

Contrast the situation in Cambodia. Secretary Rusk disavows any intention of taking over the country, but last December 21 the State Department warned Norodom Sihanouk that U.S. forces in Vietnam had been authorized to undertake military actions in Cambodia "in exercise of the inherent right of self-defense." On several occasions American forces have attacked enemy forces with small arms, artillery and aircraft; the break in relations between the United States and Cambodia resulted from such clashes. One incident, which occurred early in May, was officially acknowledged by American military spokesmen. As a further warning to the Cambodians, it was emphasized that the U.S. field commander had not requested permission from higher authority. No such permission was required: "A commander is authorized to take whatever means are at his disposal to protect his troops and his command."

Should these minatory words and actions fail to bring Cambodia to terms, and if the Thai rulers should demand a further *quid pro quo*, might they not be permitted to "adjust" their disputed frontier with Cambodia? We have supplied them with the necessary arms and equipment.

News Manglement

Almost daily, a new, ignoble chapter is added to the feud between the White House and the press corps. On the President's excursion to Princeton University, newsmen, who are dependent on White House planning, were left waiting aboard their plane from Washington for fifteen minutes before a ramp was produced to allow them off. Then they waited another quarter of an hour for a bus that never came. Some of them hitchhiked to town in trucks and police cars. This kind of contemptuous treatment of the press has become commonplace in the Johnson Administration.

A writer for a national news magazine recently wrote of the President as a "people eater," meaning that he consumed the energies of his staff until, to save their souls, they fled his employment. The President passed the word down to this writer that he would not talk to him again "until I get over being a people eater"—meaning, until the newsman wrote something nice enough about him to cancel out the previous description.

President Kennedy was accused of managing the news. President Johnson mangles it, and newsmen who do not shape what they write to serve the Administration's purposes feel his wrath. One Pulitzer Prize-winning chronicler of Presidential affairs has so offended Johnson that he is not allowed in the White House.

Judging from the recent speeches and extemporaneous outbursts of Robert H. Fleming, the deputy press secretary at the White House, he was hired primarily to upbraid the press. Recently *The New York Times* (among other newspapers) published on its front page the picture of a Vietnamese rebel, arms held high over his head, who had just been interrogated by Vietnamese marines loyal to Premier Ky. The caption told of how a moment later the rebel was shot down for no apparent reason and, as he lay dying, the marines stripped off his boots.

Hardly had this heartless vignette been publicized than Fleming was cranking out his condemnations of "inexperi-

THE NATION / June 13, 1966

IN THIS ISSUE

June 13, 1966

EDITORIALS

698

ARTICLES

702 French Eyes on Vietnam:
America's Colony in Hell

Alexander Werth

705 The Warren Commission Report: I
Some Unanswered Questions

Fred J. Cook

BOOKS & THE ARTS

716 Doris Lessing: Child of Violence

Florence Howe

718 De Beauvoir: At the Deathbed

Muriel Haynes

720 Colette: A Scandalous Sincerity

Mary Ellmann

721 To Dream with Gods or Engineers

Harriet Zinnes

723 Left Behind in Sinai

Thomas M. Franck

724 The Bathing Place (poem)

Ned O'Gorman

725 In Darkest Fulbright

Richard Kostelanetz

727 Crossword Puzzle

Frank W. Lewis

Editor	CAREY McWILLIAMS	Washington	ROBERT G. SHERRILL
Managing Editor	ROBERT HATCH	Paris	ALEXANDER WERTH
Assistant Literary Editor	HELEN YGLESIAS	Theatre	HAROLD CLURMAN
Poetry Editor	MICHAEL GOLDMAN	Art	MAX KOZLOFF
Copy Editor	MARION HESS	Music	BENJAMIN BORETZ
Advertising Manager	MARY SIMON	Science	CARL DREHER

JAMES J. STORROW JR. Publisher
ANNE C. ABRAMOVITZ Assistant

The Nation is published weekly (except biweekly in July and August) by the Nation Magazine Company and copyright 1966 in the U.S.A. by the Nation Associates, Inc., 333 Sixth Avenue, New York, N.Y., 10014. Second class postage paid at New York, N.Y. Tel.: CH 2-8400. Subscription Price: One year, \$10; two years, \$18. Foreign and Canadian postage: \$1 extra per year.

