

January 5, 1955

Transcript of Conversation between Zhou Enlai and Humphrey Trevelyan

Citation:

"Transcript of Conversation between Zhou Enlai and Humphrey Trevelyan", January 5, 1955, Wilson Center Digital Archive, Zhou Enlai Waijiao wenxuan [Selected Diplomatic Papers of Zhou Enlai] (Beijing: Zhongyang wenxian, 1990), pp. 94-105. Translated by Simon Schuchat. <https://digitalarchive.umd.edu/document/260506>

Summary:

Zhou Enlai discusses with Trevelyan Humphrey China's concerns with Britain's attitude regarding Sino-British relations. Zhou says that the Chinese side is willing to improve Sino-British relations, improve the situation in East Asia, and ease international tensions. Zhou also discusses with Humphrey the Taiwan issue. He criticizes the U.S. for infringing upon Chinese sovereignty over Taiwan and Britain for its double standards on the Taiwan issue.

Credits:

This document was made possible with support from Chun & Jane Chiu Family Foundation

Original Language:

Chinese

Contents:

Original Scan
Translation - English

坚决反对制造 “两个中国”的阴谋*

(一九五五年一月五日)

杜维廉说,艾登^[64]要他来转达一个有关中英一般关系的口信。他说,艾登外交大臣很失望地看到了周总理在对政协的报告中所说的,英国的态度在日内瓦会议^[52]之后有所改变。艾登要他来向中国政府保证,英国的态度不但在日内瓦会议之前,而且在日内瓦会议之后,都没有改变,英国的目的仍然是缓和远东局势和改善中英关系。中国报纸指责英国政府不守信义,使艾登大为惊奇。五年来,英国政府只承认中国政府,而同蒋介石没有关系。艾登认为,现在不能用战争解决任何问题。英国不是美蒋条约^[85]的参加者。在英国看来,如果那个条约对过去的情况有任何改变,那就是引致了约制。因此,英国政府

* 这是同英国驻华代办杜维廉的谈话纪要。此后,周恩来又于一月二十八日和二月二十五日两次同杜维廉谈话。这三次谈话,阐明了中国对台湾问题的严正立场,批评了英国政府的对华政策。

表示欢迎。英国政府了解中国的立场，但是不可能期望美国撤除它对蒋介石的保护，因为美国把蒋介石看作是它的同盟者。艾登相信，和平解决和和缓紧张局势的唯一希望，在于每一个人都根据实际情况来为此而努力。英国政府的真诚愿望，就是中英之间有很好的关系，即使中英在远东问题上有分歧的意见。

周恩来说，中国政府同样欢迎和愿意改进中英关系和和缓远东及国际的紧张局势。改进中英关系当然需要双方的努力。两国的制度不同，想法不同，并不妨碍两国和平共处和改进关系。不过，如果在有关两国中一国的问题上存在着对立的看法，那么无论如何是要影响两国关系的。我可以直率地问杜维廉先生，如果中国对香港采取不同的态度，会不会影响中英关系？

杜维廉说，会的。

周恩来说，英国对台湾的态度就是不对的，这不能不影响中英关系。英国不敢得罪美国，却来责备中国，这是不公正的。美国侵占台湾，美国海军在台湾海峡活动，美国帮助蒋介石占据我们的沿海岛屿并对大陆进行骚扰性和破坏性的袭击，又劫夺来我国通商的船只，包括英国的商船在内。但是英国说这一切都是对的。中国去解放自己的领土台湾和沿海岛屿，打退蒋介石的骚扰性和破坏性的袭击。英国却说这一切都是不对的。这是不公正的态度，不能不影响中英关系。如果美国占据北爱尔兰，并

且帮助北爱尔兰进攻英伦三岛，而又说英国无权打退这种进攻，这行不行呢？

杜维廉说，他不能同意周总理对英国态度的形容。英国不是始终支持一方和反对另一方的。英国是了解中国的态度的。英国反对的是加剧紧张局势，支持的是缓和紧张局势。刚才转达艾登的口信，其中心要点就是要从实际情况出发，而不能期望美国撤除它对蒋介石的保护。英国的态度不是支持一方和敌视另一方，而是真诚地以实际情况为根据。

