

Lin observes and John Foster Dulles observed before him, World War I was followed by the emergence of the Soviet state and World War II by the emergence of other "Socialist" countries and in many lands by the end of colonial rule by Western nations. In one of his more perceptive moments, Dulles suggested that this should teach Western nations a lesson. I happen to think that, in turning to setting up military establishments as large as possible, these "Socialist" regimes followed a bad example and perpetrated a fatal misstep, but there can be no question whose example they were following. As Marshal Lin, in his own terminology, remarked: "It is . . . the imperialists and reactionaries who have taught the people the arts of war."

It is difficult also, unless one adopts a different view of such matters from the prevalent non-pacifist one, to quarrel with Lin's contention: "How can it be argued that the imperialists and their lackeys may kill people everywhere, while the people must not strike back in self-defense or help one another? What kind of logic is this?"

Nuclear weapons have introduced a new dimension into the world situation. In this field also there is no basis for the charge that the Communists effected this new departure and then "forced" others, in "self-defense," to equip themselves with nuclear capability. The United States pioneered in this effort for "reasons of state" that the American government and many of its people regarded during World War II (and still regard) as sufficient. Moreover, the United States actually atom-bombed Hiroshima and Nagasaki for reasons that were and are regarded as sufficient by many in this country, though in the rest of the world there is widespread doubt.

Just now one of the indictments against the Peking regime, especially in the United States, is that it has not signed a limited ban against

nuclear testing and has proceeded to acquire the beginnings of a nuclear arsenal for itself. The danger of proliferation is declared by many experts to be the worst the world faces today. It is one about which, however, American authorities did not think before *they* produced the A-bomb, except to speculate that at least for a long time the United States would have a monopoly on the grim weapon. Obviously no moral credit can be derived from that. Nor were American policy makers deterred by the proliferation danger from producing the H-bomb, although it was already known by that time that they did *not* have a monopoly on atomic weapons.

How the heavily armed nuclear nations, such as the United States and the Soviet Union, can with a straight face ask or demand self-denial of other nations, before they take drastic steps to eliminate their own nuclear capability, has always been beyond me. It seems to me sheer effrontery for the United States to make a case out of the Chinese tests in view of the more than three hundred tests of mega-weapons it has conducted over the years and its failure to make any substantial effort to prevent France from going in for atomic weapons production.

If one thinks for a moment in geopolitical terms, one is led to much the same conclusion. If anyone is entitled to a "sphere of influence" in Southeast Asia, on what are called "security" grounds, it is China, certainly not the United States. The latter would regard a military presence of the Chinese in Mexico of anything near the size of United States presence in Japan, Okinawa, Taiwan, the Philippines and South Vietnam as a mortal threat to its security and indeed its existence. Add to this the history of humiliation of Asiatics by Western peoples (not least the United States); and Americans who want to understand their world and how to deal with it would do well to ask why a Chinese