Change of Address: Three weeks' notice is required for change of address, which cannot be made without the old address as well as the new.

Information to Libraries: The Nation is indexed in Readers Guide to Periodical Literature, Book Review Digest, Book Review Index and the Public Affairs Information Service.

THE NATION Volume 202
No. 24

699

enced" reporting, of "headline type coverage." He complained that it was very unsporting to use that kind of picture just when the government was trying to calm the American public about the civil warring in Vietnam.

It is this kind of response that prompted Charles Roberts, for twelve years a White House correspondent for *Newsweek*, to comment at a recent University of Wisconsin symposium that "apparently the President feels we should print the news just as he dictates it, without any explanation, interpretation, background, or 'speculation.' . . . It is hard, sometimes impossible, to get a straight, substantive, responsive answer out of him. . . . The President's purpose in holding press conferences seems to be to dominate and even intimidate the press rather than to tell reporters what he is really thinking."

CIA-AFL-CIO

For several years there have been rumblings of dissension in the labor movement over the activities of Jay Lovestone, the AFL-CIO international affairs director and one of George Meany's closest coadjutors. In the February 10, 1964, *Nation*, Stanley Meisler ("Meddling in Latin America: Dubious Role of AFL-CIO") referred to the antagonism between Lovestone and Walter Reuther and his brother Victor, president and international affairs head respectively, of the United Auto Workers. The dispute involved the American Institute for Free Labor Development (AIFLD) defined by Meisler as "an enterprise run by the AFL-CIO, partly with its own funds but principally with money made available by the Alliance for Progress and private enterprise." The ostensible purpose of the AIFLD was to train Latin American labor leaders and to build a strong anti-Communist labor movement in Latin America.

To this end, U.S. agencies were engaged at that time in efforts to unseat the leftist-leaning Premier Cheddi Jagan of British Guiana and to replace him with Forbes Burnham, now head of the newly independent Guyana. One of the steps in this operation was a bloody general strike waged against Jagan by the British Guiana Trade Union Council. In a letter to *The New York Times*, Jagan charged that "local trade unionists known to be hostile to my government—and none others—have been trained by the American Institute for Free Labor Development to overthrow my government." Meisler saw in the attacks on Jagan the imprint of Lovestone, a rabid anti-Communist since his ouster as leader of the Communist Party USA in the twenties. The *Times*, after noting the Reuther brothers' criticism of Lovestone's close relations with George Meany, president of the AIFLD as well as the AFL-CIO, commented that "to his enemies, Mr. Lovestone is a sinister figure, who, they say, has soured the relationships between the AFL-CIO and other free world trade unions by unnecessary intrigue and bitter feuding."

British Guiana was only one focus of AFL-CIO anti-Communist activity in Latin America and elsewhere. Since the Central Intelligence Agency was engaged in similar endeavors abroad, one could hardly help speculating on the possibility that there was not merely parallelism but liaison between the Communist-fighters of the two organizations.

Meisler indeed voiced the question: Does the U.S. Government really want the AFL-CIO to serve as a junior CIA? No proof could be cited at that time, but at the recent UAW convention in Long Beach, Calif., covered by Harry Bernstein for the *Los Angeles Times* and *The Washington Post* (May 23), Victor Reuther charged that the AFL-CIO is "involved" with the CIA in the political affairs of foreign countries and particularly their trade union movements, and that these intrusions are either entirely secret or only partially reported to the AFL-CIO executive committee.