周恩来说，关于英国的态度是否不敌视任何一方的问题，可以看看事实。过去的事实证明是相反的。举例来说，卡祺亚^[86]先生对宦乡^[87]先生说，不要去论问题的是非，要承认事实。这句话代表英国政府态度中的可疑的地方和不公正的地方。

第一，台湾已经归还中国，是属于中国的。这是铁的事实，怎么可以怀疑？但是，英国政府的代表在议会中却表示怀疑。英国参加签字的开罗宣言^[13]、波茨坦公告^[14]和日本投降条款都承认台湾应该归还中国。一九四五年十月二十五日，中国政府的代表陈仪^[88]在台湾接受了日本的投降。因此，台湾已经归还了中国。怎么能说台湾的法律地位还需要研究？杜维廉先生在北京已经很久，一定会了解这对于中国人民的感情有多大的伤害。英国政府简直已经不采取一个朋友的态度了。

第二，对中国人民的感情伤害得更厉害的，是英国政府称赞美蒋条约，指责中国解放台湾。英国一方面说，如果中国使用武力去解放台湾，就会引致战争，另一方面，又要中国容忍蒋介石在美国保护下所进行的骚扰性和破坏性的战争。比这更坏的，是英国外交次官纳丁在美国公然说，如果中国去解放台湾，英国将同联合国一起行动。甚至连美国舆论都不赞成这句话。这是完全敌视中国的态度。有这么许多事实摆在中国人民面前，却要中国政府不去论问题的是非。中国政府怎么能这样做呢？事实上，是非就在英国政府和中国人民之间。这样颠倒是非，是非常伤害中国人民感情的。

我在对全国人民代表大会和对政协的报告⁽⁸⁹⁾中提到英国，是非常慎重的，并且是站在希望中英关系改善的立场上提的。

除上边所说的以外，还有更令人愤慨的例子。美国强迫扣留了未经表达自己意志的朝中被俘人员，英国政府对此一句话不说。在日内瓦会议期间我们曾提出这一问题。艾登外交大臣在同我谈话时说，这个问题还要去提吗？甚至在同我个人谈话时，艾登外交大臣都没有说过一句批评美国强迫扣留朝中被俘人员的话。但是，关于判处十三名美国间谍这样一个完全属于中国主权和内政的问题，英国政府的代表却在英国的议会里对中国政府说了很不礼貌的话，用了很坏的字眼。我建议杜维廉

先生去翻阅一下英国议会的记录。这种做法，已经不仅是不论是非，而且是颠倒是非。

几个月来，我们是很容易忍的，虽然同杜维廉先生见了多次，但是从来没有向你表示过我们的不满。杜维廉先生或许已经感到了我们的舆论所表现的情绪，现在我把中国政府的不满正式告诉你。

谈到和缓国际紧张局势的问题，那就要问紧张局势是从哪里来的。英国说是从双方来的，甚至说是从中国方面来的。这是不符合事实的。紧张局势是从美国方面来的，中国是致力于和缓紧张局势的。朝鲜停战谈判拖延了两年，在快要达成协议的时候，美李^[90]又强迫扣留了两万七千多名朝鲜被俘人员。但是，我们仍然赞成停战，为的是和缓紧张局势。在印度支那问题上美国也竭力破坏，但是我们仍然赞成停战。艾登外交大臣在伦敦谈到印度支那问题时曾建议缔结亚洲的洛迦诺公约⁽⁷⁰⁾，这是有利于集体和平的。我在新德里时曾对尼赫鲁总理说，我们赞成这个建议。但是等到我第二次到日内瓦以后，艾登外交大臣告诉我，英国已经不再主张缔结亚洲的洛迦诺公约，因为美国反对。日内瓦会议以后，英国同美国一起搞马尼拉条约⁽⁷¹⁾，这是我们反对的。英国不坚持我们已经表示赞成的建议，却跟着美国来制造分裂。现在，马尼拉条约的签字国又要在曼谷开会，加深分裂。这如何能说是为和缓紧张局势而努力呢？

