12]</sup>

Your head is probably spinning, so I remind you this is not from 4chan or Youtube, this is from Wikipedia, footnoted to scholarly sources. So why is it up? Because they are sure you won't read it, or won't have the guts to see what it actually means.

**Beginning in August 1945, the Viet Minh sought to consolidate power by terrorizing and purging**



rival Vietnamese [nationalist groups](#) and [Trotskyist activists](#).[\[85\]\[86\]\[87\]\[88\]](#):383–441 That summer, the Viet Minh colluded with French forces to eliminate nationalists, targeted for their ardent anti-colonialism.[\[91\]\[85\]](#):205–207[\[92\]](#):175–177[\[93\]](#):699–700

So Ho is working with the French to eliminate the real local revolutionaries, and they admit it. Why would Ho, sold to us as a Vietnamese nationalist and ardent anti-colonialist, be eliminating nationalists and anti-colonialists? Now you know. He wasn't real revolutionary, since a real revolutionary would have been making alliances. It was their only hope. Instead he was undermining the local revolution on the ground for his masters in the OSS/CIA, so that they could manufacture and lead a fake revolution instead. [We saw Germany do the same thing at the end of WWI](#), when Rosa Luxemburg and other cloaked Jews came in from outside and co-opted the revolution from the locals, replacing it with a fake and pre-packaged revolution run by the bankers.

The anticommunist [Truman Doctrine](#), first announced by president Harry S. Truman in March 1947, pledged [United States](#) support to nations resisting "attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures".[\[102\]](#) After communist [China](#) and the [Soviet Union](#) recognized the [Democratic Republic of Vietnam](#), the US recognized the French-backed [State of Vietnam](#), based in Saigon, as the legitimate government in February 1950.[\[103\]](#):377–379[\[25\]](#):88

So after the OSS fomented this fake revolution, Truman stepped in and claimed the US was henceforth the protector of all small nation-states the world over, not only from Communism but from any subjugation by outside forces—excepting of course our own.

And where did this Truman Doctrine come from? Did Congress vote on it? Did Americans vote on it? Of course not. The CIA just fed it to Truman in his daily notes and it went from there. It appeared out of thin air, just in time for the US military to gear up in Korea and Vietnam. By 1949 it had led to the formation of NATO and the beginning of the Cold War. Yes, you may have thought the Cold War spun out of some major conflict between the US and the Soviet Union, but that is not the case. It was simply dreamed up by some speech writers working for the defense contractors. It probably came right out of the corporate offices of Lockheed Martin and Raytheon.

If you don't believe me, go read the Wiki page for “Cold War”. Not once do they begin to explain the start of the Cold War, since the Soviets had done absolutely nothing prior to 1947 to initiate it, or to spark the Truman Doctrine. Remember, Russia had been our ally in the war, and all aggression after the war came from our direction. Stalin offered to leave Germany if we would, but Truman wasn't interested. So the Iron Curtain was actually our baby, not theirs. See the Morgenthau Plan, which was to first punish Germany for the War by not only disarming them but starving them, and second to permanently occupy it, which is of course what happened. While stating that we were letting Western Europe self-determine, the opposite was the case: we installed our bases everywhere and pressured all these countries, not only Germany, to do what we told them. It is still going on, as we see with Trump demanding all European countries dedicate 5% of GDP to military, meaning buying arms from us. The Morgenthau Plan of 1946 was so unpopular in Europe it had to be replaced by the Stuttgart Plan, but that also backfired, especially in Poland, with the Polish government soon fearing us more than the Soviets. Somehow all that has been buried by the historians, who want you to believe the Cold War was all the Soviets' fault.

Plus, I have to remind you all this was staged as well, just like the World Wars had been. The same families ruled all of Europe and Russia as well, with the Romanovs being the cousins of the Kings of England, Prussia, Sweden, Austria, Norway, Denmark, Italy, Spain, and all the rest. [And the fake fall](#)

[of the Romanovs didn't change that](#), since Russia continued to be run by the same families before and after the revolutions, and still is. [World War I wasn't started by the assassination of some archduke](#) in Sarajevo, the Jerusalem of the Balkans, since that was a fake, and everything since then has been a similar fraud, up to the current manufactured war in Ukraine. The US and Russia have been staging this all from the first word, to keep both militaries fat. Orwell told you in 1948 how it worked, and he wasn't predicting the future. He was reporting on the present.

