

LABOR ACTION

November 4, 1957

TEN CENTS

SPOTLIGHT

Middle East War Scare Camouflages Real Fight

The current international crisis centering on Turkey and Syria has an air of unreality to it. Top spokesmen for the two greatest powers in the world have been hurling warnings and threats at each other, predicting the imminence of war, and announcing that if it comes it will be the big one. Yet no one seems to really take it seriously. There is not that nervous tension, let alone that brooding sense of doom which overshadowed international relations at the time of the Berlin airlift, or during and after the Munich crisis in 1939.

Russian spokesmen have gone to great lengths to publicize their charge that the United States is fomenting an attack on Syria, with Turkey as the advance guard. Not only has this charge been pressed in speeches by top Russian spokesmen and before the United Nations, but Khrushchev went to the exceptional and dramatic lengths of addressing letters to the European social democratic parties asking their support and aid in averting this war. Russian spokesmen claim to have conclusive proof of America's aggressive plans in the area, though they have failed to produce this "proof" before the court of world public opinion.

WAR OF WORDS

The American government, on the other hand, has not been backward in entering the war of words. While denying that the U. S. or Turkey have any intention of attacking Syria, John Foster Dulles and other American spokesmen have taken the position that the Russian charges may very well be a cover for an intended Russian attack on Turkey, and that if such an attack should develop, the United States will counter with military blows delivered at the Russian heartland.

As Dulles told a press conference on

October 17: "Certainly, if there is an attack on Turkey by the Soviet Union, it would not mean a purely defensive operation by the United States, with the Soviet Union a privileged sanctuary from which to attack Turkey."

And with that felicity of phrase which has so distinguished the present secretary of state, Dulles went on:

"The question was, would I say we are on the brink? And my answer to that is that if anybody studies history, they will find that the world has been always on the brink of war. There have been on an average over the last three or four hundred years, three wars every five years. The great reason why we have had so many wars is that people take it for granted that there isn't going to be any war. They get complacent and do not make the necessary efforts to avoid war. It's only by being conscious of the fact that war is an ever-present danger that you take adequate and effective steps to avoid getting into war."

REAL OBJECTIVE

So, the words on both sides have been hard enough. We are no more inclined to be alarmed by them, that is, to take them seriously, than is the rest of the world. Nevertheless, they cannot be taken as examples of a careless and loose way of self-expression by statesmen, or of signs of mental aberration. The problem is to divine the real motives, the real objectives which are being pursued by both sides under this cloud of bellicose phrases.

Reaching for our trusty back file of LABOR ACTION, we find a strong clue to this war scare in an article in the September 23 issue entitled "Syria: Another Guatemala in the Making?" After de-

(Turn to last page)

New York City Bill Against Discrimination in Housing

A Case Study in Liberal Politics

By SAM BOTTONE

New York—"Little Rock is the shame of the nation. New York's shame is the failure to pass the Sharkey-Brown-Isaacs Bill to outlaw discrimination in housing." This was the introduction to the mass-distributed leaflet calling for a demonstration before City Hall in New York City protesting the failure to pass a fair housing bill.

However, despite the fact that only about 250 were present, the demonstration was a success. Its success was that it was held in spite of the tremendous pressure to have it called off and the defection of some of the early supporters.

What started as a non-partisan attempt to get a fair housing bill passed before the election culminated in a meleé of political pressure and back-stabbing by the Wagner administration and the Democratic machine.

Earlier in the mayoralty campaign Mayor Wagner said that anti-discrimination

in housing "should not be a concern of politics." But when pressure began to be put to get the City Council and the Democratic administration to act, the Mayor pulled all stops out in a campaign to halt the demonstration.

The importance of the Sharkey-Brown-Isaacs Bill goes far beyond the reaches of New York City. It is an important factor in the New York gubernatorial election next year and even spills over into national politics.

The Democrats are on the defensive on civil rights because the Republican

Congress passed a civil rights bill and because the Little Rock situation was provoked by a Democratic governor. The 1956 elections indicated significant shifts of Negro voters in many areas, and it is recognized by many leading Democrats that some counter-measures must be taken to offset Republican gains among minority groups.

On the level of New York State politics, with the governorship up next year, a strong civil rights stand was deemed necessary by Democratic leaders. In 1954, Governor Harriman won by only 11,000 votes. Therefore only a slight shift in the Negro vote would be fatal to Harriman's re-election bid.

The demand for this bill—to prohibit discrimination in renting houses or apartments for reasons of race, religion or national origin—has come not only from Negro and Jewish organizations. In addition the demand to end the de-

(Continued on page 7)

EAST EUROPE:

People Want Socialist Democracy

... page 6

VIETNAM:

Two Studies in U.S. Aid Policy

... page 3

ZHUKOV A Symbol of Crisis

The dramatic "Zhukov" crisis underlines a central fact about the regime in Russia which is of the greatest importance: its continuing instability. Only four months ago one attempt to change the relations of power at the top of the bureaucratic pyramid shook the regime to its foundations. Before the Russian people and world public opinion have had a good chance to catch their breath, the combination which won the victory against Malenkov-Molotov has in turn been shattered.

At the moment, it appears that once again Khrushchev has emerged the victor in the struggle. But from the moment when the world was cryptically informed of Zhukov's demotion till LABOR ACTION's deadline, six days have gone by in which we have been left to guess the actual forces engaged in the struggle, and what the victors will choose to announce about its causes and outcome. The only rational explanation of this delay is that the fight itself raged for that long, or at least that the degree of the victory could not be clearly established for several days.

In concluding an article on Zhukov's role which appeared in the *New York Times Magazine* for

October 6, Harry Schwartz wrote: "But one thing is certain: he [Zhukov] will play a key role in Moscow decisions for the indefinite future. He commands the Soviet army, and any rival in the Kremlin who would like to purge the greatest living Soviet military hero would have to reckon with it."

INDEFINITE FUTURE

That the "indefinite future" may have turned out to be somewhat shorter than Schwartz, or anyone else outside the Kremlin clique may have imagined, does not gainsay the importance of the thought expressed in that paragraph. *Whatever outcome this crisis may prove to have, it is deep and mortally dangerous.* The fact that Khrushchev's method of "informing" the world about what has been going on has been to tell a series of enigmatic jokes and fables proves only the coolness of nerve which his boisterous exterior conceals.

The latest stories, as we go to press, come from a party at the Turkish embassy in Moscow, at which Khrushchev, Bulganin and Mikoyan drank any number of toasts, and when asked about Zhukov told correspondents to go home and have a good night's sleep. And to another reporter who asked about Zhukov, Khrushchev replied: "You know, in life one cell dies and another takes its place, but life goes

(Turn to last page)

VOTE LIBERAL

In the city elections on November 5 the Liberal Party is running 20 independent candidates for City Council out of the twenty-five councilmanic posts open for election. LABOR ACTION urges its readers in New York City to vote for the Liberal Party's independent candidates who will appear only on Row "C."

The LP is also running its own candidate for borough president of the Bronx. Max Bloom is an attorney for the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, and chairman of the Bronx County Liberal Party. His name will also appear only on row "C."

Hoffa Ouster Hailed as First Step Toward a Cleansed Labor Movement

By JACK WILSON

The suspension of the Teamsters Union from the AFL-CIO by the executive council of the parent body signifies that the differences between trade unionism and the corruptive and racketeering influences who mask as unionists are irreconcilable, and that the bona-fide union movement is going to live up to its social responsibility and clean them out.

The action of the council was quite a shock to Jimmy Hoffa, president elect of the Teamsters. George Meany, AFL-CIO president, made it quite plain that a major condition for the Teamsters to re-enter the organized labor movement was the elimination of Hoffa from all posts of leadership: an excellent condition, for as long as Hoffa remains in power in the Teamsters, so long will racketeers, corrupt elements, and fast-buck boys have a haven and a leader who has protected them so ably until the present time. Hoffa was elected president at the rigged convention precisely because he fulfills that function for them. Lightweights like Dave Beck, Frank Brewster and Sidney Brennen were bounced because they were not able to either save themselves or protect others.

A MOCKERY

Any pretensions that what went on at Miami Beach recently might be called a union convention were shattered as more and more of the facts came out on what really occurred. John English, the re-elected secretary-treasurer, admitted in a court affidavit that the election was rigged, with ineligible persons voting for Hoffa. Even the bureaucratic constitution

of the Teamsters was made a mockery of at that gathering.

The boys with the \$300 a week plus expenses pay, plus the shiny black Cadillacs may have thought they were having a good time in reading and then rejecting the AFL-CIO Ethical Practices Committee charges against their corrupt leaders. That's all they understand about unionism. That particular performance was an insult, not only to the AFL-CIO leaders, but to the entire labor movement.

As the Senate rackets committee goes into details of the tie-ups between management, and the Teamster bosses, and the strike-breaking, sweet-heart agreements and sell-outs come to light, the most ardent apologist for either Hoffa or the other Teamsters leaders may find it hard to talk.

The latest rash individual to enter the fray in behalf of the Teamsters is the editor of the *Nation*, who weeps for the lack of labor unity, and pleads against the expulsion of the Teamsters. Among other things, he asks if perhaps Hoffa hasn't learned his lesson. Of course, if Hoffa had it to do over, he would be more careful. That is all.

DIO'S PAL

Perhaps the next time a man like Hoffa won't gloat openly when a journalist like Victor Reisel is blinded. "They should have got him in the hands," Hoffa remarked after the Reisel affair. That is, they should have silenced Reisel for good. Hoffa, among other things, made no bones in Detroit about his friendship with Johnny Dio, after that affair. Dio frequently visited Detroit and was with Hoffa when reporters interviewed Hoffa.

Nor does the *Nation* editor understand that to compromise with racketeering and corruption, in the name of labor unity, would destroy the prestige of the labor movement, as well as individuals like

George Meany and Walter Reuther, which is what many persons want.

