

SIOUX CITY, IOWA  
JOURNAL

JUL 14 1971

D - 74,044  
S - 57,489

## Stale 'Despotism' Rides Again

Some time ago we ventured the guess that as the United States moved toward the recognition of Mao Tse-tung's regime in Peking, a campaign would be mounted to discredit the Nationalist government on Taiwan.

Actually "guess" is a very poor word, nor was much of a venture involved. The pattern in such cases has become so firmly established that the old hands at the game use the same script — only the names of the principles are changed.

As an initial exhibit, we offer the standardized surgery performed on Chiang Kai-shek in a recent issue of Parade, by one of its editors, Lloyd Shearer.

After a fuzzy attempt to tie in the cost of the Vietnam War with China policy, Shearer expounds: "... Chiang Kai-shek at age 83 is confronted with a loss of face on Taiwan and can no longer perpetuate the fiction that he is the rightful leader of some 750 million Chinese.

"Chiang fled to Taiwan in 1949 with 2 million Chinese mainlanders and has kept 12 million Taiwanese Islanders under his benevolent despotism ever since."

If Shearer's "benevolent despotism" strikes a familiar chord, readers surely will recall attacks waged at various times in the United States against the governments of South Korea, South Vietnam, Thailand, Laos, Cambodia (only after the coup), Spain, Portugal, Greece, Turkey, Iran, Tshombe's secessionist Katanga Province, Biafra, South Africa, Rhodesia and most of the governments of South America (except Chile). We may have missed quite a few.

Admittedly, a few of the above are not desirable, although in comparison to their Red counterparts, indeed their benevolence doth shine.

We do not argue that despotism and corruption are good, but rather that all governments, being run by men, are apt to be sullied to a degree at one time or another. Also, despotism and corruption, to use a stale and irksome old bromide, are often "in the eyes of the beholder," and Shearer and his friends are masters of the game of pick-and-choose.

Therefore, Chiang is a despot, Mao (whose regime probably murdered more people than Stalin's) is not; Thieu is a conniving dictator, Ho Chi Minh was not; Fran-

co's Spanish regime is repressive, Tito's Yugoslavia and Ceausecu's Romania are forward-looking regimes which (like the Russians and Red Chinese) are worthy of U.S. trust.

Such comparisons could go on and on; the point is, why is it our friends and allies seem to have so many faults while our enemies are pure? Is it the same reasoning that makes the American military, the FBI, the CIA, big business and most of the nation's old moral values and institutions so wrong?