I am not saying the Soviet Union didn't terrorize the Eastern Bloc countries, but they didn't do it at the behest of the fake Communist Party. They did it to their own people in Russia, telling us they weren't real Russians to start with. Like all the other rulers East and West, they were and are Phoenicians, terrorizing the whole world to maintain their own hegemony. And if the US allegedly cared so much about the freedom and sovereignty of the Vietnamese, tell me why we didn't seem to care for the freedom or sovereignty of Czechoslovakia or Romania or Bulgaria or Poland. We should have much closer ties by blood to those places than to Korea or Vietnam, so none of this makes any sense. Why spend thirty years in Vietnam and not one year liberating Czechoslovakia or Hungary? Because that wasn't the plan. The plan was to fleece all parts of Europe, but to hit the weakest countries the hardest, using the Soviet Union as cover, while sharing the proceeds. Those Eastern bloc countries just had the misfortune of being the weakest: meaning, they had fallen out of favor with the Phoenicians. Probably they had crossed the bankers. They hadn't bought enough arms between the wars, bowing to the arms mafia.

**Elections were to be held in 1956 to establish a unified government.**<sup>[25]:88–90</sup> However, the US, represented at the conference by Secretary of State [John Foster Dulles](#), objected to the resolution; Dulles' objection was supported only by the representative of [Bảo Đại](#).<sup>[78]</sup> John Foster's brother, [Allen Dulles](#), who was director of the [Central Intelligence Agency](#), then initiated a [psychological warfare](#) campaign which exaggerated anti-Catholic sentiment among the Viet Minh and distributed propaganda attributed to Viet Minh threatening an American attack on Hanoi with atomic bombs.<sup>[78][112][25]:96–97</sup> The CIA's efforts played a minimal role, as Catholic migrants were driven primarily by their own convictions and circumstances rather than external psychological operations.<sup>[113]</sup>

They admit again that the CIA didn't want peace in Vietnam, constantly planting disinfo to prevent unification or elections. The authors quoted by Wiki admit this but then tell you the CIA played a minimal role. Right. But though false, that isn't the question. The question is why the US was there at all, or why—if we had to be there—we weren't just advising leaders in the South. They admit over and over that the CIA was also behind the leaders in the North, even Ho himself, which blows the whole story.



The President of South Vietnam, and our early puppet there, Ngo Dinh Diem, has a similar story to that of Ho. They sell him as a Catholic and outsider, but his father was a high ranking mandarin and counsellor to Emperor Thanh Thai, making him a huge insider. Also note the name Thanh, which we saw above with Ho. Thanh means green, youth, or purity, though I intuit we are being told something else here. It is more than an honorific or descriptor; it must be a pointer back to the Phoenicians. Meaning? He is half-Jewish somehow.

We are told Diem's father left government when Emperor Thai was ousted in 1907, becoming a farmer, but that is the usual lie. More likely he was tapped to do undercover work in the new government. The life of his son indicates he may have been one of those who spied on the Emperor back in the day, leading to his ouster. Like Ho, Diem was offered a scholarship in Paris, but he instead went to a posh French school in Hanoi. We are told Diem was celibate his entire life, indicating he was gay, which gives us another clue as to how he advanced. And boy did he advance. One year out of school he was district chief, governing 70 villages, and by age 28 he was chief of the entire province, governing 300 villages. Diem was extraordinarily well connected through his family, his sister being married to Nguyen Huu Bai, interior minister of Emperor Bao Dai. Diem spent his early years helping the French put down peasant revolts, telling us who he really was.

Suddenly, in 1933, Diem's career apparently went off the rails (though it didn't). He was appointed to follow Nguyen Bai as Interior Minister, and was put in charge of a commission for reforms. He allegedly went too far in his recommendations and was fired in disgrace, just avoiding arrest by the French, and retiring to his farm. Now under surveillance and suspected as a revolutionary, he nonetheless “conducted extensive nationalist activities” for the next two decades. Can you read this? I read it to mean he had actually been recruited for Intelligence in 1933, and became a spy *against* the nationalists.

Don't believe me?

