ment. The London **Times** for Jan. 21, 1963, reported, for example:

"South Vietnam is the only part of the world where the Pentagon's training manuals can be put to the test under conditions of real warfare. In this tropical Salisbury plain new techniques are being developed of counter-insurgency."

Among the "new techniques" and new weapons utilized in this war with much success so far and with a now possibly increased success because of increased support in Saigon among the population are napalm bombing and chemical spraying of rice fields in "enemy territory." In the first instance a gelled gasoline is used to destroy crops and villages by fire; in the second, under the pretext of spraying weed-destroying chemicals, fields are rendered useless, perhaps permanently, and cattle and humans are poisoned. This information is not gleaned from governments hostile to America although it has been amply reported by the **Peking Review** from Red China. The respectable, liberal **The New Republic** has carried stories on these tactics and the equally respectable far-right sheet **National Review** has also reported them, although with approval. We have also followed these atrocity tales, from time to time in the liberal **The Progressive** and the radical magazine, **Dissent,** has joined in the condemnation of these "dirty" and uncivilized tactics.

The liberals, as a matter of fact, are now in a sort of box. They are no longer able to scream in anguish at Washington's reactionary role in support of a bloody, tyrannical, dictatorship. In fact, despite official denials it is quite possible that Washington did engineer the coup through its Central Intelligence Agency. On the other hand, how can they now champion the methods and weapons they have been criticizing? It is possible that the only way out for the liberals in this contradictory situation is to advocate the policy of Neutralism? But horrors! Won't that put them on the same side as the French, the Red Chinese, and the North Vietnamese Communists? And one final question, don't our liberal friends think it's time they quit trying to make capitalism operate sensibly and line up with revolutionary socialism?

HARMO

RAW DEAL IN RUSSIA: LACK OF MILITARY TOYS

Moscow (Reuters) — Soviet children are demanding better toys, including toy soldiers and tanks, a weekly magazine here has discovered.

According to the magazine Nedelya (The Weekly), the nation's boys and girls are getting a raw deal. Their toys are "old-fashioned, crude, gadgetless and simply do not measure up to the children's interest."

A round-table conference on Soviet toys revealed that one of the biggest shortcomings was in the manufacture of every boy's delight — toy soldiers.

An engineer who had probed the situation told the magazine: "Our children simply cannot buy tanks and soldiers. Is education in the military spirit in our young folk not on the agenda any more?

The magazine called in the Russian Federation's deputy minister of education for an answer.

He replied that no one had "banned" the production of "military toys." It was simply that no one had got round to designing and making them.

He promised to improve the situation, adding: "It is impossible to oust military toys from everyday life. You cannot put children in an ivory tower. They will go on playing at war. We must direct their games in the correct way."

Even excluding toy soldiers and toy tanks, Britain and France, the magazine said, are far ahead of the Soviet Union in producing by the million smart, glossy, life-like toys.

France, in fact, beat the Soviet Union in turning out the first toy sputniks.

Toys for girls are also criticized by the magazine. Soviet dolls, it says, get top marks. But there are no toy vacuum cleaners, refrigerators or washing machines.

The children also made it clear what they would like to buy in their shops: divers, submarines, tanks and toy soldiers in different positions.

Boston Globe, 11-24-63

THE DAY "THAT WILL LIVE IN INFAMY"

In his column in the N. Y. Times, September 12, 1963, Arthur Krock notes that "the personal papers of General George Marshall, now being released for publication could greatly help the postwar generation... It remains to be seen," he continues, "whether General Marshall will fully disclose the origins of several incidents in his career that led to disastrous consequences."

"UNRESOLVED QUESTIONS"

"For instance, why was Marshall unable to recall what he was doing on the night of Dec. 6, 1941, when 13 of the 14 sections of Tokyo's bellicose reply to the United States proposals of Nov. 26 had been decoded and were being studied at the White House by President Roosevelt and Harry L. Hopkins? Why, after having that afternoon seen the "pilot message" of rejection, which was delivered to Marshall by Gen. Sherman Miles and Col. Bratton of G-2, did Marshall once deny having seen it? Did he forget the paper because it seemed to him unimportant? If so, was that the reason why he went to his office on the morning of Dec. 7 90 minutes after his usual time of 9 o'clock, and after the 14th section of the Japanese reply that declared war had been lying for two hours on his desk? Above all, why did Marshall then make no attempt to use the scrambler telephone to warn General Short at Hawaii of what was impending, a warning which reached Short by Western Union seven hours after the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor?"

Mr. Krock also hopes that Marshall's personal papers will reveal more facts regarding the "calamitous division of postwar Germany, that left free Berlin entirely surrounded by territory under the control of the Kremlin, (which) remains unclear because the decisive documentation is almost wholly confined to the personal papers of Roosevelt and Churchill."

"...his conflicting statements that (a) he was unaware of the instructions for his China mission until he had undertaken it and (b) that he prepared them himself beforehand? And why did the General, as Payne * states it, make the fatal errors of 'leaving China at a critical time in the negotiations,' and prolong his mission 'long after he had exhausted his own usefulness... because he was unable to make a choice' between the Chinese Nationalists and Communists."

*The Marshall Story by Robert Payne, Prentice-Hall, 1951.

RESPONSIBILITY

General Marshall's obligation, according to Mr. Krock, is to identify those chiefly responsible for "our" troubled heritage. His final emphasis is: "Unless the personal papers establish the answers to these questions, the full outlines of a great American will remain somewhat in the shadows."

Mr. Krock wishes most earnestly for the full story of all the detailed incidents that took place in all the inner circles of all the seats of power involved in the events leading up to World War II; the gory details of all the negotiations leading to the end of that war; and the events that followed the Allied victory. After all the facts might be uncovered concerning these matters, however, Mr. Krock would still be in the dark so far as explaining the dilemmas of those chaotic times: his "troubled heritage."

Even Mr. Krock now realizes that the "day that will live in infamy" was not altogether a surprise attack. That the Japanese would strike immediately at Pearl Harbor, might not have been known in sufficient time. But what is evident is that the American heads of state did know beforehand that the Japanese would attack. The "surprise attack" on Pearl Harbor did, however, furnish a much-needed slogan and powerful propaganda weapon to stir the great majority that "we" must defend "ourselves" against the attack by a "ruthless aggressor."

In contrast to the Arthur Krocks of the War years with their praises and condemnations of individuals in high places, The Western Socialist was in the position of being able to analyze the REAL causes of the war and demonstrate that war is, in fact,