在朝鲜战争⁽⁴⁷⁾和印度支那战争⁽⁵⁵⁾都停止了以后，美国就把力量集中在台湾，指使和帮助蒋介石对我们进行骚扰性和破坏性的战争。从去年六月范佛里特⁽⁹¹⁾到东方来的时候起，美国就同蒋介石筹划签订美蒋条约。签订这个条约的目的就是要霸占台湾和澎湖列岛，第二步就是发动新的战争。这同日本侵占东北时的情形一样，同慕尼黑协定⁽⁹²⁾签订以前德国侵占奥地利的情形也一样。艾登外交大臣和丘吉尔首相当时都是反对“慕尼黑”的，但是现在却要中国承认东方的“慕尼黑”！说穿了，就是有人想在世界上制造“两个中国”，使蒋介石在美国的保护下得以反攻大陆，在大陆上复辟。这不是和缓而是加剧紧张局势。

中国政府一直到现在都在致力于搞好中英关系。两国的制度不同，对问题的看法不同，这并不妨碍两国的和平共处和友好合作。但是不要彼此伤害，否则就会妨碍改进关系。如果对两国关系的伤害是由中国政府负责的，那么中国政府是勇于改正的，从不隐讳。例如，在海南岛上空我们误打了一架英国飞机以后，我们就道歉和赔偿。至于英国政府伤害中国人民感情的事，使中国人民不能容忍的事，我站在愿意中英友好的立场，认为值得英国政府深加思考。

中国政府赞成和缓紧张局势，并为此而努力。凡是英国政府所采取的合乎实际并且有利于和缓紧张局势的

步骤，都会得到我们的赞成。但是不能要求我们承认侵略，让美国肆无忌惮地制造紧张局势，放手准备新的战争。如果艾登外交大臣愿意和缓紧张局势，中国政府希望英国政府劝美国政府把军队从台湾撤走，这才能和缓紧张局势。如果英国说劝美国有困难，美国不会听，那么如何能和缓紧张局势呢？我们不能犯这个历史错误，不能容忍美国的胡闹。美国好战分子蛮不讲理，中国人民是不能容忍的，也不会被吓倒。过去的事实已经证明了这一点。艾登外交大臣曾经告诉我说，美国政府中也有人是愿意和平的。如果这是确实的，那么同美国政府还可以说理，而英国就恰恰能够起说服的作用。中国政府的态度是很清楚的。只要任何国家愿意同我们建立正常关系，愿意同我们和平共处，并且放弃对我们的侵略，我们是会首先伸出手来的，对美国也不例外。

我们欢迎并希望中英关系能按照去年日内瓦会议时候我同艾登外交大臣谈话的精神^[93]，得到改善。

杜维廉说，感谢周总理所作的充分的叙述，一定如实地转告艾登。他感谢周总理在过去几个月中所采取的约制态度。但是他又建议，以后周总理有何不满之处，直接向他提，而不要通过报纸，他随时听候周总理召见。

周恩来说，我同意以后有意见时找你谈，但是，舆论是全国人民的事，况且中国舆论对英国的批评是由英国引起的，中国从不主动发起对英国的批评。自日内瓦会

议至艾德礼^[63]访华的一段时期中，中国舆论对英国的态度，杜维廉先生应当是知道的。中国有句古话，叫做“后发制人”。这就是中国的态度。

杜维廉说，对于周总理刚才所涉及的几点，他想作一些评论。第一，关于卡祺亚同宦乡的谈话，似乎有一些误解。英国政府并不是要中国政府不论问题的是非，而是建议按实际情况来寻求解决的办法。每一方对于问题的是非都有自己的看法，而英国的建议却证明了它是不敌视任何一方的。英国所作的积极建议是要求双方约制。这个建议不仅向中国提出，而且也同样向对方提出。

周恩来说，如果一个人打了另外一个人一拳，第三个人出来劝架，他不劝第一个人放下拳头，却要求第二个人不还手。这如何能说是要求双方约制？

杜维廉说，第三个人出来劝架，结果常常是自己挨打。

周恩来说，现在不是第三个人挨打，是第三个人不去劝第一个人住手，反而责骂第二个被打的人。

杜维廉说，周总理刚才提到，艾登曾说过在美国政府中也有人愿意和平。艾登当时曾加上一句：艾森豪威尔^[48]就是这样一个人。英国认为，中国把美蒋条约的目的说成是帮助蒋介石反攻大陆，那是错误的。英国绝对相信美蒋条约的目的是要起一个约制作用。因此英国政府表示欢迎。