With the start of the **World War II** in the Pacific, seeing an opportunity for Vietnam to challenge French colonization, he attempted to persuade the Japanese forces to declare independence for Vietnam in 1942 but was ignored. Diem also tried to establish relationships with Japanese diplomats, army officers, and **intelligence operatives** who supported Vietnam's independence. [22] In 1943, Diem's Japanese friends helped him to contact Prince **Cường Để**, an anti-colonial activist, who was in exile in Japan.[23]

That's pretty easy to unwind, isn't it? If he was under surveillance by the French, why would they allow him to do all that? Because, like Ho and Hitler, Diem was one of ours from the start. He was an agent of the Anglo-Americans. He wasn't a nationalist or revolutionary, he was blueblood Tory, king's-man, and G-man.

**Diem attempted to travel to Huế to dissuade Bảo Đại from joining Hồ but was arrested by the Việt Minh along the way and exiled to a highland village near the border. He might have died of malaria, dysentery, and influenza had the local tribesmen not nursed him back to health. Six months later, he was taken to meet Hồ, who recognized Diem's virtues and, wanting to extend the support for his new government,[25] asked Diem to be a minister of the interior. Diem refused to join the Việt Minh, assailing Hồ for the murder of his brother Ngô Đình Khôi by Việt Minh cadres. [16][26]**

**Diem also secretly maintained contact with high-ranking leaders of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, attempting to convince them to leave Hồ Chí Minh's government and join him.**

That's all the usual BS, but again it is fabulously easy to unwind. Why would the Viet Minh at first exile him for six months, then have their leader Ho offer him a top job? Given Diem's known bio, it should have been one or the other. He should have been the enemy, in which case Ho would never offer him a ministry position. But if he did offer it to him and he refused, Ho would never just release him. He would either kill him or exile him, with a huge price on his head should he return. That to prevent what we see there: Diem trying to turn Ho's leaders against him. So as usual this makes absolutely no sense and has no continuity. Plus, it is completely unbelievable that Ho and Diem would meet on friendly terms like this at all, and is just more proof they were both agents working for the same people. Sort of like Biden and Trump:



In 1950, allegedly to avoid a death sentence finally imposed on him by Ho (why didn't Ho just kill him when he was in the room?), Diem left Vietnam, at first going to Japan, which was of course run by the US at that time. The first thing he did is meet Wesley Fishel, yet another Jewish CIA agent. Fishel and Diem then flew back to the States, but Diem was allegedly “not successful in winning support for Vietnamese anti-Communists”. Right. The CIA then flew Diem—who they did not support—to Rome to meet the Pope.

Some American officials worried that his devout Catholicism could hinder his ability to mobilize support in a predominantly non-Catholic country. Diệm recognized that concern and broadened his lobbying efforts to include a development focus in addition to anti-communism and religious factors. Diệm was motivated by the knowledge that the US was enthusiastic in applying their technology and knowledge to modernize postcolonial countries.[37]

Hmmm, that confirms what I have been telling you, doesn't it, about the US not being so interested in liberation as in "modernizing" postcolonial countries. Modernizing them how and why? Well, in order to profit off them, of course. And as to the how, we touched on that as well: burn down the forests and replace them with factories and shopping malls, just like in the US and the rest of the first world.

The next section on Diem's page at Wiki is the most transparent by far, since we are told this:

### **Becoming Prime Minister and consolidation of power**

Until 1953, the State of Vietnam was nominally independent from Paris. Since dissatisfaction with France and Bảo Đại was rising among non-communist nationalists, and support from non-Communist nationalists and Diệm's allies was rising for his "true independence" point of view, Diệm sensed that it was time for him to come to power in Vietnam.[44]

In early 1954, Bảo Đại offered Diệm the position of Prime Minister in the new government in Vietnam. In May 1954, the French surrendered at Điện Biên Phủ and the Geneva Conference began in April 1954. On 16 June 1954, Diệm met with Bảo Đại in France and agreed to be the Prime Minister if Bảo Đại would give him military and civilian control. On 25 June 1954, Diệm returned from exile, arriving at Tân Sơn Nhất airport in Saigon. On 7 July 1954, Diệm established his new government with a cabinet of 18 people.[45]

You have to laugh at how sloppy the storytelling is here. Despite allegedly having no support from the US or Europe (as we learned in the previous paragraphs), and despite having been fired by the Emperor years earlier in disgrace, and despite having a death sentence from Ho, Diem decided it was time to become to power anyway. So that's how it works! You just decide it is time to come to power, and poof, you are Prime Minister. But if it is that easy it begs the question why Diem didn't do this years earlier. If you can mind-trick the Emperor into appointing you Prime Minister any time you like, why wait two decades for it? Why travel around the world building alliances when you can just chopper in on a CIA Chinook and seize power in a moment? As with King Victor Emmanuel and Mussolini in Italy, the Emperor Bao Dai suddenly all but abdicated, giving Diem both civilian and military control of the entire country, though he had never governed more than a province and had zero military experience or qualifications.