In Michigan this week, the United Auto Workers go on trial in federal court on charges of violating the Taft-Hartley Law because, it is claimed, dues money was spent indirectly in financing Guy Nunn's program which has political candidates on it. This is spending money for politics, the federal attorney's claim, and the UAW was indicted.

STRANGE STORY

Strange isn't it. Jimmy Hoffa has openly bragged he has spent lots of dough in the right places to get political influence. Why the evasion by the Senate Committee of that part of Hoffa's career. Or how come three recommended contempt citations in 1954, after the hearings in Detroit in 1953, disappeared or got lost in Congress?

The top labor leaders know about this and many other activities and influences of Jimmy Hoffa. Lacking the power to subpoena records, or otherwise gather evidence, they have utilized the exposés of the Senate committee to build a public case against Hoffa and the Teamster union leaders. They know that with the ranks their moves against Hoffa are popular. Not the least of the reasons why a major section of the AFL wanted labor unity was because they wanted a strong social force like the CIO with them in one organization to make the bloc of decent trade union organizations so strong that the powerful Teamster bosses could be taken on.

The first great accomplishment of labor unity is now before us: The reading of Jimmy Hoffa out of the organized labor movement as represented by its overwhelming bulk united in the AFL-CIO. A cleaner, more democratic, and more union-minded movement is an inevitable result of this necessary purge.

Extent of Corruption in Labor Movement Shows:

Ranks Must Be Rallied to the Fight

By BEN HALL

Now that the Teamsters Union has been suspended from the AFL-CIO, there is speculation about the possibilities of a big split in the labor movement and an internecine war reminiscent of the fight in 1936. The assumption is that unions expelled from the AFL-CIO might unite among themselves and join with those which are now independent into some kind of a rival federation. Behind all this talk there is a huge element of exaggeration. It is hard to imagine any device that could unify all these discordant and diverse groups: Hoffa, John L. Lewis, Building Trades groups, remnants of unions expelled from the CIO, the minor unions under fire for corruption. What could be their rallying cry? Whatever they might hit upon, they would come before the world as a haven for racketeers. Who would want such a label if he could escape it?

Nevertheless, the united labor movement faces a series of separate, hard battles on different levels with a whole group of unions. To clean out ordinary thieves from the labor movement might seem like a primitive task. But the dimensions of the job ahead is only partially indicated by the problem of the giant Teamsters Union.

How widespread is the disease of corruption? A hint of what is involved can be gained by listing some of the unions

already under fire and those which may soon be in the news:

International Longshoremen's Association. Expelled. Its membership is approximately 65,000.

Teamsters. Suspended. Membership 1,400,000.

Bakery Workers. Suspended. Membership 160,000.

United Textile Workers. Suspended. Membership 100,000.

The following three unions were disciplined some time ago:

Distillery Workers Union. On probation for one year. It is now split between two rival executive boards both claiming to represent the union. Membership 35,000.

Allied Industrial Workers. Formerly John Dio's stamping grounds and now presumably in a process of reorganization. Membership 120,000.

Laundry Workers Union. In open defiance of an AFL-CIO order to clean house. Membership 73,000.

IN BACKGROUND

But these are only the unions which have already been formally called to account. There are others, some very powerful, which have remained in the background. For example:

Carpenters Union. Its president, Maurice Hutcheson, was accused of profiting from a crooked land swindle in Indiana. A grand jury did not indict him and others on the grounds that a criminal offense had not been proved. But he refused to answer questions at an investigating committee, taking the Fifth Amendment. He is a member of the highest AFL-CIO Executive Council. But so far, he has not been called to account. It was not surprising that he congratulated Hoffa upon his election and voted against the suspension of the Teamsters. Union membership 800,000.

Operating Engineers. Controls the mammoth-sized machinery that you see erecting big buildings. This union has

spawned some of the most notorious crooks. Joe Fay was one of its products. As far as I know, none of the present international officers have been publicly accused of unethical practices. But some of its locals have been deeply involved. In Nassau County, Long Island, its Local 138 is still run by the DeKoning family; the father, who just died, and son were both convicted of extortion. But the International has done nothing. Let us be generous: it is lax. Membership 200,000.

Hod Carriers Union. This is the union which once went without conventions for some twenty-five years. In brief, it belongs in the same category as the Operating Engineers. We remind our readers that the Hod Carriers, Carpenters, Operating Engineers, and Teamsters are linked nationally by a mutual assistance pact. Membership 433,000.

ADD IT UP

Now, add it up for yourself. Remember that each union represents a separate problem. Racketeering or other unethical practices, are not as deeply implanted in some as in others. Still, you get unions with a total membership of 3,386,000.

Once, these unions could swing the balance in the AFL but now with unity they have been reduced to a minority. Yet, they still wield enormous power. They have a combined membership larger than the whole labor movement before 1936.

We can begin to understand the proportions of the task before the unified labor federation. It can hardly be accomplished merely by adopting resolutions, passing motions, and exerting formal discipline. At some point, the millions of good trade unionists in these and other unions will have to be rallied in the fight for clean, democratic unionism.

LABOR ACTION

A sub is only \$2.00 a year!

READERS TAKE THE FLOOR

Disputes Sputnik Piece

To the Editor:

Comrade Bottone's article on the Sputnik, as well as the box score on page 6 of the October 21 LABOR ACTION inadequately "refuted" those who look at the Russian "moon" as conclusive evidence of the superiority of Russia's social system over capitalism. Both the article and the box failed to deal with the real and more serious arguments advanced by supporters and apologists for Russia's social system; and both were bogged down in superficial analogies.

The articles maintain that these supporters and apologists who claim the Sputnik as proof of Russia's social superiority must, if logic prevails, see the German development of the rocket in 1945 as proof of the superiority of German Nazism over competing social systems, Japan's development of a superior fighter plane in the war as proof of that country's higher social development, America's lead in the production of automobiles as proof of her social superiority, etc., etc.

However, not even Foster, much less a Deutscher, is guilty of the clumsiness attributed to them in LA. In fact the LA article quotes Foster but misses his point. What impresses Foster and the more sophisticated Kremlin apologists is the development made within Russia in the past 30 years. Despite the primitiveness of the Russian economy following the civil war and despite the near obliteration of Russian industry in the Second World War, the Russians have made scientific advances which are possible only on the basis of a technological level that few would have thought possible 30 years ago.

The point that Foster makes—and made much more cleverly by Deutscher—is that within Russia, beginning with the primitiveness of her economy after the civil war, a hypothetical capitalist system would not have been able to achieve these scientific heights, whereas, Russia, with its nationalized economy has been able to accomplish miracles. This argument cannot be answered with facetious analogies to America's lead in automobile production or the Nazi's lead in rocket warfare. If Hitler had taken over an economically devastated nation in 1933, if Germany was saddled with a backward agrarian economy, a low level of technology and a small, uncultured working class then the analogy would have some merit. For under those conditions the emergence in one decade of a powerful mechanized *Wehrmacht* under Hitler and Germany's lead in rocket warfare would have been startling indeed. But as Germany was not the east but the most technologically advanced nation on the European continent before Hitler took power the military-scientific achievements under Nazism are nowhere near as significant as Russia's launching of the satellite.

To effectively answer the arguments of Foster, or Deutscher, or the SWP one must begin with the simple, obvious fact that the advance made in industry and science in Russia is phenomenal. More than that one must recognize that had backward Russia been organized on a capitalist basis some thirty years ago it could not have announced the launching of the satellite, take the lead in developing intermediate and long range intercontinental missiles, fathom the secret of the H-bomb, etc. (I trust that no one will argue that I cannot prove what capitalism in Russia could or could not have achieved because capitalism there was destroyed.)

The Kremlin, with its nationalized economy and totalitarian terror, with its inhuman concentration on heavy industry at the expense of the living standards and freedom of its people has achieved with its social system within what could not have been achieved under a capitalist system within Russia. This does not mean that it is socialist, or progressive or superior to capitalism. But to argue against such conclusion it is not necessary to reduce the Kremlin apologists (Deutscher) or the Kremlin enthusiasts (Foster) to the level of political idiots.

JULIUS FALK

LABOR ACTION 13th YEAR

November 4 1957

Vol. 21, No. 36

Published every other week by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone WATKINS 4-4222—Re-entered as second-class matter July 26, 1957 under the act of March 3, 1874.—Subscription: \$2 a year; \$1 for 6 months.—Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

Editor: GORDON HASKELL
Assoc. Editor: HERMAN BENSON
Business Manager: Mel Stack

Editorial Board:

GORDON HASKELL
HERMAN BENSON

MAX MARTIN
SAM BOTTONE

U. S. AID TO VIETNAM — A BALANCE SHEET

By DAVID HOTHAM
(From The Reporter)

Over the last three years South Vietnam, with a population of eleven million, has received an average of \$260 million yearly in American aid alone, not to mention what it has been getting from France, from the United Nations, from the Colombo Plan countries, and from a dozen small aid organizations of various kinds. The impact of aid from the United States has already been nothing short of spectacular.

One of the most striking successes was the absorption and resettlement of the vast number of refugees from Communist North Vietnam who flooded down across the 17th parallel after the end of the Indo-China war. There were nearly nine hundred thousand of them—coming not over a period of years but over a matter of months. The problem of dealing with this wholesale migration would have been insuperable for the new and unstable government of South Vietnam in its early days, and might well have brought about its downfall. As it was, the transportation, reception, and resettlement of these unfortunate people was probably one of the most efficient exploits of its kind undertaken anywhere in the world. . . .

