

# CONNECTIONS

## New Team—Old Problems



We're already getting quite used to the new team. Ford and Rockefeller: The words roll from the lips quite easily. And the Nixon who dominated the news for so long has slipped from intense consideration with surprising ease. It's hard to grasp the immensity of the change. But imagine that you had been cut off from the news for the last year and suddenly had it all wash over you. No Presidential election, and yet we have a new President and a new Vice President, both acting as if they are quite at home in their respective positions.

The transition of Presidential power was one of the remarkable political events of our time. There was little doubt in the minds of sensitive observers that the United States was living through a period of severe strain and distress. And the euphoria that followed the elevation of Gerald Ford to an office that he assumed gravely but confidently was understandable. And so, too, is the feeling of relief and even slight depression. We are back from the dangerous but exhilarating heights and down once again to the realities of severe domestic and international problems. We have surmounted a very real crisis of internal political order and now must turn to some of the tasks that have been neglected or slighted.

One of the large problems faced by President Gerald Ford lodges in the relations he has with his Secretary of State. Even were Kissinger as brilliant as his warmest admirers assert, the foreign policies in which he played such an active and important role were not his alone, were not even primarily his. They were the policies of Richard Nixon, whose principal interests—as he many times asserted—lay in the field of international affairs. In immediately sending out word that Kissinger would stay on as Secretary of State, Ford acted with commendable prudence. The continuity of many recent U.S. commitments must be maintained, at least until it is evident that the new President is firmly in control of policies he supports.

Well and good! But not, after all, much beyond what is essential. Many of the policies, many of the actions initiated by Nixon are yet to be proven. The opening to China, détente with the USSR, the entire area of strategic weapons, the continuing problems of the Mediterranean, Greece and Turkey, Israel and the Arab countries—all these demand continuing attention, continuing decisions. And Kissinger, inevitably, will for some time play an important role.

In this issue of *Worldview* Frances Hill illuminates the view of Henry Kissinger by focusing on one geographical area, Africa. The terms of her analysis lend weight to those who describe him as brilliant, but they also lend weight to those who describe him as narrow. He is at his best, as others have noted, when he can act as a great man dealing with other powerful men. This necessitates a degree of confidence and secrecy that is highly congenial to some circumstances, but not to all. To some forms of government, but not to all. To some administrations, but not to all. Whether it will prove to be best for the present Administration of the United States, as it copes not only with crises but with the more ordinary circumstances of foreign affairs, is far from certain. Should we hope for the crises in which Kissinger excels, or should we strive for the less exciting, more mundane operations that attend relative stability?

The question is, of course, rhetorical. The choice is not wholly ours. In this issue of *Worldview*, in which we made no special attempt to deal with the sore spots of our world, there are articles not only on Kissinger and his exciting world but on specters that will not fade with the autumn mists. Both Senator Hatfield and John Naughton focus in on the now familiar but no less urgent problem of population, food, and world hunger. The recent meeting of experts in Bucharest showed that the leaders of the world, or at least spokesmen for major countries, are far from agreeing about the scope of the problem, its causes, or the possibilities of alleviating world hunger and starvation. It may be necessary to point out—it should be unnecessary—that the problem of world hunger has moral implications not always evident in other equally grave issues. Which means at least that many people are beginning to see it as a problem to which they must address their attentions, and as a problem in which the U.S. as the richest country in the world is inextricably involved.

John Pawlikowski and Barry Rubin comment on different aspects of the Middle East. Not the least interesting aspect of the article by Pawlikowski, who has long been involved in Christian-Jewish relations, is that he tells how he has changed his mind on a number of significant points.

And lest you overlook the lead article, let us call your attention to Mark Taylor's. The occasions for literature on war are not, unfortunately, at an end.