Also amazing that Diem decided this just in time for the Geneva Accords, which divided Vietnam again on the 17<sup>th</sup> parallel, giving the North to the CIA's man Ho and the South to the CIA's man Diem. It was now almost nine years after the end of WWII, and the CIA still had Vietnam bogged down in this manufactured civil war, with an actual line drawn down the middle, all to guarantee continued conflict and war profiteering. Within five months the bankers had taken over South Vietnam:

**On 31 December 1954, Diệm established the National Bank of Vietnam and replaced the Indochinese banknotes with new Vietnamese banknotes.**[53]

Just another whacky coincidence, I'm sure. It couldn't have been the point of the whole thing. And was this National Bank actually national? I will answer this way: is your own Federal Reserve actually Federal? Nope. Both should be called the Phoenician Navy Private Bank, parked in every nation's




capital to feed on it like a huge spider.

As more proof this was another CIA circus, a “referendum” was scheduled for 1955 so the people could vote for Diem or Bao Dai as the new President. The wording by itself is a clue, since we have to ask who called this referendum. As Emperor, Bao Dai would not call for it, since he had nothing to gain from it. And Diem had no authority to call such an election against an Emperor, since Emperors are not elected to start with. You can't vote against an Emperor, by definition of Emperor. Nonetheless the CIA went through with this farce, reporting 605,000 votes for Diem in Saigon, a city of 450,000 registered voters. Oops.

Wiki again admits the referendum was called by the CIA, and they even tell you the officer: **Edward Geary Lansdale**, later a major general, but at the time he was head of the US Military Mission in Saigon.

During this period, he was active in the training of the **Vietnamese National Army** (VNA), organizing the **Caodaist** militias under **Trình Minh Thế** in an attempt to bolster the VNA, a propaganda campaign encouraging Vietnam's Catholics to move to the south as part of **Operation Passage to Freedom**, and spreading claims that **North Vietnamese** agents were making attacks in South Vietnam.

You can read that as Lansdale being Diem's handler, as well as being the one actually controlling the Vietnamese military. On Lansdale's page, they admit he lived in the Presidential Palace with Diem. This is proof the CIA was running South Vietnam in the 1950s. Lansdale had learned to run a country two years earlier, when he did pretty much the same thing in the Philippines.



We also find this:

**Lansdale during this time traveled to Vietnam with a young **Daniel Ellsberg** who would work in the U.S. Embassy there.**<sup>[12]</sup>

I encourage you to read into that everything sexual you can, as you should. They are begging you to do so.

Diem was supposed to be the democratic alternative to the Communist Ho in the North, but Diem's rule in the South was actually the more tyrannical. He refused to call a vote in 1956, though it had been required by the Geneva Accords. Diem's brother Nhu was the head of the party, and Wiki admits he was a Nazi, constantly quoting Hitler directly and patterning his secret police after the Gestapo. Diem appointed his other brother Archbishop, and he was like a modern Borgia. So if you ever thought the South was the good guys, well, you were wrong. There were no good guys in this story, since they were the usual CIA goon squads, composed of local aristocrats with the right bloodlines and no scruples.

In these sections we also learn that the Catholic Church remained the largest landowner in South Vietnam, and that Diem continued to favor Catholics and suppress Buddhists and others. So now we know why Diem was visiting the Pope. Of course this contradicts what we are told about Diem's nationalism, as well as his alleged antagonism to French occupation, since where do you think the Catholicism came from? It came from the French occupation, and was wholly Western. So Diem being a Catholic and promoting the Church is just more proof who he was working for. We can be sure he had no support on the ground, since there is no way the peasants had accepted Catholicism, anymore than the peasants in England in the 16<sup>th</sup> century had accepted Protestantism.

