

Mr. Dulles Finds Reasons for Non-Recognition Straight Out of Confucius**On the Alarming Decline of Ancestor Worship in the New China**

Working up toward the climax of his speech in San Francisco on why we ought never—yes, never—to recognize Communist China, Mr. Dulles touched on the danger it represented to traditional Chinese culture. “The venerated graves of ancestors,” said the Secretary of State, with an almost Confucian indignation, “are everywhere being desecrated.” We are sorry he did not continue in this vein. It is not only ancestor worship which is declining. Marriages are being contracted in China without casting the horoscopes of bride and groom, and houses are being built without testing the site for malevolent spirits. Such defiance of Heaven must sooner or later bring the regime's downfall.

Mr. Dulles spoke of the horrors being visited on the Chinese. “Individuality and personality are brutally suppressed,” Mr. Dulles said. In the good old days, the poorest coolie or rickshaw boy, after his day's work in Shanghai, could shop around according to individual taste (as his counterparts still do in Cairo and Calcutta) before deciding which doorway or gutter he would sleep in that night. Personality flowered. “Children,” Mr. Dulles went on with his description of the new commune system, “are placed in wholesale nurseries, so that the women can also be part of the slave labor.” In the good old days, there were no “wholesale”—or even private, retail—nurseries; children were not separated from their mothers; both worked.

Where the Good Old Days Still Exist

The good old days still exist in Hong Kong. A few days after Mr. Dulles spoke, Peggy Durbin provided a description in the *New York Times Magazine* (Dec. 7) of conditions in that city. “In some families,” Miss Durbin wrote of the more fortunate, “the father has a permanent job, perhaps at piece-work ten hours a day seven days a week in a Chinese factory; his wife embroiders at home while looking after three undernourished children.”

Even into this paradise, the serpent of social reform has been creeping. Miss Durbin wrote of a new regulation to limit the hours of working women and children—but not men—to ten hours a day and six days a week. She quoted a leading Hong Kong paper, the *South China Morning Post*, as warning that the city must “make gradual, not revolutionary progress in this type of social reform.” A few more years of godless propaganda and the male workers of Hong Kong will be demanding Sunday off, too.

This change in hours for women and children is due to foreign influence. John G. Norris in the *Washington Post* (Nov. 5) reported from Hong Kong that the regulation against work for women and children more than 6 days a week and 10 hours a day was imposed by the British colonial authorities because the home government complained of competition in cheap textiles. (Here we see how the proletariat benefits from colonialism.) The blow was softened for the Hong Kong capitalist, according to Mr. Norris, by attaching to the new regulation “no guarantee that overall wages would

Separate But Equal Voting?

One way to compromise the voting issue might be to promise that if the South allowed Negroes to vote, Congress in return would legalize segregated ballot boxes.

not be reduced.” Thus the pious millowner will still be able to maintain the graves of his ancestors in the style to which they have become accustomed.

Troubles Nice People Don't Talk About

“Few Hong Kong residents,” Miss Durbin wrote, “face the ugly possibility that hundreds of thousands of people, without the elementary right to work, in daily view of luxury and plenty, repress resentments that might one day tragically explode into violence.” When it comes we may expect Mr. Dulles to attribute the outbreak to indirect aggression, subversive propaganda and the lack of sound religious training. In Hong Kong's better circles, Miss Durbin wrote, “it is just not chic” to talk of the surrounding misery. This, too, is reminiscent of the good old days everywhere in Asia.

Hong Kong teems, of course, with refugees from the Communist mainland and their flight—like that of others coming across Soviet borders—testifies to much that is wrong with the new regimes. But we had better not lean back with smug satisfaction. The misery of the China mainland is the misery of a people struggling hard with bare hands to make a leap forward out of poverty; it holds a promise for the future not to be found in the slums of Hong Kong, i.e. in the good old days. We are being blinded by hateful propaganda to the immense strides forward of the new China.

No. 3 in Steel Production

We pass on one item out of many. The *Baltimore Sun* (Dec. 9) carried a dispatch from its London bureau citing a British trade letter. It reported that this current “year of the great leap” (as the Chinese Communists call it) may enable China in 1959 to surpass Britain, West Germany and France and to become the world's third largest producer of iron and steel after the USA and the USSR. The British Council for the Promotion of International Trade says this marks “a scale of growth for which no previous parallel exists in any country” and that the Peking planners have repeatedly underestimated the rise in steel output.

A giant is awakening, dragging itself up by its bootstraps out of poverty. It is not wise to shut our eyes to this progress. It is not charitable for a people as rich and well-favored as our own to survey the scene with the self-righteous distortions of Mr. Dulles. The day may come when the new China, too, will have ample means to look after the tombs of its ancestors.

Edgar Snow on Chiang Kai-shek: “A Scavenger Among the Relics of the Past”

“Under Chiang Kai-shek's government some attempt was made to establish rule by constitution and law, some roads were built, modern banks were established, some flood control work progressed, scientific study was somewhat encouraged, educational facilities improved, and women began to claim legal equality with men. Modernization along such lines was certainly more rapid than under previous regimes; had there been no Japanese invasion Chiang might have succeeded in unifying the country under right-wing dictatorship. But the whole pace of change was too slow to cope with the deep crisis inside Chinese society. Increasingly

Chiang resorted to despotism to hold back the tidal demand for revolutionary measures.