During the past three years sixty-four per cent of all American aid to South Vietnam has been in the form of budget support used to pay the salaries of the 150,000-man national army. Of the remaining thirty-six per cent about a third has gone to the refugees, leaving twenty-four per cent of the total aid for economic development. Those who justify this priority maintain that in a country like South Vietnam, which is constantly threatened by Communist aggression, there must be no weakness and military needs must come first. . . .

"DEFENSE SUPPORT"

It is clear, however, that strategic thinking is deep-rooted in Washington's view of Southeast Asia. I was much struck recently by a remark made to me by one top American aid administrator in the area. "If I want to put through a new project," he told me, "I call it 'defense support' and not 'economic aid.' It is much more likely to be approved by Washington." If this is the attitude of Washington, it reveals a fatal lack of appreciation of the Asian viewpoint.

What is the aid program doing for South Vietnam? American aid pays for Diem's army. It trains that army and supplies equipment for it. It trains the 14,500-man police force and the forty-seven thousand members of the civil guard, which is equivalent to a sort of rural police. Members of the staff of Michigan State University are schooling Vietnamese officials in many branches of public administration. . . . In addition to all this, more than four-fifth of all South Vietnam's foreign trade depends on the commercial-aid program, putting goods in the shops that the country could not dream of affording if left to itself. . . .

Here is the way the system of commercial aid works. Goods are ordered from abroad by importers in Vietnam and the bill for these is paid to the foreign supplier by Washington. When the goods arrive in Vietnam, the local buyer pays the price of them into a special fund held by the National Bank of Vietnam which is called the Counterpart Fund. This fund, which is in local currency, is used by the American aid mission for aid projects inside the country. . . .

GENERATING COUNTERPART

The Americans maintain that nothing is brought into the country that has not been ordered by importers. The Vietnamese say that the Americans thrust the goods upon them regardless of whether or not there are enough people to consume them. This has given rise, in some anti-American circles, to the old story that the United States forces its surplus commodities on countries like South Vietnam, a story that is supported by the undoubted fact that the South Vietnamese are obliged, under the rules of the

aid program, to buy their flour and their milk in the United States only.

The real reason for the trouble is probably twofold: a lack of contact between American officials and the commercial world, and the peculiarity of the commercial-aid system, which regards the imports not so much as an end in themselves as a means of "generating counterpart." The more imports are brought in, the more money goes into the Counterpart Fund, and the more money is available for aid projects of other kinds. There is thus no incentive, rather the reverse, for American and Vietnamese aid officials to tailor the imports to the country's needs. Yet the material loss is severe and wastage is always demoralizing. . . .

But a much more fundamental question is at issue: How far is American aid helping to develop South Vietnam, in the sense of increasing its productive appa-

ratus, rather than simply freezing the standard of living at a certain level which the population is accustomed to? If the latter, it is a dangerous policy, because if at any time this aid were to be reduced, the pegged standard of living would inevitably fall, with unpredictable consequences. . . .

Most Vietnamese demand insistently that aid to their country should not merely be used to peg existing living standards but to help the country produce for itself, so that it can achieve economic independence. This is a perfectly normal desire on the part of any country. How far then is American aid going in providing new investment for South Vietnam? Certain projects, such as the \$8-million refugee resettlement scheme at Caisan in west Cochinchina, are investments in the sense that they are helping Vietnam to revive its lost rice exports.

(Turn to last page)

Since the departure of the French from South Vietnam, and the installation of the Ngo Dinh Diem government with American backing, Indochina has tended to fall out of the area of attention of socialists and the public generally in America. At the time of the French left, it appeared more than likely that it was only a question of time, and not too much of that, before South Vietnam was Stalinized.

The other day, terrorists hurled bombs at American installations and personnel in Saigon. The Diem government accused the Stalinists of organizing the attack. But whether or not this is true, it is entirely possible that another political crisis or explosion is not far off in Vietnam.

We believe readers of LABOR ACTION will find the following information useful in their analysis of political developments in Vietnam. The article by Sol Sanders is reprinted in full from the Postwar World Council Newsletter. It seeks to place the Diem regime in relation to developments in North Vietnam. We have also excerpted extensively from an article by David Hotham which appeared in the September 19, 1957 The Reporter which deals with the character and impact of American economic aid to the Diem regime.

The Vietnam Picture And a Review of U.S. Policy

By SOL SANDERS
From Post-War World Council Newsletter

Inflation was avoided. The back of the Banque de l'Indochine's control on the economy was broken; South Vietnam is today in the dollar rather than the franc zone and the profits of French investments are not being repatriated at outrageous exchange rates. Security has been established throughout the South where for nine years French army units had to travel in convoy. Ricefields are beginning to produce in something like normal quantities; there may even be a rice export surplus this year although still far from the two million tons which made Indochina the biggest rice exporter in the Orient prewar.

But there is a dark side. Little progress has been made toward setting up a democratic state. Power is monopolized by Diem, personally, and by members of his family who control most of the principal posts of the government. One suspects that there is no national spirit except a purely negative anti-Communist sentiment, a mulled over anti-French and anti-Chinese nationalism. The newspapers are tightly controlled. The jails are full of prisoners, perhaps large numbers of Communist agents but also, most likely, people whose only crime is to oppose the Diem regime.

AN EXPLANATION

Diem has an explanation for this state of affairs. He argues that, after all, Vietnam is still a country at war. He argues that so long as his countrymen in the North live under Chinese and Communist tyranny, the Saigon regime has no choice but to maintain its 15 American-equipped divisions in readiness to repel external aggression and to take all precautions to insure internal security.

The fact is that one of the reasons that the regime in the South looks so good is what has happened in the North. Ho Chi Minh fell heir to the most important part of the country. Hanoi has for centuries been the cultural and economic heart of the country. The North had the beginnings of the industrial nucleus which the French had developed: coal, mining, and timber. An intangible quality is the aggressive and disciplined nature of the Vietnamese of the North, where through the centuries the battle to eke out a living on the plains of the Red River has formed a tough, practical, industrious character.

But Ho had one big handicap: The North has been food-deficit country always. Its rapidly growing population has always had to be fed from the ricefields of the South which produced all the ex-

portable surplus prewar. Furthermore, the Chinese Communists have had their own problems. Not only have they demanded a pound of flesh for their arms aid during the fight against the French before Dien Bien Phu, but they have defaulted on their propaganda to aid the Communist regime once it was installed in Hanoi. Only the building of railroads, used to take Vietnamese raw materials like coal and wolfram, connecting the Red River Valley and southern China, have been completed on schedule. Nor have the Russians come through with the \$100 million loan they promised Ho after "liberation."

NO OUTSIDE AID

At the same time that external aid has not been forthcoming, Ho has had difficulties at home. Communist Party Boss Dang Xuan Khu, a sort of Vietnamese Khrushchev, tightened the belt on the peasants to such an extent that last fall revolts broke out. It's still not clear how bad they were. But they caused a temporary letdown in the super-Stalinist structure of the Vietnamese regime.

Thus de-Stalinization finally reached Hanoi. There was a great confession of illegal repression and Ho, who had been somewhat eclipsed in recent years by the ambitious Dang Xuan Khu, resumed his role as a moderate national Communist, one he has carefully cultivated for French Socialists and other non-Communist leftists. However, there is some evidence to indicate that the softening of the regime has been only temporary and that a return to rigid police-state methods has come about in the last few months. Apparently Ho has no other choice than classic Stalinist exploitation since he can expect no aid from the Russians and only slight help from Peking.

All this has made the relative prosperity of the South look good. But there's little doubt that the air in Saigon is deceptive. Diem has neither provided the kind of psychological inspiration an Asian national revolution demands of its leadership nor has he given the country the cue toward getting out of its economic dependence on the U. S. There is talk of a rice surplus, of moving into a period when the country can export enough rice to fill the gap between the revenues of the regime and its costs. What's needed is about \$200 million annually.

United States aid administrators and the State Department representatives have not filled, nor could they be expected to fill this vacuum. The program of relief for the refugees seems to have been fairly well administered; that is, no

such graft as was considered normal in Nationalist China before 1949 has come to light although there are many rumors. But there has been no progress beyond the relief stage; nothing in the way of a long-term program has been worked out.

A PRAGMATIST

Diem approaches the problem of economic development with at least one factor in his favor. He is a pragmatist, not an economic nationalist and has no preconceived notions about what kind of economy must be built. His advisors, principally Wolf Ladejinsky of Japanese and security-problems fame, have told him that the country is primarily an agricultural economy and must remain so.

One principal agricultural problem is the necessity for land reform. Ladejinsky apparently has made little headway toward effecting any real solution here since Diem has not felt strong enough, despite his authoritarian regime, to tackle the landlords. Nor is it certain that he understands the urgency of solving this problem in combatting the phony reformism promised by the Communists.

One cannot help feel that more enlightened leadership in Washington might help provide the kind of program that could build a genuinely democratic and therefore stable state in South Vietnam, awaiting that day which all Vietnamese yearn for when the unity of the country can be reestablished. Diem could be encouraged to take the chance of reconciliation with former French puppets, as he has sometimes done with former Communists, allowing other political forces to form, and thereby creating a decentralization of power. It is hard to believe that a free press in the South could destroy the state so long as the U. S.-equipped army stands between it and the Communists. That kind of freedom would create an atmosphere which could rival the fanaticism of the North, it would create the only kind of political offensive which can in the long run win out against the combination of reformism and xenophobia masquerading as Asian Communism.

If that kind of policy is not pursued at Saigon, U. S. policymakers can be assured that the present regime has reached its zenith, that one day young Vietnamese may attack the embassy in Saigon with the same kind of hysterical nihilism that has shocked us and shown the utter bankruptcy of American policy in Formosa. A South Vietnamese regime, which does not go forward to more freedom, and to economic progress, can only decay.

U. of Chicago Activity Sign-up Shows Campus Political Revival

The beginnings—but only the beginnings—of the long-awaited student “thaw” in political life were in evidence as the University of Chicago began its new term. Activity night was one sign; campus controversy another.