By 1963 Diem's government had become so corrupt the CIA had to fake his death and retire him. He had become a liability. And again, Wiki just admits the CIA was involved, though of course they don't tell you the death was faked. They even tell you the CIA agent in charge of the faked death: **lieutenant colonel Lucien Emile Conein**. My regular readers will love that, since they will be able to read that immediately. Because of course Conein is just another variant spelling of Coen, Kohn, Kohen, Cohen, and Commene.

**Conein is best known for his instrumental role in the November 1963 coup against Ngô Đình Diệm and Diệm's assassination by serving as Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge Jr.'s liaison officer with the coup plotters and delivering \$42,000 of the known cash disbursements.[4]**

Conein had been in Saigon since 1954, the year of Diem's rise, so he came in on the ground floor of this vaudeville.

**On 1 November 1963, Conein donned his military uniform and stuffed three million Vietnamese piastres into a bag to be given to General Minh. Conein then called the CIA station and gave a signal indicating that the planned coup against Diệm was about to start.[169] Minh and his co-conspirators swiftly overthrew the government.**

Wiki actually publishes the famous picture of Diem's bloody corpse, which I have no need to reprint for you since it isn't Diem. This person is way too young to be Diem, who was 62 by that time, and he isn't dead anyway. He just has some moulage splashed on his face. Compare the face of that guy to the face of Diem at the top of the same Wiki page. No match. Not even close.

**Diệm was buried in an unmarked grave in Mạc Đĩnh Chi Cemetery.[171]**

Sure he was. But what was the point of that? Why not let his family bury him? Why hide the body? *Because there was no body*, as usual. We have seen it hundreds of times.

**Kennedy had not anticipated Diệm's murder. The U.S. ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, invited coup leaders to the embassy and congratulated them. Lodge informed Kennedy that "the**

prospects now are for a shorter war".<sup>[155]</sup> Kennedy wrote to Lodge congratulating him for "a fine job".<sup>[156]</sup>

Another huge contradiction. Kennedy knew nothing—was out of the loop completely—but nonetheless allowed his ambassador to initiate the coup and brag about it afterwards, at which time Kennedy phoned him and congratulated him for his success . . . which Kennedy had known nothing of.

After telling us Kennedy didn't want any troops on the ground, only advisors, Wiki admits

The CIA ran the [Phoenix Program](#) and participated in the [Military Assistance Command, Vietnam – Studies and Observations Group](#) (MAC-V SOG).<sup>[163]</sup>

The Phoenix Program, eh? They just throw it in our faces.

The program, which lasted from 1968 to 1972 [the other page implies it went back to 1963] was designed to identify and destroy the [Viet Cong](#) (VC) via infiltration, [assassination](#), [torture](#), capture, [counter-terrorism](#), and [interrogation](#).<sup>[2][3][4][5]</sup> The CIA described it as "a set of programs that sought to attack and destroy the political infrastructure of the Viet Cong."<sup>[6]</sup>

Throughout the program, Phoenix "neutralized" [81,740](#) people suspected of VC membership, of whom 26,369 were killed, and the rest surrendered or were captured. Public disclosure of the program led to significant criticism, including hearings by the [US Congress](#), and the CIA was pressured into shutting it down. A similar program, Plan F-6, continued under the government of [South Vietnam](#).

81,000, you say? Had to be that or 33,000. But notice it wasn't covert, since there was public disclosure and even Congressional hearings. So they wanted us to know this was going on. Or they wanted us to THINK this was going on. So that we would think that our trillion dollars of defense was going to something besides memos, scripts, and military blowjobs.

The next section is on the Gulf of Tonkin event, which they now admit was a fake.

An [NSA](#) publication declassified in 2005 revealed there was no attack on 4 August.<sup>[172]</sup>



We also find that photo, which is obviously faked as well, proving Operation Rolling Thunder, the response to Gulf of Tonkin, was as fake as the attack on the ship. Meaning, we didn't bomb North Vietnam in response. We just said we did. You heard it here first.

I've hit 17 pages now so I think I'll pause and call this part 1. There may be a part 2 or not, depending on how frisky I feel. I am already sick to death of this and consider this in the can already. It was proved by page 7, to be honest, and I only kept writing to give you something to read other than the dreck at Infowars or Breitbart.