



CPYRGHT

**China Hands  
Heard From . . .**

As the day of the China experts dawned on Capitol Hill, there was no mistaking the gleam in the eyes

of Sen. J. W. Fulbright and Sen. Wayne Morse. Happy anticipation, however, was short-lived. For Prof. A. Doak Barnett, of Columbia University, and Prof. John K. Fairbank, of Harvard University, ended up by giving the Johnson Administration's Vietnam policy the strongest support it had yet received from the intellectual community. No amount of prodding by Senators Fulbright and Morse could elicit disapproval of our actions in Vietnam from these two recognized "China hands."

Columbia's A. Doak Barnett appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on March 8. On the issue of Vietnam, Prof. Barnett expressed his firm support of our military effort in defense of the independence of South Vietnam. "If we begin to back off our policy," he stated, "we would tend to confirm the Vietcong and Chinese approach, and this would not induce them to consider optional policies. It might well confirm them in the course in which they are now embarked." On the matter of "neutralizing" Southeast Asia—a catchword that seems to have caught the fancy of Senator Fulbright—Prof. Barnett was equally firm. "There needs to be a stable power balance [there]," he said, "that in the long run we and China can accept."

Harvard's John K. Fairbank argued two days later in the same vein. The United States, he insisted, should "hold the line" militarily on the Korean border, in the Taiwan Strait and "somehow in Vietnam." South Vietnam has become a "focus of power politics" and "perhaps power has to be used in smaller wars if we are to avoid bigger wars." The underlying issue in Vietnam, Prof. Fairbank recognized, is "nation-building." "The real test," he pointed out, "is not whether we can fight, but whether we can be more constructive than destructive *while we are fighting.*" (Emphasis added)

All in all, March 8 and 10 were not very encouraging days for the various "peace" movements.

CPYRGHT

**. . . on the Matter  
of Red China**

On the other hand, the professors were none too happy over the traditional posture of the United

States toward Red China. The beast may need cuffing in Southeast Asia, they admitted. At the same time, it may be the wise thing, they suggested, to attempt to draw Red China out of its isolation from the world community. Prof. Fairbank drew the picture of a psychotic Red China whose persecution complex causes it to flail out at its imaginary enemies. Psychotics, it appears, are best

CPYRGHT

CPYRGHT

treated with a certain amount of deliberate indulgence.

Significantly, the Administration seems to have bought the Barnett-Fairbank thesis. On NBC's "Meet the Press," Vice President Humphrey suggested on March 12 that U. S. policy toward Red China should be one of "containment without necessarily isolation"—a formula that echoed A. Doak Barnett word for word.

Don't be surprised, then, if the United States assumes a passive attitude when the question of seating Red China next comes up before the UN General Assembly. Don't be surprised, either, if Red China rejects the peace offer.

CPYRGHT

**Malta's Elections  
and the Church**

Old habits die hard. In a pastoral letter of March 13, Malta's Archbishop Michael Gonzi did what

reporter Carlo Cardona, in his article on p. 412 of this issue, half expected the Maltese hierarchy might do—and half hoped it wouldn't. The Archbishop's pastoral put the Church squarely in the middle of that island's current election campaigns.

In fairness, it should be stressed that the archbishop did not specifically tell his flock for whom they should vote. His letter, also signed by Bishop Joseph Pace of Gozo, simply exhorted Catholics to exercise their voting franchise as good citizens. "No one," it said in part, "should remain neutral and abstain from voting for candidates from whom religion and the Church have nothing to fear." The trouble was that, by explicit references to Dom Mintoff's Labor party, the letter also made it clear that Labor's candidates did not exactly fit those requirements.

At this remove, second-guessing the archbishop's letter and the whole situation in Malta is a risky business. Cordona's analysis, however, and the still painful memories of flaps caused by similar pastorals in Puerto Rico in 1960 and in Malta itself in 1962, cannot help raising the question of whether the archbishop has chosen the wisest course. That question, it seems to us, becomes doubly pertinent in view of the fact that this pastoral was written hard on the heels of the Second Vatican Council's Declaration on Religious Liberty.

CPYRGHT

**Cuban Nerves  
Are on Edge**

Havana seems to be going through a siege of the jitters. Early in March, seven Cubans accused of

plotting to kill Fidel Castro went on trial amid great publicity. Two of them, as majors, held the highest rank in the Cuban military. All seven had fought at Castro's side against Batista. In the incredible fashion of Communists

CPYRGHT

CPYRGHT

CPYRGHT

CPYRGHT

trials, the principal defendant, Maj. Rolando Cubela, admitted his guilt and pleaded: "Send me to the wall. Execution, that's what I want." At Castro's own request, however, he was given 30 years in jail.