As a sign of the recent situation, there were fewer groups with tables at activity night. There were token exhibits on the part of the Young Democrats and the Young Republicans, and a table from the Peace Center, an organization loosely affiliated with the American Friends Service Committee and chiefly concerned with the problem of the H-bomb. The most lively table, and this was a sign of the new developments which are occurring, was that of the NAACP.

CONTROVERSIES

The politics of democratic socialism were also very much in the forefront at the meeting. The Young Socialist League and the Young People's Socialist League both had exhibits of their work and activities. But most heartening was the fact that the Politics Club was re-established on the Chicago campus. This is a group whose “purpose is to bring together liberals, socialists and pacifists in order to explore alternatives to capitalism and Communism and in general to advance the ideas and program of democracy.” The Politics table displayed the club's own literature along with copies of *Anvil*, *Dissent*, the *American Socialist*, *Liberation*, *LABOR ACTION*, *Universities and Left Review* and *Mankind*. The Club has already arranged meetings featuring Norman Thomas, A. J. Muste, Max Shachtman, Bert Cochran, Irving Howe, David Hereshoff, I. F. Stone, William Worthy, Ralph Helstein, Pete Hoban, B. J. Widdick, Carl Shier and Dorothy Day.

The Politics Club received an excellent response to its presentation. The first organizational meeting was attended by 25 students representing a broad range of student political opinion.

Two controversies have also figured in Chicago campus life as the term began.

One involved an attack in the Chicago *Maroon*, signed Franc-Tiereur, which took off against “Aristotle Schwartz,” Chicago's legendary and mythical student intellectual. The criticism decried the fact that Aristotle hates football, despises the “vulgar attributes of a healthy body,” dresses poorly and carries a guitar instead of a tennis racket. The piece was entitled “Portrait of the Intellectual as a Young Phony,” and contained obvious elements of truth as well as a one-sided presentation of the question. The author himself admitted the next week that only the Joe College set had been made happy by the crusade against Aristotle Schwartz.

The following week saw a counter-attack by those who wished to defend the role and function of the student intellectual and bristling remarks about the Joe College crew. Franc-Tiereur himself retracted saying that in comparison with the Joe Colleges “I would stick with Aristotle Schwartz.” While “Aristotle's flaw is that he took too seriously the external trappings of intellectualism and liberalism,” he need not try to redeem himself by flying “to the camp of the anti-intellectuals and anti-liberals. He need only start thinking on his own.”

The second controversy was more serious. The campus chapter of the NAACP questioned the administration about thirteen allegations concerning discrimination practiced at the U of C or in property under its control. The letter was moderate in tone, remarking that “we hope the administration will take this opportunity to prove the allegation false.” Two replies met this query. One was a vicious poem attacking the NAACP and beginning “Heil, NAACP.” The other was a longer letter signed by “M. R.” which attacked the campus chapter on several grounds, among them that it was the Negro's fault that he was discriminated against. At this point, the issue has been posed sharply, and we can expect further debate and controversy on the U of C campus over this very important issue.

Denitch Tour: Berkeley Meetings Fruitful

By A. L.

Bogdan Denitch, national field representative of the YSL, last week concluded a highly successful stay at the University of California, Berkeley—one stop on his current country-wide tour.

Over 300 students heard Denitch speak on “The Crisis in Civil Rights” at a Sather Gate street meeting. His audience was serious, friendly — characteristics which indicate a new attitude to dissenting ideas. Denitch stressed at this meeting the role that students could play in furthering the struggle for civil rights. Why is it, Denitch asked the students, that in no other country but America are students “silent” on crucial national issues.

On opening the meeting to discussion, one student asked, “What can we as students actually do to make ourselves heard?” Denitch answered that by joining the NAACP and by joining with other campuses throughout the country, students would be adding to the public pressure on politicians to end Jim Crow in the United States. Denitch pointed out the need for a major political re-alignment.

Denitch again addressed over 200 students at a Sather Gate street meeting on the crisis in Syria. He called for the

YSL Tour Makes New Friends In Pacific Northwest Area

The Fall YSL tour to the West Coast has brought the message of democratic socialism to areas in the Pacific Northwest never before reached by the organization.

At the beginning of the month, YSL National Field Representative Bogdan Denitch spoke at Reed College in Portland, Oregon, on “The Russian Bloc Since Stalin.” The meeting was sponsored by the Young Political Innocents, a new student group at Reed who presented Denitch as their very first speaker. An hour long discussion period demonstrated once again that Reed has long been a center of political sophistication and that the new club was perhaps named with tongue bursting through cheek.

After speaking at Reed, Denitch addressed the Portland Open Forum on “Disarmament and the H-Bomb.” A sizable section of the audience was made up of sympathizers of the Communist Party, and they reacted more in the old CP fashion than according to the new line. One person took a sharp attitude toward the CP's current position saying, “I never thought I'd see the Communist Party put its tail between its legs and run from reaction!” As a result of the political make-up of the audience, most of the discussion centered on the question of the nature of the cold war and, in particular, the role of Russia in it.

A few days later, Denitch addressed the first public meeting of the Seattle Unit of the YSL. About forty persons attended an off-campus meeting on the “Liberal Failure on Civil Rights.” About two thirds of the audience then came to the YSL social held the next night, and the result of Denitch's activity in the area has been to bring the Seattle YSL Unit back into activity.

One of the most interesting events of Denitch's Northwest swing was a debate held in Seattle under the auspices of the

Socialist Workers Party. Denitch was on a program with Ann Dorsey of the SWP and Ron Ginther, a former LYLER. Mrs. Dorsey's remarks were in favor of a broad socialist youth movement unaffiliated to any adult group. Denitch made a much more specific speech. He outlined the requirements for a revitalization of the socialist youth movement, arguing that it must be a broad democratic socialist organization, unambiguously dedicated to the support of democracy everywhere and therefore opposed to Russian totalitarianism. Ginther more or less agreed with Mrs. Dorsey's presentation, though he specifically alluded to the “broad and unaffiliated” youth group which the Socialist Workers Party is currently trying to establish. He also rejected Denitch's demand that the new movement take an unambiguous stand for democracy everywhere, arguing that there were still many valuable people in the Communist movement who were not ready to oppose Russian totalitarianism.

During the discussion, there was a lively exchange on various topics raised during the presentations. An SWPer attacked Denitch's characterization of Russia as imperialist, arguing that there was nothing in Lenin's description of imperialism which justified this attribution. Denitch replied that the fact of Russia exporting its social system on the points of bayonets was proof enough for him.

There was also a revealing discussion of socialist youth regroupment. A YSLer in the audience pointed out that the SWP conception perpetuates all of the worst features of the present sectarian existence of the socialist movement, that a “forum” approach, with its inbuilt characteristic of competing tendencies and without a program in favor of democracy everywhere, would not really aid in the long run to winning youth to a real socialist commitment. A student in the audience then spoke and said that he felt that the SWP was more interested in “theoretical clarity,” given its conviction in the correctness of its views, while the YSL was concerned with reaching out to new elements who had not previously had any experience with the socialist movement.

Challenge will report in future issues on other aspects of Comrade Denitch's tour, and also will carry coverage on George Rawick's recently concluded mid-western tour. Still another YSL tour, by Michael Harrington, YSL national chairman, is now being planned for mid-November.

University of Chicago

Wednesday, Nov. 6, 8:00 P.M.

BOGDAN DENITCH

“What This Country Needs Is A New Foreign Policy”

Ida Noyes Hall

Anvil Forum Committee of Roosevelt University

Thursday, Nov. 7, 7:30 P.M.

BOGDAN DENITCH

The Middle East Crisis

430 S. Michigan Ave.

Saturday, Nov. 9, 9:00 P.M.

A Revolutionary Party

Refreshments Music Fun

At the Meiers', 1343 E. 50th St.

ARE YOU FROM

New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Buffalo, Albany, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, St. Louis, Denver, Los Angeles, Albuquerque, San Francisco, Seattle or Portland?*

DO YOU WANT

to fight for socialism on the campus and in the youth movement?

THEN CONTACT

the YSL Unit or Organizing Committee in your area, or write to

YSL
114 W. 14th Street
New York, N. Y.

*If you're not from any place where we are, start us where you are. Write to the above address.

Help SP-SDF in California To Break Up the Ballot Monopoly

(The following communication has been received from Local Los Angeles, SP-SDF. We are glad to bring it to the attention of our readers.—Ed.)

There is a tendency in American political life toward the establishment of a ballot monopoly by the two old capitalist parties and to rule minority parties, particularly the Socialist Party, off the ballot.

Conditions for maintenance of a place on the ballot for the Socialist Party are constantly made more difficult and to secure a place on the ballot made nearly impossible by state legislators, themselves Democrats and Republicans.

This is anti-democratic and dangerous to all social progress, which nearly always stems from third parties, starting as minority parties.

In California, the Socialist Party is fighting this threat to social progress and for a full and free suffrage by contesting the constitutionality of the California ballot law, which effectually bars all minority political parties from the ballot. Hence, a court victory by the Socialist Party will be not for itself alone, but for all minority political groups.

The American Civil Liberties Union has endorsed our case, and a splendid group of attorneys, headed by A. L. Wirin, is counsel.

The Supreme Court of California has, in an unusual move, recognized the importance of the constitutional questions raised by the case, in granting a hearing, on our appeal, without awaiting a ruling by an intermediate appellate court. It has set

the case for oral argument in Los Angeles on October 14th.

In the event of an adverse decision in the case by the California courts, an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States is being planned. To carry the case through the courts, funds are urgently needed, for court costs, printing charges and other expenses. Our present minimum budget is \$2,500. We need your help. A free and unfettered ballot can be secured—one not dominated and controlled by the defenders of the economic and political status quo, who wish to prohibit all social protest and social advance from being voiced via the ballot.