Reuther cited a recent case in which A. Paulson, general secretary of the International Food and Drink Workers Federation, with headquarters in Geneva, found it necessary to abolish the Panama office of the federation because of the presence there of eight individuals who were said to be "posing as official representatives" but of whom he had no knowledge. Reuther said this "seems to be one most recent example of CIA activities." A spokesman for the AFL-CIO denied that the AIFLD had any connection with the CIA. He also denied that Lovestone had had anything to do with setting up the AIFLD—which is not the same as saying that he never had anything to do with its operations.

Despite the denial, Victor Reuther continues to take a dim view of Lovestone. "The tragedy of the AFL-CIO activities in the field of foreign affairs," he says, "is that they are a vest-pocket operation by Jay Lovestone. . . . Mr. Lovestone seems to have brought into the labor movement the working habits and undercover techniques which he learned when he was in the highest echelons of the Communist Party." Which, come to think of it, sounds very much like the working habits and techniques of the CIA itself.

Slight Thaw

Some glimmerings of sense are beginning to appear in the American policy toward Communist China—perhaps to be followed, on some distant tomorrow, by reciprocal manifestations on the part of the Chinese. The Johnson Administration, however, cannot be credited with taking the initiative in withdrawing from the John Foster Dulles position that Red China was only a passing pestilence which Dr. Dulles himself would help to eradicate. The fact is that the Administration has been impelled toward realism by Senators Edward and Robert Kennedy, George McGovern, J. W. Fulbright and Rep. Henry Reuss, and by a general feeling around the country that it was about time to cease cowering before the China Lobby and the ghost of Joe McCarthy. This change we owe also to George Kennan, John K. Fairbank and the other experts who testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The fact that in 1965 the vote for admitting Red China to the UN was a 47-to-47 tie, with twenty abstentions, no doubt helped.

In his speech of May 3, Edward Kennedy suggested as an immediately feasible measure the appointment of a "blue-ribbon commission of distinguished men to make, publicly, recommendations for new directions in our China policy." In submitting this proposal Senator Kennedy lamented the fact that outstanding scholars and public servants were persecuted during the 1950s for what had hap-

pened in China. "As a result," Mr. Kennedy concluded, "the wellspring of respected scholarship, on which sound political discussion is based, began to dry." This is a precise summation of what happened in the McCarthy era; accordingly *The Nation* suggests that the first appointees to the commission should be Owen Lattimore and such other victims as may be willing and able to serve.

At first, Senator Kennedy's proposal received a cold reception from the State Department. Secretary Rusk said that it already had ample outside advice. Shortly, however, the Secretary found the proposal "intriguing" and promised that in the future State would seek outside advice "somewhat more systematically." This somewhat reluctant change of heart may have been initiated by President Johnson, who is sensitive nowadays to ideas publicized by the Kennedys.

It must be emphasized that progress toward alleviation of U.S.-Chinese tension will be slow—a matter of a decade or two. There is little hope of any major change until the United States is prepared to abandon its alliance with the Chiang Kai-shek regime and to acquiesce in the status of Taiwan as an autonomous region of China, or an independent state with close ties to the mainland. The idea that scientific, educational, cultural, artistic, medical, athletic contacts, etc., can bring about a reconciliation is illusory.

Nevertheless, the emerging willingness on the American side to consider the possibility of friendly relations is a great advance over the frozen hostility of recent years. With luck, it might even help to extricate behemoth from the morass of Vietnam. Senator McGovern made this point and showed how, having substituted communism for the devil, we had assumed identical attitudes toward the Viet Minh, our ally in the war against Japan, and the Chinese Communists after their defeat of the corrupt Kuomintang. Secretary Rusk would be well advised to read carefully the speeches by McGovern and Edward Kennedy, and the subsequent discussion by Senators Fulbright, Jackson, Proxmire, Pell, Hart and Miller.