On March 12, Lawrence K. Hunt, a former U. S. Air Force captain who has lived in Cuba since 1956, received a similar 30-year sentence, for spying. As in most of these trials, the CIA was made out to be the villain. So was Manuel Artime, one of the three leaders of the Bay of Pigs invasion, who now lives in exile and figures in many of Castro's tirades as the typical anti-revolutionary "worm."

Those who seem to know claim that Castro made a serious blunder when he promised that any Cuban with relatives abroad (and who in Cuba doesn't have them?) could leave the country. Now everyone is asking himself: "Why don't I go to Miami?" By opening up this possibility, Castro has unsettled people more than he realized. Even the police and soldiery are jumpy. In recent weeks, three civilian members of foreign embassies have been fired at and wounded—by mistake.

From Sukarno

CPYRGHT

Old revolutionaries never die; they simply fade away. If Sukarno is ruminating at all on recent events

in Indonesia, his thoughts may well be running along such lines. Though his name may still possess a certain magic throughout Indonesia, real power has passed out of the hands of the President into those of the military. After taking over the government on March 12, Indonesia's new strong man, Lt. Gen. Suharto, moved to purge Sukarno's Cabinet of its pro-Communist element—notably Foreign Minister Subandrio—and ordered his regional commanders to wipe out the last vestiges of the Indonesian Communist party. It has been suggested that the moves never would have been made were it not for the strong stance being taken by the United States against communism elsewhere in Southeast Asia.

Sukarno had taken his stand against his restive generals on the issue of communism. No Communist himself, he believed that the ideology was a force that had to be accepted in Indonesian society. The military and, it would seem, a good proportion of the Indonesian people disagreed. They felt there was only one way to halt the corrosive drift to the extreme left. The Army took over. It was as simple as that.

The problems Suharto has inherited, however, are anything but simple. There are many centrifugal forces at work in this sprawling island republic. Potentially the richest nation in Asia, Indonesia is, after almost two

CPYRGHT

decades of Sukarno's rule, virtually bankrupt. Moreover, the Communist apparatus may prove just as dangerous under as above ground. For the moment, at any rate, Indonesia has been snatched from a precipice. The danger of a Peiping-Jakarta pincers aimed at Southeast Asia has lessened.

CPYRGHT

Could They Bend the Ear?

When two of our editors were in Moscow earlier this year, the Lenin Mausoleum in Red Square was

closed. So they were disappointed in their hope of seeing the mummified body of Vladimir Ilich Lenin, who died January 21, 1924 at the age of 54.

Recently, a book was published in London that makes us wonder whether they missed anything after all. Its author, Dr. Stefan Possony, concludes that "the odds are overwhelming that an unnamed practitioner of Mme. Tussaud's art modeled Lenin's hands and head from wax." According to Possony, there were apparently three separate attempts to embalm Lenin's body between 1924 and 1928. The first took place soon after his death, but "the body deteriorated within six weeks." A second attempt seemed to be more successful but lasted less than five months. Ghoulish as it sounds, the Russians claimed they used a new technique and were so successful that they could "bend the corpse's ear; the cheeks felt soft and cool; and when one lifted an arm, it fell back without stiffness." This was apparently done by immersing the body in water, then in a mixture of water and weakly concentrated acetic acid, and finally in peroxide of hydrogen.

The book claims, however, that the body had clearly deteriorated by 1928 and that the remains were disposed of and a dummy substituted. It states that observers of the body, visiting the mausoleum in the early 1930's, noted that Lenin's head had more hair than he had at the age of 30. Hence "visitors who looked at photographs of the old and the dead Lenin wondered whether death might have cured his baldness."

CPYRGHT

The Negro Soldier in Vietnam

The figures do catch the eye. At the end of 1965, the Army in Vietnam was 14.8 per cent Negro, the

Marine Corps 8.9 per cent Negro. Between 1961 and 1965, the Negro death rate in the Army was 18.3 per cent. In the Marine Corps, the Negro death rate was 11.3 per cent.

The suspicion that inevitably arises from such statistical discrepancy was expressed at the closed hearings in Washington on new military appropriations for Vietnam.