Give as much as you can to continue the fight for a real democracy. Make your check payable to the Free Ballot Committee, 1904 S. Arlington, Room 209, Los Angeles 18, California.

WILLIAM BRIGGS, state chairman, Socialist Party, SDF, California.

FROM THE PERIODICALS

What Page Do You Read?

"A somewhat serious lapse [in Solomon Adler's book *The Chinese Economy*] is the flat assertion that the 'second' agrarian revolution in China has been 'entirely peaceful.' No radical change in China is ever entirely peaceful. Evidence from the Communists' own files covering the liquidation of private individual production in the land would modify this belief."

Edgar Snow in *Monthly Review*, October 1957, page 192

"Cooperation among the [Chinese] peasants has caught on very well, without the least show of force on the part of the state."

D. D. Kosambi in *Monthly Review*, October 1957, page 199

Fairy Tales for Adults

"Under such circumstances, why are the police much less in evidence in new China than in most other countries, including the United States and the USSR?"

AHMED BEKHAT

It is with deepest sorrow that we pass on to the readers of LABOR ACTION the following item from the *New York Times* for October 29:

"Ahmed Bekhat, 27-year-old secretary of the French Federation of the Union of Algerian Workers, which adheres to the moderate Algerian National Movement was slain in a Paris suburb Sunday,

presumably by terrorists of the National Liberation Front."

Ahmed Bekhat wrote the article on the proposed "framework bill" for Algeria which appeared in LABOR ACTION on October 7. The assassination campaign conducted by the FLN against political opponents can only harm the great cause for which they fight.

Why is there no counterpart to the Un-American Activities Committee, no witch-hunt in any form? All criticism is carefully studied, and sincerely welcomed. People are now genuinely free to express any political opinion they like, including the belief that capitalism is superior to socialism. If they wish to study the speeches of Chiang Kai-shek, scrupulously accurate versions will be provided so that the reader can judge for himself what Chiang's ideas of democracy really meant. This freedom does not extend to certain types of action. The possible lover of capitalism is not free to practice its most rapidly profitable aspects, to indulge in black-marketing, adulteration of goods, opium smuggling, and such unso-called activities."

(D. D. Kosambi in *Monthly Review*)

How about the right to grow "poisonous ideological weeds" where only flowers should bloom?

New NI Issue Out

A new issue of *The New Internationalist* is off the press, one that is particularly stimulating. The lead article is a lengthy analysis by Max Shachtman of the recent purge which stripped Molotov, Malenkov, Shepilov and Kaganovich of their authority. The analysis is made especially relevant as a result of the most recent sensational development—the demotion, or attempted demotion, of Marshall Zhukov. Written before the Zhukov demotion, Comrade Shachtman's article discusses the unprecedented authority the professional military bureaucracy has won, the likely conflict between this bureaucracy and the ruling Communist Party hierarchs and the possibility that the military would move to establish a military dictatorship in Russia in face of the increasingly apparent inability of the Party-dominated Politbureau to organize a stable regime.

Shachtman's analysis is supplemented by another article written by the same author shortly after Stalin's death. In "Bureaucratic Collectivism: Two Eras," Shachtman discusses the class nature of Russian society and the probable changes that would be wrought by Stalin's death. It is a concise theoretical exposition of the views of the ISL on the subject, and it is interesting to see how operating on the basis of his analysis, Shachtman's predictions of post-Stalin reforms—and their limitations—have been borne out by events of the past four years.

The issue is by no means consumed with the "Russian Question." H. W. Benson in his article "Unions, Racketeers and Senators" probes the Senate committee probes. Their findings are discussed and motives examined. Moving from politics to economics, T. N. Vance offers a penetrating critique of John Strachey in which the British economist is taken to task for his "Amalgam of Marx and Keynes."

As a special feature the *NI* has translated—and printed for the first time in English—an essay written by the Hungarian intellectual George Lukacs in 1919, "What Is Orthodox Marxism?" This Marxist classic is prefaced with an introduction by Michael Harrington.

Rounding out the issue are a number of shorter items of interest.

JUST OUT

New Internationalist

A New Stage in The Russian Crisis, By Max Shachtman • *What Is Orthodox Marxism?* By G. Lukacs • *Unions, Racketeers and Senators*, By H. W. Benson • *An Amalgam of Marx and Keynes*, By T. N. Vance.

50 cents

114 W. 14th Street, New York 11, N.Y.

Young Socialist CHALLENGE

Undercover Man Flubs in Berkeley

Campus Meeting Attracts Camera Fiend

The following item is reprinted in full from the October 22 issue of the *Daily Californian*, published by the Associated Students of the University of California. The article was accompanied by a photograph of the undercover man in the act of taking a picture, with the caption under it "QUIS CUSTODIEST IPSOS CUSTODES? (Who's going to watch the watchers?)"—Ed.

By PAT LYNDEN

On Friday there was a street meeting—everyone was there.

The speaker, Bogdan Denitch, spoke about the Syria-Turkey crisis. He is a Socialist.

It came to the attention of a few persons attending the meeting that a young gentleman, happy faced and clean cut, was wandering about through the crowd, carrying a briefcase. The briefcase had a little hole in one end of it. The man had one hand stuck down inside the zipper of his briefcase and he kept fiddling.

Pretty soon the man began attracting all sort of attention. A couple of people even pointed and giggled.

This apparently embarrassed him very much so he went away. One University student who was very curious followed the man. The student said that he walked down the street to a Ford car and put his briefcase inside. Then, according to the student, he took a camera out of his briefcase and came back toward the crowd that was listening to the socialist speaker.

Then he started taking pictures of everyone around. A *Daily Californian* reporter approached him and inquired:

"Excuse me sir, why are you taking all those pictures?"

"I like to take pictures, it's my hobby."

"Why did you have your camera in your briefcase before?"

"I had my books in the briefcase. Is that all right with you?"

"Are you a student?"
"No."
"Why are you here?"
"I told you, I like to take pictures."
"Why doesn't your car have any registration, and how come you have a police radio?"
"I didn't come in a car, I came by streetcar."
"But we saw you put your briefcase in a car—it was a federal car wasn't it?—and we saw you take . . ."

"Did you touch that car?"
"Why? Is it your car? We thought you came by streetcar."

"I did—the car belongs to a friend of mine—did you go inside or touch anything?"

"What difference does it make? It's not your car."

"What's your name?"

"We didn't touch anything. We want to know why you were taking pictures through your briefcase at first, and why you put your briefcase in a federal car."

"Mind your business."

"We're sort of interested in what security agents do. Would you give us an interview?"

"No."

Then the man left. When he got to the corner he started to cross the street to the car. But he saw that some students had followed him, so he crossed the street in the opposite direction and got on a bus going west.

Some thought that maybe he was from the Burns committee. (The Burns committee is a California state investigating committee. They generally investigate for subversion. The legislature gave the committee \$50,000 this year to go around to college campuses.) The Burns committee is scheduled to come to this campus sometime in the near future.

TASC (Toward an Active Student Community), a student political party organized last semester, condemned "photography of or taking names of observers of Sather Gate street meetings by public or private agencies for the purpose of discrimination against those individuals as a violation of rights of freedom of speech and freedom of assembly." The resolution was passed at the TASC meeting yesterday.

"Can't we even listen to a speech anymore without being watched?" one student asked.

University of Chicago POLITICS CLUB

Monday, November 11
8:00 P.M.

WILLIAM WORTHY

One of three U.S. Newsmen who visited China against State Department orders will report on his trip and show films he made while in China.

Room 122 Social Science Bldg.

Sunday, November 17
8:00 P.M.

IRVING HOWE

Editor of *Dissent*

MORTON KAPLAN

Assist. Prof. of Pol. Sci., U. of Chicago

DAVID HERRESHOFF

Carnegie Fellow, U. of Minn., contributor to *American Socialist*

Discussing Milovan Djilas' book

THE NEW CLASS

Room 122 Social Science Bldg.

Harrison Salisbury Reports and Proposes a "Third Force" Policy

The Peoples of East Europe Want DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISM

By LARRY O'CONNOR

An Eastern Europe straining toward democratic socialism, and a policy designed to foster the creation of a neutralized "third force" area lying between Russia and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization powers in Western Europe. That is what Harrison Salisbury, New York Times correspondent and expert on the Communist world saw on a recent tour of all the satellites but East Germany, and what he returned to advocate at the conclusion of a series of articles in his paper.

"Riots in the streets of Warsaw," wrote Salisbury, "the Bulgarian rock 'n' roll craze, Alabama still living in the age of Stalinism, the quiet Czechs, the quieter Hungarians (their quiet etched in bitter hatred), the eccentric Yugoslavs, the contented Rumanians—this is Eastern Europe today.

"The common note is change. The hallmark is diversity. And in country after country beneath a thin authoritarian crust there is instability—political, economic or both."

"In this instability lies the danger of chronic crisis and possible war. The danger of the aimless rioting of apolitical youths in Warsaw or of rhythmic outbreaks in Bulgaria lies not in the acts themselves but in the fact that they are symptoms of deep frustration."

Although Salisbury does not spell it out too clearly, the frustration lies in the universal hatred of Communism and of the Russian overlords of the satellites, coupled with a feeling of helplessness to get out from under their domination.

Sole Common Denominator

"Today the only coherence given to the areas is provided," Salisbury writes, "by geopolitics. Eastern Europe is and remains a forepost of the Soviet Union's defenses. The Soviet Army is the sole common denominator in a diverse area."