“It was, however, unfair to call Chiang a despot and let it go at that. . . . He was not a great tyrant, only a petty one . . . he never understood that his worst enemies were in his own camp. Chiang was not resolute, only obstinate; not wise, only obsolete; not original, only a scavenger among the relics of the past; and not ruthless, merely vain—as none knew better than the greedy parasites who surrounded and finally consumed him.”

—Edgar Snow's new book: *Journey to the Beginning*.

The Key European Issue Is Still the Nuclear Rearmament of Germany

(Continued from Page One)

bondholder party" (as in the Press Club speech) considered good enough for the ignorant rabble, while its betters in private decide the issues of war and peace?

It is time to look back over the events of the least two decades and see how many historic decisions have been taken without public consultation and debate, though these may foreclose our fate. The first two may be excused on the ground that they were taken in war-time; these were the decision to develop the atom bomb and the decision to drop it on Hiroshima. But the others were made in peace time. There was the decision to go ahead and try to make the H-bomb without an effort to negotiate a stopping point with the Russians; this decision, which Oppenheimer opposed with tragic consequences for himself, might never have been known at the time if former Senator Johnson of Colorado had not blurted out news of the H-bomb in a radio interview. Then came the decision to make nuclear arms "conventional," i.e. to make any future war nuclear, and now we are getting ready to make Germany a nuclear power, again without debate.

Humphrey Plays It Safe

So powerful is the hold of decisions made by a small inner group that even Senator Humphrey at his press conference on his return from Moscow said German policy was not something for any "ordinary Senator" to discuss! He defended the nuclear rearmament of Germany by saying that we were keeping custody of the nuclear arms to be sent the Reich and that the German army was *merely* being trained in their use.* The Senator, with his eye on the Presidency, is obviously intent on keeping in with the inner circle, showing himself loyal to its clichés and dependably devoted to its stereotypes, a "safe man," despite the fact that liberals and Mrs. Roosevelt like him.

Everywhere else in the world there is debate on Germany, including the Reich itself. Our papers, ballyhooing the West Berlin elections of last Sunday as an overwhelming defeat for the Communists, slid over the more important fact that they showed a larger majority than last time for

the Social Democrats, who want to negotiate a neutralized Germany, over Adenauer's Christian Democrats, who find even Mr. Dulles too flexible for their taste. In Britain (see page two) the opposition has a clear alternative policy; in Canada, Lester Pearson advocates disengagement. Only here there is no alternative offered by the opposition and even Humphrey comes back from Moscow with a stultifying formula: we need do nothing but stand firm on Berlin.

Far More Dangerous Than Korea

Berlin, Humphrey says, is only a "probing" operation. But the "probe" tests our brains as well as our resolution. Berlin is only the most dramatic of a number of exposed Western salients that give Moscow and Peking the initiative; they can turn it on or shut it off as they please because our position is so exposed. Berlin can only be saved from submersion by solving the problem of German reunification; in the long run the position of West Berlin is otherwise untenable. But the East will no more agree to a reunified re-armed Germany in NATO than we would to a reunified re-armed Germany in the Warsaw pact. Yet so long as Germany is split, it is a more dangerous European Korea, more dangerous because of the exposed and encircled position of West Berlin. A majority of the city's voters are against the Free City proposal; they don't trust the East to honor that status and we don't blame them. But a majority of the city's voters are also for trying to negotiate a way out of the impasse by negotiating a neutral Germany. Our press applauds them for the first and ignores them on the second. Where do the Democrats stand on this? Why should they and Humphrey be allowed to duck the question?

Drift is not statesmanship. West Berlin will not be saved by rigidity. We suggest that the real question which ought to be thrown open to debate is this: Irrespective of what the Russians think (why must we always react to them, instead of thinking on our own?), is it to America's advantage, will it make Western Europe more secure, if we proceed to make West Germany a nuclear military power? On the basis of bitter experience, twice repeated in our lifetime, is it safe to trust them with such weapons? Can we be sure that they will not use them to blackmail a new partition of Poland and make a new deal with Moscow? Wouldn't a neutral Germany without arms be a safer bet for both sides?

* The Senator deplored the interpretation given his news conference in Geneva Nov. 22, which implied that the path to a settlement with Moscow lay in abandoning nuclear rearmament for West Germany; he claimed he was misunderstood.

VACATION NOTICE

The Weekly is published 48 times a year. Ordinarily it does not go to press the last two Thursdays in August or December. (Actually this year 49 issues were published. Because of what seemed to be an imminent summit meeting, we took no vacation during August and this issue is Vol. VI, No. 49.) The Weekly will not appear the next two weeks. Our next issue, Vol. VII, No. 1, will go to press Dec. 31, and be dated Jan. 5. We wish our readers a festive holiday and a happy New Year.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.

Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Washington, D. C.
Post Office