周恩来说，如果一个强盗跑到你的家里，占据楼下的屋子，现在说用一个条约来容许他占据楼下的屋子，只是不让他上楼去。试问：即使他现在不到楼上去，你住在楼上会感到安全吗？

杜维廉说，他的意思只是要说明美蒋条约的约制作用，而这正是英国政府表示欢迎的。

周恩来说，一个外国用武装霸占了我们的领土，这怎么还能说是约制？

杜维廉说，英国真正相信美蒋条约是起约制作用的。至于蒋介石反攻大陆，那连百万分之一的可能性都没有。

周恩来说，暂且不谈蒋介石反攻大陆的事。美蒋条约是要使美国对台湾和澎湖列岛的侵占合法化。英国赞成，但我们是永远不会同意的。英国承认美国的侵略，这对中英关系是不利的。

杜维廉说，英国不是美蒋条约的参加者，因此不发生“承认”的问题。英国的意思只是要说，不能期望美国撤除它对蒋介石的保护。这是一个不可逃避的事实。

周恩来说，承认“慕尼黑”就是承认既成事实。但是，英国现在连慕尼黑的教训都拒绝接受了。

杜维廉说，他不能同意这种历史对比。接着，他转而谈另外两点。第一，关于纳丁所说的话，脱顿已经在下院作过解释⁽⁹⁴⁾，那就是，英国除了作为联合国一员对台湾所承担的义务以外，没有别的义务；第二，关于台湾

的法律地位。开罗宣言和波茨坦公告都只宣布了一个意图要把台湾归还中国，但是还没有一个国际协议来履行这个意图。因此，在法律上说，台湾还不是中国的领土。至于蒋介石接受日本的投降，那只是把日本人从台湾移走而已。但是，现在不是要从法律的观点，而是应该从实际的观点来寻求解决的办法。英国承认中国，不承认蒋介石。曾经有人说，英国外交部发言人用了“中国国民党政政府”的字样。经查询后发现并没有用过这种字样，即使用过这种字样，也是没有什么重要性的。

周恩来说，台湾的地位是毫无问题的，甚至连美国发表的白皮书^[95]和杜鲁门发表的声明^[96]都承认这一点。当时中国政府的代表陈仪既然接受了日本的投降，台湾就已经归还了中国。这是铁的事实。说台湾还没有归还中国，是对中国人民感情的极大伤害。过去英国政府并没有这样说过，这是最近的一个新论调，是为了替美国开脱，使美国有权侵占台湾。至于纳丁所说的话，那是不简单的。他的意思是说，如果中国去解放台湾，英国就要同中国打仗。英国舆论已经说明了这个含义。我们可以暂不争论，看看事情的发展。

杜维廉说，他不同意这种解释。纳丁的意思只是说，如果对台湾进行攻击，将会引致更广泛的战火，使联合国都被牵涉在内。

周恩来说，联合国至今对台湾并没有作过任何决定。

纳丁的意思是否要联合国通过决议,使台湾不属于中国,而归美国保护?

杜维廉说,没有这种打算。

周恩来说,既然没有这种打算,那么只要美国不再霸占台湾,中国去解放台湾,如何会引致更广泛的战火,如何会使联合国都牵涉在内?是不是美国无论作什么事,我们都要承认?

杜维廉说,英国只是要求承认事实。

周恩来说,美国懂得英国的弱点,因此,造成了事实以后,就要英国承认,然后英国又要大家承认。

杜维廉改口说,英国要求的不是承认事实,而是考虑事实。然后他又重复说,美蒋条约是有约制作用的,而另一方面又不能期望美国撤除它对蒋介石的保护。他又说,即使考虑了这个事实以后,仍然可以努力来缓和紧张局势。英国不感到悲观失望,而认为只有考虑了事实才能找到出路。

周恩来说,如果考虑事实的话,那么只有美国撤走武装力量才能和缓紧张局势。如果艾登外交大臣愿意和缓紧张局势,那么努力的方向就应该是劝美国撤走武装力量。不能因为美国造成了事实,就要大家容忍。如果英国劝美国撤走武装力量,美国不听,那么英国当然不能负责。不过,如果英国说美国是对的,中国是不对的,这就伤害了中英的关系。