Reader Beware

In a recent lecture on the multifarious activities of the Central Intelligence Agency, Senator Morse warned readers, members of Congress and the public at large against blind confidence in studies emanating from universities and other ostensible centers of scholarship, when the source of financing is unknown. He cited a case where he himself and John F. Kennedy, then a Senator, promoted a study of U.S. policy in Latin America. One of the papers that came out of the project was prepared at a division of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology which, it later turned out, had been created under a CIA grant. According to Morse, the paper was a good one, but neither he nor Kennedy knew about the CIA's role, nor did MIT trouble to enlighten them. Morse adds that we still have no idea how many other studies have been subsidized by the CIA, the Defense Department, or other government agencies that operate under the cloak of national security.

Several cases of *sub rosa* financing by the CIA of book or magazine publishers have come to light, and there may be others that have not been disclosed. A deception not

involving direct subvention has been uncovered in connection with an article on "The Faceless Viet Cong," by George A. Carver, Jr., in the April issue of *Foreign Affairs Quarterly*. In its identifying note the magazine told everything about the author except that he was an employee of the CIA. *Commonweal* (May 13) calls attention to an article in the February 24 *Reporter* on the National Liberation Front. This one was written by Douglas Pike, identified as a specialist in research on the Vietcong for the U.S. Information Agency in Saigon "who recently spent a year at MIT preparing a definitive study of the NLF." Presumably this is the same MIT Center of International Studies that was established with CIA money, has only recently severed its relations with the CIA, and is still headed by a former CIA assistant director. "Once again," *Commonweal* asks, "what is one to think?"

It would be utterly fatuous to credit authors like Mr. Carver, or the unknown number of publications and writers who may have been subsidized directly or indirectly by the CIA, with an objective viewpoint. As an employee of the agency, Mr. Carver was no more free to reach conclusions favorable in any material respect to the Vietcong than a writer in a Vietcong publication would be to say anything good about the American war effort in Vietnam. When such connections are concealed, either the author has deceived the publication or the publication the reader.

The MIT case, the CIA infiltration of Michigan State University and the suspicion that, justly or unjustly, now surrounds a multitude of university projects abroad, all give support to Sen. Eugene McCarthy's proposal for the creation of a broadened Senate committee to oversee the operations of the CIA. Enough has been revealed to show that the present improvised committee is hardly more than a cover for anything the agency cares to perpetrate. The plea that the CIA's legitimate operations would be compromised is specious. Will anyone assert that the members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee who would serve on the new panel are less loyal than the Senators on the present committee?

Atlanta's Operatic Mores

A belief particularly dear to the hearts of liberals is that acceptance of racial desegregation by whites increases with education and income. This reflects, perhaps, our faith in education as a cure for social ills and our unspoken fear that if education and economic security won't cure prejudice, nothing will. In Atlanta, Ga., that fear is only too well grounded. In the Gate City, as it delights to call itself, a measure of desegregation has been achieved—through force of law—in schools, hospitals and other public institutions; but the doors of private institutions remain closed to Negroes. With few exceptions, the "leaders" of the community choose to limit their associations to persons like themselves in race, and usually in religion as well.

The ultimate test of Atlanta's elite came with the annual visit of the Metropolitan Opera, the high point in the region's cultural and social life, co-sponsored by the Junior League and the Music Festival Association, a body studded with the names of top-drawer business and social leaders. In recent years, or since the Negro no longer knew his place,

the Met's appearance has presented problems as well as artistic joy. Until 1962, Negroes were permitted only in top gallery seats, but that year Rudolph Bing announced that the company would not play before racially segregated audiences. The opera lovers were in a dilemma. They could continue the policy of offering tickets on a priority basis to those who had bought them the year before, thus practically insuring the inheritance of the best seats in the house, or, as Mayor Hartsfield expressed it, they could have "enough Negroes in the front rows for Mr. Bing to be able to see them." Compromise prevailed: there is no longer any restriction on where anyone may sit—he just has to have the ticket.