The countries of Eastern Europe remain poor. Workers live in direct poverty, and what economic development has taken place is based on the ruthless exploitation of labor and is subordinated to the control as well as interests of Moscow. With the liquidation of the collective farms in some countries, and a let-up of the pressure on the peasants in others, the peasants tend to be better off, on the whole, than the workers in these "socialist" states. It is from these conditions that the disillusionment with and hatred for the Stalinists regime stems. As Salisbury writes:

"Only by visiting in rapid succession the capitals of Belgrade, Tirana, Sofia, Bucharest, Budapest, Prague and Warsaw does one see the full impact of the revolution against communism.

"This does not mean that the literate spokesmen of these countries reject socialism or a socialist society. For most of them this is still the ideal. But they want a socialism founded on democracy morality, principles and concern for man.

"The writers, the poets, the playwrights, the artists, the scientists and the students, the men and women capable of using their minds, have turned violently against Stalinist-style, police-supported regimes. . . ."

And Salisbury continues:

"What the West must remember about this process, a shrewd observer said recently in Warsaw, is that all of this started inside the Communist party. The sharpest critics are Communists or men closely associated with communism.

"The process of evolution or revolution is occurring within the Communist movement because that is where the best minds of these countries have been assembled by force of circumstances. . . ."

"For the fact is that the Communist myth in Eastern

Europe, never strongly established, seems broken beyond repair. This becomes apparent when even the writers of Czechoslovakia, as calm and conventional as any of their countrymen quietly explain why Poland and Hungary revolted.

"The basic reason, they say, was the widening disparity between the Communist word and the Communist deed; between what was said in the novels, the plays and the newspapers about life in those countries and the actual life of the people."

U.S. Popular in East Europe

Salisbury writes at length about the popularity which the United States continues to enjoy behind the Iron Curtain. This popularity, he explains, is "the obverse side of Soviet unpopularity. In no case can it be attributed to United States policy or United States propaganda."

In a word, the people of Eastern Europe are convinced that Russia is their main enemy, and hence look to the United States with wistful longing. A strong analogy could be made between this attitude toward America in the Russian empire, and the attitude toward Russia in countries which are still, or have just recently emerged from domination by capitalist imperialism.

But where is it all leading . . . and where should it lead, in the best interest of America and of the peoples of the area? At this point, of course, Salisbury is leaving the area of interpretive description and going into one of political analysis. He comes out flatly for the idea that present American policy has been sterile, or worse, and that the maximum the United States can hope to achieve, or to assist in achieving, is a neutral, "third force" area in Eastern Europe. Here is his reasoning on it:

"Creation of a neutral or quasi-neutral force lying between the Soviet Union and the American-allied states of Western Europe would serve as a major deterrent to war. It would reduce tension in a traditionally inflammable area and 'roll back' Soviet influence much more effectively than the flamboyant words of some Western political orators. . . ."

"A chameleon-like transformation of Eastern Europe from a Soviet defense position to a neutralized force, independent in world politics, such as Marshal Tito envisages, would not be easy. It will be impossible without rational rethinking of United States policy and the evolution of an American program based on mutual self-interest that emphasizes friendship, inter-relations, mutual interests, steadily strengthening contacts."

And he tries to develop the implications of such a policy as concretely as he can as follows:

No Drift Back to "Stalinism"

"There is no assurance, of course, that the present somewhat relaxed Soviet policy toward East Europe will endure. But there is no sign anywhere in the area of a Soviet drift back toward the sterile methods of Stalinism. . . ."

"Most observers in East Europe believe that only a profound threat to Soviet security, possibly new violent uprisings like those in Poland and Hungary a year ago, would move Soviet policy into harsh channels.

"This suggests that bitter-end opposition in Moscow would not be aroused by a slow and quiet drift of East European states toward a more moderate position, particularly if it was accomplished under the mentorship of Yugoslavia and with the encouragement of India and Egypt. . . ."

"There is some reason to believe that China would throw her influence against interference by Moscow in such a trend so long as Soviet military security was not jeopardized.

"In such a situation the role of United States policy becomes paramount.

"In most of Eastern Europe, American policy can base itself upon a sturdy foundation of pro-American sentiment bulwarked by anti-Russian and anti-Communist feeling.

"But to be effective United States influence must be exercised through these channels where power actually exists—through the cultivation of friendly contacts with Communist rulers, closer association with opinion-making members of the intelligentsia, training and technical guidance of the new technological cadres. Soft rather than hard sell is clearly indicated."

The ideas set forth here are not, of course, unique with Salisbury. They represent a view which, interestingly enough, finds supporters in virtually every section of the political spectrum all over the world, from ardent

Stalinoids to ardent supporters of capitalism, and not excluding a goodly sector of the world socialist movement.

A Rope of Many Strands

In the rope of Salisbury's argument there are many strands. The explicit and implicit ones are skilfully intertwined, and often one strand fades imperceptibly into another, and at times the whole rope loses any clear outline. It may be of some use for the clarification of thought on this whole complex of problems to separate out some of the strands and describe them in blunt, clear-cut terms.

The first point which Salisbury and his co-thinkers accept without explanation is the assumption that any drastic change in the political-economic systems of the satellites constitutes a "threat to Soviet military security." Hence, it is to be avoided, as the reaction against it by the Russians could lead to their resumption of a "hard" policy toward the satellites. Proof: Hungary.

Actually, of course, the dramatic and violent nature of the Hungarian revolution lent a semblance of accuracy to this idea. But if the Polish revolution, let us say, were to proceed by less dramatic, more gradual means to the granting of real political rights of organization and advocacy to rival political parties, in a word, to effective, operational democratic socialism, would the Russian rulers regard such a development as any less of a threat to their "security."

The answer is clearly no, even though it may well be true that a gradual development would give the Russians even less of a publicly acceptable pretext for intervening militarily than they had in Hungary. But the danger to them of the success of the Hungarian revolution was not that it impaired their military security (from what side?), but rather that it undermined their political position both at home and throughout Eastern Europe.

A second assumption is that what inhibits the development toward more democracy in most of the satellites is one and only one thing: Russia's military might. The resistance to such development inside the satellite countries by the ruling class in each is minimized, and the reason for this is clear enough. Salisbury and his co-thinkers regard the development of real democracy for the people in this area as a utopian dream, and a dangerous one at that. The maximum to which the peoples of the area can and should aspire, in the present circumstances, is to a status such as that of the Yugoslavs under Tito, more or less. Hence the tendency to justify and excuse Gomulka's crack-down on democracy in Poland on the ground that this is necessary to re-create a solid, stable party base for himself.

Tito Is the Model

Why should this be accepted and encouraged by a writer for the pro-capitalist New York Times? Because only thus can Gomulka rule Poland with a firm hand (stability, law and order) and at the same time, move toward a strong degree of independence from Russia in the field of foreign policy. Tito is the model.

This is also the assumption behind the attacks on any policy aimed at stimulating and encouraging popular resistance against the Communist regimes in any of these countries which runs through Salisbury's series. (Not that we hold any brief for the form or content of the Voice of America or Radio Free Europe propaganda.) For what must be aimed at is not real democracy, real civil liberties, real popular government, all of which imply a revolution, violent or peaceful, sudden or drawn-out, against the regimes. Such a revolution might "provoke" Russian intervention, and thus defeat the goal of Salisbury's policy: a cordon of National Stalinist regimes surrounding Russia.

And finally, of course, is the idea that though the regimes in the satellites are shaky, the Russian regime itself is stable and powerful. That is the fundamental conception which lies behind all the others, and which sets the limits of the policy Salisbury advocates. And if that assumption is really unassailable, even by such a powerful political force as successful revolution (quick or slow) in Eastern Europe, it is true that many of the other assumptions built into Salisbury's analysis gain in validity.

No Revolution in Russia

Although no one can demand that a writer commenting on a trip through Eastern Europe also express himself on the solidity and durability of the Russian regime, it might not be presumptuous to guess that the idea of a popular revolution for real democracy in Russia is just as alien to the conceptual world of Salisbury as is that of revolutions in the satellites. He operates in a world in which "the men and women capable of using their minds" are mostly, and rightfully in power, and the rest of the herd should limit its aspirations to goals and methods which will make the world safer and more comfortable for such people on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

Salisbury's observations and ideas, as expressed in this series are important. He sees countries in a process of upheaval and political turmoil with democratic socialism the conscious objective of the main political currents which are undermining Stalinism. He, like so many other advocates of "third force" or neutralist ideas, from the bourgeois and Stalinist or Stalinoid camps, would like to see these currents channeled and tamed into courses which put the danger of war farther off. To ward off the danger of war is an objective which we share. But the real forces at work in the anti-Stalinist revolution are far too vast and powerful to be limited to such a goal. They strive for the liberation of mankind.

Read and subscribe to

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

America's Leading Marxist Magazine

50 cents

\$2.00 a year

New York City Housing Bill — —

(Continued from page 1)

facto school segregation runs smack into the Negro and Puerto Rican ghettos in New York City.

Therefore considerable support was present, on paper, for the enactment of this important piece of legislation. And when Mayor Wagner introduced it last May, it appeared that it would have little difficulty in getting by the City Council. A certain amount of opposition was expected from the real estate interests but it was not expected to prove too serious.

But the well-laid plans went awry. Instead of being a means of rallying liberal and labor forces to support of the Democratic ticket, it became a divisive force when Mayor Wagner and the Democratic-controlled City Council buckled under the attack of the racists real estate boards.

However, this did not prevent most liberals and trade unionists from supporting the Democratic ticket. The least expected was that it would jolt some of the complacency in liberal circles. Instead with relatively minor distinction, a double standard of morality has been erected—one for the South and another for the North.

Now in New York City those active in the attempt to pass a law to end housing discrimination have experienced a taste of what the pressure must be in the South. If a southern liberal like Governor Faubus of Arkansas could become an instrument in the hands of the reactionary forces in the South, even though acknowledging the inevitability of integration, we can see the magnitude of the retreat on the part of the liberal mayor of New York who has a great deal to gain when confronted with a significant opposition to housing integration.

