

DEC 21 1965

# These Days . . . . .

By John Chamberlain

## Peking's Conditions

A GROUP of Yale University professors and students, including an eminent divine, an eminent Dante scholar, an eminent authority on Melville's "Moby Dick," and, to be perfectly fair, a few eminent political scientists, have signed one of those



Chamberlain

\$5000-to-\$8000 newspaper advertisements calling for a "nationwide reappraisal of our Far Eastern Policy." The name of the group sponsoring the advertisement is Americans for Reappraisal of Far Eastern Policy, and it wants to negotiate with Red China, beginning with the question of Red Chinese admission to the United Nations.

Well, in a fluid world there is nothing eternally sacrosanct about any policy. But just how do you negotiate with a country like

Red China? Where do you begin when the conditions are all laid down for your defeat before you have even so much as opened your mouth?

LET'S START with this matter of U.N. admission before going on to other matters in the Far East that the Yale minority thinks need "reappraisal." The Red Chinese have spurned the United Nations recently, and have even talked of setting up a rival "peace" body. But they have said enough in the past to indicate they might condescend to take a seat by Manhattan's East River if the rest of the world would be good enough to change the U.N. Charter and expel "all imperialist puppet states."

The Taiwan Chinese would, of course, have to be thrown out; Red China has said it won't sit with the "Chiang Kai-shek clique." Satisfaction for Red China here would require a preliminary abandonment on the part of the Taiwan Chinese of their right to a veto in the U.N. Security Council.

This, no doubt, could be arranged if the U.S. were sufficiently Machiavellian to threaten Taiwan with cancellation of an existing treaty of mutual defense. But if "reappraisal" were to involve such arm-twisting, there wouldn't be a country in the world that would continue to trust the United States in any vital matter.

Another condition laid down by the Red Chinese is that the U.N. repudiate its 1951 resolution condemn-

ing Peking as an aggressor in Korea. Thus there could be no negotiations looking to seat Red China in the United Nations without the United Nations itself eating crow.

AS FOR "negotiating" a peaceful solution of the Vietnam War, North Vietnam's President Ho Chi Minh has said he will talk when the United States has departed from Saigon. Very nice of the old revolutionary. We might meet him on his own terms by saying that we will talk when he gets his troops and agents out of South Vietnam. By all means let the South Vietnamese govern themselves without the intervention of either Ho Chi Minh or Lyndon Johnson—or, for that matter, Mao Tse-tung. Any time a "reappraisal" involves an even-handed quid pro quo, we are all for it.

The advertisement signed by a minority of the Yale community and sponsored by Americans for Reappraisal of Far Eastern Policy says "the United States and China are on a collision course." Pardon me, but the United States isn't touching a single blessed thing that Red China owns. We have studiously and systematically refrained from giving Chiang Kai-shek offensive military weapons such as big bombers or missiles or atomic warheads. We don't even let him buy landing craft, and during the Korean War we used the Seventh Fleet to keep him from attacking the Chinese mainland. If there is going to be any "collision," it will be because the Red Chinese get between us and the North Vietnamese forces that are trying to throttle a small, inoffensive agrarian people in South Vietnam who are suffering because Ho Chi Minh himself has consistently refused to abide peacefully by the Geneva Agreements of 1954.