

Part 3 of the Chinese note then makes certain counter-proposals. The first of these, which they call point A, provides for withdrawal of foreign troops from Korea and a settlement of Korean domestic affairs by the Koreans themselves. That would be satisfactory, I think, if it meant that this would be done according to the principles of paragraphs 2 and 3 of our statement, and providing that the Peking Government clearly and specifically indicates that the foreign troops to be withdrawn would include Chinese forces and nationals. The interpretation of their note given to us through the Indian Ambassador in Peking, though still, not too precise on these points, gives grounds for believing that Peking accepts them.

Point B reads as follows:

"The subject matter of the negotiations must include the withdrawal of United States armed forces from Taiwan and the Taiwan Strait, and Far Eastern related problems."

That has already been included in our statement, though in somewhat different form. I do not think there should be any great difficulty here, because our statement was quite clear on this point, and contemplated honest and sincere negotiations with a view to reaching a settlement.

Point C sets up a committee of seven for the negotiation and settlement of political questions, excluding presumably any other State from that body. In this respect the Peking reply goes further with a more rigid provision than that contained in paragraph 5 of our statement. Moreover, it states that the "rightful place of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations should be established as from the beginning of the seven-nation conference".

If this means that one of the important subjects for post cease-fire discussions must be decided in advance, namely, membership of the People's Government of China in the United Nations, then of course this Peking counter-proposal would not be worthy of consideration. But the message from Peking read by the representative of India on Monday last seems, at least to me, to indicate that the Peking authorities do not require such a condition, but ask the members of the proposed conference when it meets to affirm their right to membership in the United Nations.

There are many Members of the United Nations who have already recognized the Peking Government as the de jure government of China; there are others who were coming to the view that, having regard to the facts of the situation and the desirability of having as a spokesman for the Chinese people at the United Nations a representative of the Government which, whatever we may think about it, is in effective control of continental China, such recognition should be given to the Peking Government. There is little doubt that there was a trend in that direction, which by now might have resulted in a decision as to membership in the United Nations, when the outbreak of war in Korea and the relationship, from the beginning, of the Government in Peking to that war, made any such action, for the time being, quite impossible.