It is not surprising that New York has taken the lead in the entire country in progressive legislation toward the elimination of racial and religious discrimination and bigotry. It has happened for no other reason than that it makes good local politics since the idealism of the politicians in New York is neither above nor below that for the rest of the country.

DEMOCRATIC TEST

But the test of the determination to carry through legislation furthering democracy comes when it runs into opposition. It is at this point that the Wagner administration proved itself to be weakened and vacillating when confronted with a concerted drive by the reactionary real estate boards in the city.

It would be safe to say that if the real estate board, representing as it does only a small minority as an organization, were the only articulate opposition then the fact that all liberal and labor organizations are for the bill would have been enough to carry the day. But it is no secret to those aware of the real situation that the opposition is much more widespread.

It extends to hundreds of thousands of small property owners and even to larger numbers of white tenants. In New York City racial barriers are only partially broken down in employment and the professions. There are no laws enforcing segregation, and the weight of the city government is against such discrimination. But it is also a fact that a large minority—if not a majority of New Yorkers—many of whom are part of minority groups often discriminated against themselves—are not for integrated housing of Negroes and whites.

When the real estate boards called for a letter-writing campaign against the bill, they tapped this reservoir of racial bias and bigotry. A veritable avalanche of letters opposing the bill descended on City Hall outnumbering the pro-civil rights letters by about 3 to 1. And this was enough to frighten off the Mayor and the City Council especially when the campaign led by the State Committee Against Discrimination in Housing—an organization composed of about 40 liberal and labor groups—failed to counter-balance the real estate board's effort.

This failure cannot be confined to any single reason. First many of the liberal organizations are paper organizations, that is they are composed of a non-activist membership. Second is the fact that almost without exception no labor union really gave a major push to a campaign to

educate the membership and drum up support for the bill. Thirdly, it has to be acknowledged that there is widespread apathy, at this time, even among the mass of the Negro people to actively participate in a political campaign. While it is true that there have been stirrings in the North, by and large they have been confined to switching votes at election time.

STALLING TACTICS

Faced with a widespread and articulate opposition, the Wagner administration has been seeking various devices and stalling tactics to delay passage of the bill it says—until after the November election. The official rumor is that the stall is on to help elect Democrats in areas of the city where opposition to the bill is strongest.

A consequence of this is that the bill will probably be encumbered with amendments designed to make enforcement a difficult job. Then it will be argued that even a weakened bill is better than no bill at all instead of fighting for the original bill which now appears as a paragon of simple and direct enforcement procedure.

A note ought to be made at this point about the tactics of the Republicans which belies their new-founded claim to be the champions of civil rights. In brief they have been trying to work both sides of the street.

Their mayoralty candidate has been critical of Democratic stalling but at the same time refuses to come out and say where he stands on the bill. The local Republican councilman candidates, on the other hand, have been conducting whispering campaigns that to vote for the Liberal or Democratic candidates means Negroes and Puerto Ricans moving into all-white areas, thus making an appeal to the racist sentiments.

Most Democratic candidates have been following the lead of City Hall. They are either for the bill "in principle", or else refusing to take a stand at all. The Liberal Party councilman nominees (the Liberal Party while supporting the major positions on the Democratic ticket is running almost a full independent slate for the City Council) have been outspoken in their support of the bill.

It appeared that no major effort would be made to get passage of the fair housing bill before the November election which had been the original promise of the Democratic administration. However late in September, the idea for a mass demonstration before City Hall was proposed by the Committee of Racial Equality (CORE) and it took the lead in forming the Committee for Immediate Action on the Sharkey-Brown-Isaacs Bill.

HEARTENING RESPONSE

The initial response to the call for the demonstration was heartening. The major organizations responding were the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, District 65 of the Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Union, Americans for Democratic Action, the American Jewish Congress, Jewish Labor Committee, NAACP, Interdenominational Ministers Alliance and the Riverside Democratic Club.

There was expectation of widespread labor support as a number of unions indicated initial sympathy for the idea of the demonstration. Therefore plans were made for a demonstration at which it was confidently expected that several thousand would participate during lunch hour on October 23.

An organized campaign was initiated by the Wagner administration and the Democratic Party against the Committee for Immediate Action to get it to call off its demonstration. If the same sort of determination were used to secure passage of the bill as was used to try to call off the demonstration, there might be a fair housing bill on the books now.

One of the first indications of the campaign to sabotage the demonstration came when the Committee found it impossible to line up labor union backing. Resolutions in favor of the bill could be typed up in a few minutes, but no support for the demonstration.

HEAT TURNS ON

Then leading Democratic politicians began to apply pressure on the chairman of the Committee to withdraw. At a planning meeting on Oct. 10, Earl Brown,

the Democratic Negro councilman from Harlem and one of the sponsors of the bill, appeared to argue that it might be a good idea if, instead of a City Hall demonstration, a meeting were held uptown. He subtly tried to dissuade the Committee from its intention by offering his personal assurances that his bill would be passed after the election especially since there was no chance of action before the election. However, Brown was careful not to speak out for calling off the demonstration. He just questioned its wisdom just before the election.

It was at the Oct. 17 meeting that the big guns were fired in the attempt to argue the Committee out of the demonstration. Stanley Lowell, assistant to the Mayor, former state chairman of ADA and the leading advocate of the bill in the Wagner Administration came to the meeting. Also attending were representatives of District 65 and the Jewish Labor Committee. All had the same purpose in mind.

It was Lowell's speech that swung waverers back to supporting the demonstration. He spoke for about a half an hour on the difficulties in enacting the bill. Then sensing that he was getting nowhere with the majority of committee members, Lowell said that since many labor unions had pulled out or refused to come along, the demonstration would be 90 per cent Negro and that would be very bad.

Then he stated that a small meeting might become a "rabble-rousing demonstration." Instead there should be advocacy for the bill on a reasoned basis rather than on a demonstration which might become "lawless." He then wound up with an inference that most of those present at the meeting were Johnny-come-latelies to the fight for civil rights.

At this point several members of the Committee shouted out that Lowell had been given enough time and that the Committee had important business to attend to. Shortly after there was a unanimous vote, but with several abstentions,

to go ahead with the demonstration.

As Oct. 23 neared the Democratic machine began a vicious rumor campaign in Harlem that the demonstration was called off, and a Democratic Councilman speaking in the Negro community in Brooklyn also told an audience that it was called off. Then it was whispered that the American Jewish Congress, which stayed til the end, had left the Committee.

Another rumor circulated was that A. Phillip Randolph of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters who was to lead a delegation, along with former baseball star Jackie Robinson, to see the Mayor had pulled out. The fact was that Randolph, a vice president of the AFL-CIO, had to go to Washington for the AFL-CIO Executive Council meeting which was dealing with the Teamsters. Instead he sent a strongly worded letter with Ben McLaurin, a vice-president of the Brotherhood who attended the delegation in his place.

The only thing the Tammany machine stopped short of was to call the Committee a bunch of "Reds" or "Communists." But that would have been an act of desperation which from the point of view of the Democrats was unnecessary as distasteful as they might find the demonstration. The main reason is that the demonstration in no way affects Wagner's chances for re-election since the labor movement is solidly behind him and the Republican candidate is just going through the motions of a campaign.

Although the attendance at City Hall was only a fraction of what might have been expected, it had to be considered a success in face of the vicious maneuvers by Tammany Hall and the tail-ending policy of the labor movement in this city with the notable exception of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters.

It did keep the spotlight of publicity on the need for a fair housing bill, and it is a warning that City Hall will not be allowed to renege on its promises, or get away with a thoroughly emasculated bill.

LABOR SCOPE

America's No. 1 Heel

The union-wrecking provisions of the Taft-Hartley law have been turned against the United Rubber Workers Union, Local 511, on strike against the O'Sullivan Rubber Co. ("America's No. 1 Heel") of Winchester, Va. since May, 1956. The device used against the 300 strikers is a simple one: Section 9(c) of the law reads, "Employees on strike who are not entitled to reinstatement shall not be eligible to vote" in collective bargaining elections. After 17 months, the company was able to recruit a force of strike-breakers from the hills of West Virginia and the strikers were officially "discharged." The company petitioned for an NLRB decertification election which was finally held last week. Only scabs were allowed to vote; the 300 strikers were no longer recognized as employees. Naturally, the union lost and its bargaining rights were taken away. The strike goes on; picketing continues. The Rubber Workers Union now calls for a national boycott of O'Sullivan products, a weapon used with some success by the UAW in its long strike against Kohler.

Labor Can Help!

Many, many months ago, the AFL-CIO announced the setting up of a big fund to give financial aid to those in the South fighting for democracy and civil rights. Victims of White Council boycott and persecution would have the backing of a large defense fund. It was announced but then its collection and distribution got so entangled in a series of conflicts and maneuvers within the labor bureaucracy that the whole project collapsed. But here is an item we missed at the time but which should not be forgotten:

In July, Region 9 of the UAW undertook an extraordinary fund raising campaign. More than \$2,000 was collected to buy a combine for the farmers of Clarendon County, South Carolina. The farmers (Negro landowners and taxpayers) had organized themselves into a co-op to

market their products directly and free themselves from dependence upon the White Council-controlled dealers in tobacco, grain and cotton. The co-op gets the combine and will assign it to its members as necessary. This is only a small sample of what the labor movement could do if it had the will.

Four-Day Week

One of the unions that spearheaded the fight for an 8-hour day, as far back as 1905, was the International Typographical Union. In August it held its 99th convention in New York. There, it decided to begin the campaign for a four-day work week of not more than 8 hours per day. Locals were authorized to fight for this demand beginning on January 1, 1958. Thus, a series of local ITU efforts to win a four-day week will probably coincide with a UAW drive for shorter hours in the auto industry. In January, the UAW will convene a special two-day convention in Detroit to spell out its 1958 demands. High on the list, according to the decision of its last convention will be the demand for a reduction in hours.

