

1960's. It should not have surprised us that twenty years of Communist rule should have left so many large pockets of frustration, envy, and discontent where a political leader could find effective allies against the Party machine. It should not have surprised us that the definite, if modest, measure of improvement in Chinese life since 1949 should have created an appetite for individualism and independence rather than more hunger for self-abasement and sacrifice. It should not have surprised us that the recovery of self-confidence and stability among one in four of the human race should have strengthened the instinct for autonomy at every level — household, family, village, county, province, and region — and rendered China progressively more difficult to rule from one single desk in Peking."

But most of us, it must be admitted, were surprised. Just as many people were surprised by the Hungarian revolution of 1956 and were forced to rethink their ideas about the individual and society under totalitarian rule. Those few who are not caught short by these and similar events in contemporary political life are those who have sound insights into the person and the political communities of which he is a part. These people — some of whom could be listed and who are still lively commentators on political affairs — are not necessarily experts. But they have a better grasp than many experts of both the limitations and the potentialities of man in political affairs. To continue Mr. Wilson's immediate conclusion:

"The first point, therefore, from which to start an appraisal of where China stands today after all this turmoil is a recognition that, contrary to the propaganda of the Communists, ironically parroted by some of their most hostile critics in the West, China has not fundamentally changed over the past twenty years. She has recovered a great deal of poise, self-respect, and adequacy of living standards, but these by themselves would tend merely to reinforce the pre-existing social fabric."

Twenty years takes us back almost to Dean Acheson's well-known speech to the National Press Club in Washington. Addressing that group in January, 1950, the then Secretary of State outlined the military policy of the U.S. toward Asia and indicated the political policy from which it derived. The military policy was based on maintaining strength on the chain of islands running from Japan to the Philippines; our present policy, which has led us to place many troops on the Asian mainland, flows from a quite different con-

cept of how U.S. strength should be employed and what a U.S. presence should accomplish.

And this returns us to our original question: Is Communist China following a policy that is dictated by national interests or by communism? For the evidence mounts that they can severely diverge. And let us add several more questions. Are the intentions of China best judged by her aggressive proclamations or by her more temperate actions? Should the U.S. adopt an aggressive or a conciliatory policy — or continue on its present uncertain way? Should we take seriously the advice to build a thin A.B.M. defense against China's potential ICBM's? Should we — following, for example, Italy and Canada — establish diplomatic relations with China? Because of the domestic policies of the United States, some of these questions could be reopened, re-examined and more readily resolved by the Nixon Administration than by any Democratic administration. We will have some few years' breathing space before they become urgent.

J. F.

## AFTER THE WAR

The peace talks proceed apace but the war continues and the casualties mount. Nevertheless many people anticipate the end and plan accordingly. Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam, for example, has initiated a campaign for the amnesty of U.S. army deserters. "They, with their buddies in the field, have carried our guilt long enough." And the aerospace industries anticipate a postwar growth. "Our future planning is based on visible contracts. One must believe in the long-term threat."

With this issue we welcome another regular columnist to the pages of *worldview*. Donald Brandon is Chairman of the Department of Political Science at the University of San Francisco. He has written and lectured widely on political theory and American foreign policy. Dr. Brandon is the author of *American Foreign Policy: Beyond Utopianism and Realism*.