杜维廉说，对英国来说，并不发生在道义上作判断的问题。艾登嘱他转告的口信，只是说明了改善情况的唯一途径。

周恩来说，英国政府代表在议会所说的话和纳丁所说的话显然是对中国的责备。

杜维廉说，他不能同意。他说，今天他所转告的口信才代表英国政府的意见。关于马尼拉条约，那是防御性的，正如中国同苏联之间的防御安排一样。

周恩来说，关于艾登外交大臣的口信，我们已经给予答复，请照我们所说的转告艾登外交大臣。马尼拉条约同我们建议缔结的亚洲洛迦诺公约不同，它是制造分裂的，因此许多亚洲国家表示反对。亚洲以外的国家用马尼拉条约来帮助某些亚洲国家造成集团，而许多亚洲国家没有参加，这是不能同中苏条约作同样解释的。亚洲以外的国家到人家的地区去，提供人家并没有要求的保护，在人家的领土上建立军事基地，这如何能解释成为是防御性的呢？美国正在越南南部破坏印度支那的协议。美国对保大⁽⁵⁾政府的援助和训练保大的军队，都是破坏印度支那协议的。

杜维廉说，周总理所谈的越南情况，他不熟悉。至于周总理今天所提出来的不满之处，他将转告艾登。

RESOLUTELY OPPOSE THE PLOT TO CREATE "TWO CHINAS"*[\[1\]](#)

(January 5, 1955)

Humphrey Trevelyan said, [Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary] Anthony Eden wanted him to relay an oral message concerning the general relationship between China and the United Kingdom. He said, Foreign Secretary Eden had been very disappointed on seeing Premier Zhou Enlai, in his report to the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference (CPPCC), say that the British attitude had undergone some change after the Geneva Conference. Eden wanted him to assure the Chinese government that the attitude of the British government has not changed, before or after the Geneva Conference: the objective of the U.K. remains the easing of tensions in the Far East and improvement of Sino-British relations. Eden was shocked by Chinese press accusations that the British government was not keeping its promises. For the past five years, the British government has recognized only the Chinese government, and has had no relationship with Chiang Kai-shek [Jiang Jieshi]. Eden believes that it not possible now to solve any problem through war. The United Kingdom is not a party to the U.S.-Jiang (sic) Mutual Defense Treaty. In the British view, if that agreement has led to any changes from previous conditions, it would be restraints. Therefore, the British government is in favor of it. The British government understands the Chinese position, but it cannot wish for the United States to abandon its support of Chiang Kai-shek, because the United States sees Chiang Kai-shek as its ally. Eden believes peaceful resolution and easing of the tense situation is our only hope, towards which everyone must strive, based on the actual circumstances. The British government sincerely hopes that there be an excellent relationship between China and the U.K., even though there is a difference of opinion between the two regarding issues in the Far East.

Zhou Enlai said, The Chinese government likewise welcomes and hopes for an improvement in Sino-British relations and an easing of tensions in the Far East and international arena. Improving Sino-British relations naturally requires efforts by both sides. The two countries have different systems and different ideas, but this would not prevent the two countries from peacefully coexisting and improving their relationship. However, if one of the two countries has an antagonistic approach to an issue concerning the other, then their relationship will surely be affected. I could ask Mr. Trevelyan frankly, if China were to adopt a different attitude towards Hong Kong, would it not affect Sino-British relations?

Trevelyan said, it would.

Zhou Enlai said, The British government's attitude towards Taiwan is wrong, and this cannot but affect Sino-British relations. The U.K. may be afraid to offend the United States, but it is unfair for it to blame China. The United States has occupied Taiwan, the American fleet is active in the Taiwan Straits, the U.S. helps Chiang Kai-shek occupy our coastal islands and carry out harassing and destructive attacks against the mainland as well as seizing ships engaged in commerce with us, including British merchant vessels. But the U.K. claims there is nothing wrong. China is liberating its own territory, Taiwan and coastal islands, repelling Jiang's harassing and destructive attacks, and the U.K. says it is wrong. This unfair attitude cannot but affect Sino-British relations. If the U.S. occupied Northern Ireland, and assisted Northern Ireland in carrying out attacks on three islands of the United Kingdom and also claimed that the U.K. had no right to repel this kind of attack, would that be all right?