NEW YORK	
LABOR ACTION FORUM	
Thursday, November 7	TRENDS IN AMERICAN LIBERALISM BEFORE WORLD WAR I Speaker: Sam Bottone
Thursday, November 14	LIBERALISM AND THE PROGRESSIVE MOVEMENT AFTER WORLD WAR I Speaker: Julius Falk
Thursday, November 21	INTEGRATION AND THE N. Y. CITY SCHOOLS 8:30 p.m. at L. A. Hall, 114 West 14 Street, N.Y.C.

Zhukov: Symbol of Crisis — —

(Continued from page 11)

on." And just not to give a too macabre impression, added that he had just seen Zhukov in good health.

BAD TROUBLE

All this flippancy and evasiveness, however, cannot conceal the fact that the regime is in bad trouble. If Zhukov had to be removed so as to forestall some actual military plot against the regime, that would speak for itself. But even if he was removed not because he had started an actual plot, but just because of the feeling by Khrushchev and others that he had achieved too dangerous a position, that too does

not speak well for internal strength and stability. Surely Khrushchev is as aware as anyone that frequent purges and overturns in the leadership (even if accompanied by proclamations about the "unshakeable unity," and the "garnite-like solidarity" of the party and Central Committee), cannot enhance the strength and prestige of the administration either inside or outside Russia.

If Zhukov is a real leader of the officer corps, his summary removal cannot solidify their loyalty to the ruling individual or clique. There is some evidence that in speeches he made since June Zhukov had delib-

erately played down the role of the party, and insisted on the role of the nation as a whole and specially of the army in winning World War II. His immense popularity with the people was attested to by the spontaneous demonstration for him in Leningrad last summer. The removal of a man like that can only intensify the feelings of insecurity and hostility toward the Khrushchev leadership in the army and in wide sections of the rest of the Russian bureaucratic ruling class.

If Khrushchev proves able to remove Zhukov, does this mean that Russia has moved one step closer to the supreme rulership of one

man, that most stable form of autocracy?

In a sense, of course, it could mean that. In each successive combination made by Khrushchev by which he removes rivals to his power, he tends to gain more power for himself. The process could be carried out to its end without at any point generating a sufficiently powerful group to resist and strike down the new tyrant. But, on the other hand, with each success it reveals its nature, tendency and goal more clearly to the whole bureaucracy, who still shudder at the memory of the days when Stalin's arbitrary will ruled the land. And the fact that Khrushchev is now moving so swiftly may indicate not that he feels he no longer need exercise restraint, but rather that the crisis of the regime is so acute that he is forced to pile one disturbing move on the other to keep from being dragged down himself.

At the moment the degree of the crisis is concealed behind the censorship and the fact that in Russia the drama of politics is still played out behind the scenes. A more concrete assessment of forces and tendencies will be possible in following issues of LABOR ACTION.

Mideast War Scare — —

(Continued from page 11)

scribing the feverish moves the American State Department had made in its effort to put pressure on the Syrian government, or to prepare for its overthrow, the article concluded:

"For the moment, at least, the State Department appears to have drawn back. If this is not simply an attempt to divert public attention from the area while a coup is prepared, it may give time for the democratic forces in Syria to gain additional strength, and for the mobilization of public opinion in this country against any attempt to repeat in Syria the disaster of Guatemala under conditions far more dangerous to world peace."

It is reasonable to believe that Russian intelligence in the Middle East is able to keep track of what American foreign policy was up to, specially if it were preparing to overthrow a government as broadly based as the Syrian one. But if the State Department's apparent relaxation of policy toward the end of September really was "simply an attempt to divert public attention from the area while a coup is prepared," how better rivet public attention on the area than to blow up a big war-scare over it? The glare of publicity alone would pretty much tie the hands of the Dulles brothers and their agents.

U.S. PULLED BACK

On the other hand, let us assume that the State Department had really pulled back from any "Guatemalan" strategy it may have contemplated under the strong resistance of all sections of Arab politics, including those most closely allied with the United States. While they were whooping it up against the Syrian government, flying arms to Jordan, and the like, the impression was created very strongly in the area that the United States was capable of organizing a Guatemalan coup in and around Syria. The Russians could have decided to utilize this impression for their own purposes. By claiming to have proof of the plot, by warning the world of the "war

danger," they could both strengthen the impression that the State Department had been actively organizing such a plot and that the Russians had thwarted it by timely counter-action.

Furthermore, by the world-wide publicity they have given the campaign, the Russians may have sought to make a very strong impression on the American government in connection with future struggles and/or deals in the area. If they are in a position to thwart the more devious aspects of American foreign policy in the Middle East by simply turning the light of publicity on them, this could lead weight to the idea that it would be much better to make some reasonable deal with them over the area than to try to slug it out.

This notion, that one of the things the Russian government has in mind is a deal, was given weight by New York Times correspondent James Reston after his interview with Khrushchev. The "deal" they have in mind for the moment appears to be the dissolution of the Baghdad Pact in exchange for Russian agreement not to arm Egypt and Syria further. That is, both sides would agree to leave the Middle East a militarily neutral zone.

And finally, of course, there are Khrushchev's own domestic problems to consider. Although only a madman would start a modern nuclear war so as to "solve" his domestic problems, a very sober and sane ruler who is engaged in a life-and-death struggle with powerful domestic opponents might find an atmosphere of national peril, of impending war, most useful in rallying the doubters and waverers in the ruling class behind him.

So, if the "war crisis" in the Middle East drifts away and dissolves it will not mean that somebody was just idly calling "wolf, wolf" to see the people jump. Rather than sighing with relief and turning to other matters we should recognize that this episode illustrates how intense and deadly-serious is the struggle which is going on over the Middle East today.

New Perspectives for American Socialism

The Case for Unity

Introduction by
Max Shachtman
ten cents

INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE
114 West 14th Street
New York 11, N. Y.

Aid to Vietnam — —

(Continued from page 31)

The same can be said of road building, the replacement of livestock, improvement of communications, and so on. Work in the educational field—the agricultural college at Blao, village schools, long-term training carried out by the Michigan State University team, can be classed in the same category. But you don't have to talk very long to the Vietnamese to find out that this is not at all the sort of thing they have in mind when they talk about development. What they believe will really help them, what they want, is industries.

NOT ONE NEW INDUSTRY

American lack of enthusiasm for industry in South Vietnam is noticeable. "This country's vocation is agricultural," I was told by one USOM official after another. "If the money the Vietnamese want to put into industry were only put into reviving their agriculture, they would get a much more profitable return on it." It is a striking fact that not a single new industry worthy of the name has been established in the country during the three years since the end of the war in Indo-China. . . .

The difference of opinion arises between Americans and Vietnamese over the problem of how industries should be started in a country that in the past has had almost none. There is a basic conflict of ideology here. The Americans think that free enterprise should do the job. The Vietnamese want planning with at least some state-owned industries to get things started. One of the most intelligent members of the Vietnamese government is angry over the American attitude. "They are hidebound by their ideology of free enterprise," he told me. "They tell us that free enterprise made the United States so prosperous, and that it would do the same for Vietnam. But they forget that it took them fifty years and more to do it. We haven't got fifty years to play with. In the North they are industrializing fast. If we rely on free enterprise, on the good will of foreign capital, we shall never get started. It is absurd."

"The American attitude is medieval and retrograde on this question," he continued. "They give us buffaloes when what we need are tractors with which to modernize our agriculture. They support our army. But what is the use? Unless they help us to develop our country, our

army will not fight for them. We are not their mercenaries."

Another highly placed official with whom I discussed the industrial question told me that in his opinion there was no entrepreneurial class in Vietnam, and that it was a waste of time to expect Vietnamese capital to come forward. Therefore the state must take the initiative in industrialization. Almost every word that this official said to me would have been approved by a textbook socialist. "What we need in Vietnam is planning," he insisted. "Foreign private capital will not solve our problem. Even if we manage to attract it in sufficient quantities, it will mean more foreign enterprises in this country—something we have been trying for years to get rid of. . . ."

A similar question arises over the Vietnamese land reform, which limits private ownership of land to a hundred hectares, or about 250 acres. When the plan is executed, it will involve compensating some twenty-two hundred landowners for about seven hundred thousand hectares. It is estimated that this buyout may cost, at the official rate of exchange of thirty-five Vietnamese piastres to the dollar, something in the region of \$80 million. Ten per cent of this sum will be paid to the landlords cash down; the rest will be given them in the form of government bonds redeemable over twelve years. The Vietnamese feel that the tardy land reform could be materially advanced if the compensation money could be advanced out of American aid. But this also, it seems, is against the principles on which the aid is given. "Middle Western taxpayers would never stand for it," I was told by one American expert. . . .

Perhaps the most important question of principle to be raised since foreign aid to Asia started concerns the method whereby that aid can best be used to create industries in countries that have almost none, or where the existing industry is mainly in foreign hands. If Washington is doctrinaire on the question of free enterprise for the development of these countries, such development may take far too long. In some countries this may not matter, but in Vietnam, where there is literally a race in progress on the two sides of the 17th parallel, it does matter. It is South Vietnam that is "the bastion of the free world in Southern Asia." We must think a little more about the people inside the bastion and their needs.

The New Class

"An Analysis of the Communist System"

By Milovan Djilas

List \$3.95

our price \$3.50

The Roots of American Communism

By Theodore Draper

List \$6.75

our price \$5.75

History of the Russian Revolution

By Leon Trotsky

Trotsky's great classic, now available for the first time in years
New Edition—Three Volumes in One

List \$12.50

our price \$10.00

Labor Action Book Service
114 West 14th Street, N. Y. C. 11, N. Y.