As always where the arts, especially opera, are concerned, social rewards and punishments are a consideration. Entertaining for the opera stars has traditionally been the reward for those who have labored long and hard in the operatic vineyard. The Piedmont Driving Club was the chosen place until two years ago, when Leontyne Price sang one of the leading roles. On that occasion the party following the performance was given at a restaurant. And this year, the sixth after the beginning of school desegregation in Atlanta

and the second after passage of the civil rights bill, the Atlanta Opera Guild held its luncheon, a social event of the highest importance, at the Piedmont Driving Club as of yore—but without the members of the Metropolitan company. Unanimously, the artists stayed away. They sent their regrets, said an assistant manager, because Negro members of the company were not invited and "we don't like to attend functions where all our members cannot attend."

Explanations followed. According to the president of the Opera Guild, the luncheon had to be held at the Driving Club; all attempts to find a suitable public facility had ended in failure. The president said further that the Guild has no restrictions on membership "other than \$8 a year dues," that they have members from eight states and for all she knows, some of them may be Negroes. The Driving Club said that members are permitted to invite guests to functions, but "we do have racial restrictions on guests." In sum, it appears to be a case of wanting not to entertain Negroes more than wanting to entertain Metropolitan opera stars, and anyone who knows Atlanta knows that anything the elite group wants more than that, they must want very much indeed.

FRENCH EYES ON VIETNAM

AMERICA'S COLONY IN HELL

ALEXANDER WERTH

Paris

If General de Gaulle is, in many ways, disengaging himself from the "tutelage" of the United States, it is not because he hated Roosevelt during the last war and is generally "anti-American," but very largely because he sees the war in Vietnam as the biggest danger that the peace of the world has run since the end of World War II. He himself was one of the Guilty Men of the French war in Vietnam of 1946-54; but he gradually realized his mistake, welcomed the end of the war there, and has latterly advocated a neutralization of South Vietnam. As the world's "No. 1 decolonizer" (a description of which he is very proud) he has been increasingly shocked by the news coming from Southeast Asia. I understand that he has been studying with particular care the detailed report recently brought back from Vietnam by Robert Guillain, the gist of which has just been published in a series of five long articles in *Le Monde*. Guillain belongs to that small band of French writers who have spent years in Vietnam since the end of World War II and who consider that the Americans (with rare exceptions) "simply do not understand what kind of country they have taken on."

He opens his series with a description of Saigon. The piaster-franc currency rackets of the French occupation were child's play, compared with the innumerable rackets going on in Saigon today. There is not only the dollar-piaster racket with its three different exchange rates; there are rackets in everything. Vast quantities of PX goods are stolen and resold in Saigon, GIs and big and small Vietnamese officials all playing their part in these thefts. There are rackets in real estate, in building materials, in opium

and gambling dens; and, above all, there is prostitution, this being "Saigon's biggest industry." Thousands of rooms in hotels and private houses are being let to GIs for the purpose, so that a high proportion of the population is making a good thing out of it. Guillain "found Saigon nauseating."

Here, after twenty years of wars and revolutions, are re-established all the detestable visions of white supremacy, the whites are masters of the city. . . . Is not America afraid of the judgment of the "third world"? For here, after twenty years of decolonization, the Americans have turned an Asian capital into the world's biggest whorehouse.

The Vietcong could spoil all the fun by turning Saigon into a city of terror, as the Algerian nationalists did in Algiers; but they prefer it this way: they want the people to realize that "South Vietnam's head—i.e., Saigon—has gone completely rotten." They intensify this "rottenness" by frequently interfering with food supplies to Saigon; the result is ever rising prices, inflation and discontent. And it is not as though the Vietnamese (and the girls) liked the Americans; they merely like dollars. The Americans, on the other hand, imagine that they have friends in Vietnam:

What is surprising is that the Americans shouldn't be aware of the *political* decay in Saigon. Without experience of Vietnam, and too crude to see the finer points, they judge everything in black and white—the "good" Vietnamese who work for them and whom they regard as their friends, and the "bad" Vietnamese who live in the jungle. What they do not see is that, only too often, the "good" and the "bad" Vietnamese is the same person.

There is, in fact, no "parallel" Vietcong organization;