

Fairbank in this setup. And the remainder—still bigger wheels from finance, business and the Academy, include several who have some anti-Communist, including anti-ChiCom, credentials: Franklin Lindsay, for example (ex-CIA, presently Pres. of Itek Corp.), Prof. George E. Taylor (director of the University of Washington's Far Eastern Institute), Prof. Marshall Shulman (author of an excellent book on Stalin's foreign policy).

# NATIONAL REVIEW

NOV. 8, 1966  
VOL. 12, NO. 45

The Two Chinas Panel . . . p. 1

November 8 . . . p. 4

Let's All Riot . . . p. 6

BULLETIN

What's up? The timing, on first thought, is odd: at just the moment when Communist China a) is giving all-out support to the other side in a war we happen to be fighting; b) has antagonized a lot of African states by brazen subversions; c) has revealed both the barbarism of the regime and its internal division by the grotesque Red Guard romp; and when d) Secretary Rusk has given the word that the U.S. will oppose the Two Chinas device and any other weakening on Peking-recognition. All this, however, is just what explains the timing, as John W. Finney, who was given the story for leakage in the Oct. 21 *New York Times*, rather naively reveals: "The study is reported to have been undertaken . . . with the encouragement of those factions within the Administration that have been advocating a modification of the sixteen-year-old policy opposing the admission of Communist China to the UN."

The indirect manipulations of the old China-appeasers, in and out of government, with their hard core in the upper career echelons of State, mounted Operation Panel.

It was launched earlier than planned for the very reason that the swing in world and UN opinion has this year been *against* UN acceptance of Peking. The Assembly vote against admission would almost certainly have been larger than last year, with the shift of at least a number of the African delegations. The aim of the China-appeasers is to discourage this swing against Peking by suggesting that Washington is about ready to capitulate.

One may incidentally note that it is Secretary Rusk, opponent of weakening, who is the real target of this maneuver; and Ambassador Goldberg who is the presumptive beneficiary.

CPYRGHT

It seems that the Institute for Pacific Relations was right after all: those Chinese Communists *are* nothing but agrarian reformers. That is what we gather from the report just issued by "a panel of prominent citizens" who—no doubt encouraged by the reformist zeal shown lately by the Red Guards (or "Boy Scouts," as we would call them)—can't wait to welcome Peking into the United Nations. They figure the way to begin is with the "Two Chinas" prescription; get that down us as a preliminary dose and we aren't so likely to retch while swallowing the real thing.

Of course the Two Chinas pill is a bit shopworn, but this isn't just any old Panel. It was sponsored (don't hold

your breath) by the United Nations Association—which *must* be strictly non-political because it has no trouble with the IRS about its tax exemption. It was paid for out of a \$450,000 kitty anted up by—let's check this: yes, by the Ford Foundation! Among the 27 prominents of which it was composed, we do note a few who won their China spurs in the IPR—Arthur Dean (whose base is Sullivan & Cromwell), Joseph E. Johnson (Pres., Carnegie Endowment for International Peace), Prof. A. Doak Barnett (East Asian Institute, Columbia); and several UNophiliacs—Ernest Gross (ex-Amb. to the UN, more recently barrister for Liberia and Ethiopia *in re* South West Africa), Anna Lord Strauss (ex-Pres., League of Women Voters), and the inevitable Arthur (Rule-of-Law) Larson. But observe that, a) these are all among the biggest wheels of the IPR and UN crowd, and b) they are the cleanest, fellow-traveling-wise. This is not like the old days; there is no Owen Lattimore or Edgar Snow or even John K.

FOIAb3b

CPYRGHT

NOVEMBER 8, 1966 1