

3 Feb 1964

EDITORIALS

To Lead or To Follow

The United States has strongly protested France's decision to recognize Red China. France has rejected the protest in language as curt as one loving ally can well use to another. Now a part of the U.S. diplomatic Establishment, though still bitter, is beginning to cool off. A few of the men who sit at the big desks are trying to think — always a more profitable exercise than grinding one's teeth. "Sources," quoted by *The New York Times*, say that, just maybe, this could be a good thing for the United States.

That depends on another beloved U.S. ally — Chiang Kai-shek. The Sino-French accord, such as it is, was negotiated by M. Edgar Faure, a former premier and foreign minister, and one of its conditions was that France would not have to break off relations with Taiwan. The Chinese Communists have never tolerated the idea of such duality before; that they are now willing to do so indicates that they place a considerable value on French recognition. The question is whether Taiwan, though unhappy, will prove equally amenable. If the State Department is wise (its wisdom may need some catalyzation by President Johnson), it will urge the Generalissimo not to break his ties with France.

If that influence is not brought to bear, or if Chiang proves intransigent, the dominoes will fall. Clearly, what the Chinese Reds hope for is that Chiang will cooperate in isolating himself. Portugal, if only because of its interest in Macao, is then likely to extend recognition to Peking and let Chiang cut his throat if he feels like it. Japan is another candidate, and Canada. And others.

In the UN, fifteen African countries still recognize Chiang's government on Taiwan as the lawful ruler of all China; of these, thirteen are former French colonies. They are independent, but many of their statesmen speak French and in such matters tend to follow the French lead. The result, *The New York Times*' Review of the Week (January 19) points out, "could be a perilously narrow margin, if any, for the forces blocking Peking's admission to the UN." This is sound arithmetic, considering that last October, amid great rejoicing in the American delegation, the General Assembly vote against seating Red China in the Security Council was 57 to 41. If nine nations switch, all is lost.

What is so perilous about this prospect? De Gaulle undoubtedly foresees this possible, and indeed likely, development, and it does not freeze his blood. On the contrary, he sees possible advantages for France — and perhaps trouble for China. In the latter area, is there not a lesson for us in our own hemisphere? Here we have hegemony, and look at our troubles, in Panama, in Cuba, in all of Latin America. Once the American military are out of Vietnam (and the

time is growing short when we can withdraw with dignity), the Chinese Reds may wish we had stayed. Over the centuries, no love has been lost between the little nations of Southeast Asia and the great incubus to the north. If they get along no better in the future than in the past, we should be able to retain a considerable measure of influence (shared with France) in South and Southeast Asia. They might even begin to like us down there, once we stop dropping napalm.

But if the specter of neutralism continues to haunt Washington, if we can never wean ourselves from Dulles and Acheson, if we continue to contest China's admission to the UN, if, in short, we follow our right-wing bigots to the end, then, indeed, the end will be bitter. It is as if anti-communism had blinded us. De Gaulle not only sees, but *foresees*, and we do not. We had better follow him.

The Draft Becomes an Issue

The author of the following editorial, John C. Esty, Jr., is headmaster of the Taft School, Watertown, Conn. For the March 14, 1959, issue of The Nation he wrote "The Draft Dilemma: A Way Out," and in the February 23, 1963, issue he published "We Don't Need the Draft."

Last spring Congress took two days to debate and vote a four-year extension of Selective Service. Only two weeks elapsed between the opening of hearings and the signing of the bill — a remarkably expeditious performance, especially for that session of Congress. The whole procedure provoked only desultory news stories and practically no editorial comment.

Now, less than a year later, the draft is developing into a national issue. In the past two months:

• More articles and editorials were written about the draft than in the previous five years.

• A Senate subcommittee on employment and manpower, directed by Sen. Joseph Clark, has held hearings on the effect of the draft on unemployment and the training of youth.

• Congressman Robert Kastenmeier of Wisconsin has renewed his efforts to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 to provide for a study by the Secretary of Labor of the military needs of the nation.

• Senator Russell halted passage of a draft-exemption bill in the Senate, and announced that his Armed Services Committee would conduct hearings early in the new session to examine the total effect of all exemptions from the draft.

• President Johnson ordered draft physicals given to eighteen-year-olds to identify early, and develop remedial measures for, the nearly half who will fail the physical and mental standards of Selective Service.

Why should there be this sudden activity and in-

? + 17 for inst. rights IRC