

Letters to The Times

Two-China Idea Queried

Opposition Expressed to Proposal as Solution to Problem

The writer of the following was formerly director of the Office for Far Eastern Affairs and special assistant to the Secretary of State.

CPYRGHT

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In your Oct. 23 issue you again urge, under the caption "A Two China Policy," adoption of that policy. This time, after all too many hypotheticals and subjunctives, you confidently predict that "Ultimately this [the two-China policy] will be the . . . acceptable . . . solution of the China problem in the United Nations." One wonders, May one comment?

You affirm that "A two-nation procedure that would vote both Taipei and Peking into the United Nations might have a chance of acceptance. . . ." "Might have"—conceivably; but what would be the likelihood?

Well-informed observers know that, with the exception of some "Taiwanese," all articulate Chinese think in terms of there being one and only one China, and that both of the now contending Chinese Governments have declared their firm opposition to the "two-Chinas" idea. You yourselves point out that "the Russians pose the question as all or nothing for Peking."

Record of Aggression

One feature of the procedure you advocate is that it would, if adopted, confer immediately upon Communist China membership in the United Nations. Does Communist China's behavior, past and present; do its current aggressions southward and its floundering in Cuba; does the recent rejection of it in and by vote of the United Nations Assembly, does anything actual or probable warrant a belief that a proposal thus favoring that troublemaker would have a "chance" of adoption?

No government has thus far ventured formally a "two-China" proposal. Suppose that one or more were to do so, that the Assembly voted "yes," that Taipei and Peking assented or acquiesced and, finally, that there emerged in place of one China, two. How long would that arrangement—defying considerations of geography, history, race, beliefs, economics and politics—endure? "Guaranteed" internationally—yes; but what would be its ultimate sanction?

Can it be imagined that the Communist rulers of the mainland, provoked by admission of their "republic" to the United Nations, would desist and refrain from machinations directed toward consummation of their fixed purpose to bring Formosa within their domain? One may well reflect upon what happened to Korea 50 years ago: declared "independent," forthwith annexed by Japan.

Earlier Statement

Your statement that the "reality" now is that "while there was once only one China, there are now two states . . ." reminds one of a similar affirming in Europe 100 years ago regarding the United States.

Finally, in your concluding paragraph, the presence in your gambit of a "could," an "if" and another "if" points away from rather than toward confidence in your immediately ensuing dictum that the two-China policy "will be the . . . solution."

STANLEY K. HORNBECK,
Washington, Nov. 7, 1962.

CPYRGHT