Trevelyan said, He could not agree with Premier Zhou's description of the British government's attitude. The U.K. does not always support one side and oppose the other side. The U.K. understands the Chinese attitude. The U.K. opposes intensifying of tension and supports easing tension. The central point of Eden's verbal message which I just relayed was that it is necessary to consider the actual situation, and to

not expect the United States to remove its protection from Chiang Kai-shek. The British attitude is not support for one side and hostility towards the other. Instead, it is sincerely based on consideration of the actual situation.

Zhou Enlai said, as to whether the British attitude is or isn't hostile to any one side, we can just look at the facts. Past facts prove that it is the contrary. To give an example, Mr. Carter (?) told Mr. Huan Xiang*[2], there's no point in debate whether something is wrong, you have to accept the facts. These words demonstrate the dubious and unfair aspects of the British government's attitude.

□

First, Taiwan has already been returned to China, and belongs to China. This is an ironclad fact, so how can one doubt it? But the British government's representative at the conference expressed doubts. The U.K. was a signatory to the Cairo Declaration, the Potsdam Declaration, and clauses of the Japanese articles of surrender, all of which acknowledge that Taiwan ought to be returned to China. On October 25, 1945, Chen Yi*[3], the Chinese government representative on Taiwan, received the Japanese surrender. Therefore, Taiwan has already been returned to China. How can one say, then, that the legal status of Taiwan still needs further study? Mr. Trevelyan, having lived in Beijing for a long time, you must certainly understand how this hurts the feelings of the Chinese people. The British government's attitude is clearly no longer that of a friend.

□

Second, even more hurtful of the feelings of the Chinese people, the British government has praised the U.S.-Jiang [mutual defense] treaty, which accuses China [of seeking to] liberate Taiwan. On one hand, the U.K. says if China were to use military force to liberate Taiwan, that would lead to war, and on the other hand, it wants China to tolerate the harassing and destructive attacks carried out by Chiang Kai-shek under the protection of the U.S. Even worse, Under-secretary for Foreign Affairs [Anthony] Nutting said publicly while in America that, if China were to move to liberate Taiwan, then the U.K. would take action, together with the United Nations. Even American public opinion did not approve of these words. This is totally a hostile attitude towards China. With this many facts set before the Chinese people, yet you expect the Chinese government not to point out the rights and wrongs of this issue. How can the Chinese government act this way? In fact, this problem is between the British government and the Chinese people. This is to mix up right and wrong, and it really hurts the feelings of the Chinese people.

□

The references to the United Kingdom in my reports to the National People's Congress and the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference were extremely deliberate, and were made from a position of hoping for improved Sino-British relations.

In addition to what I have said above, there's another example that is even more infuriating. When the United States forcibly detained North Korean and Chinese prisoners of war who had not expressed their intention [as to where to be released], the British government didn't say a word. We have raised this question during the Geneva conference. During my meeting with Foreign Secretary Eden, he said, are you still going to raise this issue? Even during his unofficial conversation with me, Foreign Secretary Eden never once criticized the Americans for the forcible detention of North Korean and Chinese prisoners of war. However, regarding the sentencing of thirteen American spies, a matter which falls completely within China's sovereignty and internal affairs, a British government representative said some extremely impolite things about the Chinese government before the British Parliament, using some very bad language. I suggest that Mr. Trevelyan go read the transcripts from the British Parliament. Such behavior not only ignores right and wrong but reverses them.

□

For the past several months, we have been very tolerant, and although I have seen

you many times, I have never before expressed our dissatisfaction. You are probably already aware of the sentiments expressed through [our] public opinion, and now I officially inform you of the Chinese government's dissatisfaction.

To speak of easing international tensions, one must ask where the tensions come from. The U.K. says they come from both sides, or even says they come from the Chinese side. This goes against the facts. They come from the American side; China has worked hard for the easing of tensions. The Korean armistice talks dragged on for over two years; when it seemed that an agreement was about to be reached, the U.S. and the Syngman Rhee [government] forcibly detained more than 27,000 Korean and Chinese prisoners of war. Nevertheless, we still approved the armistice, in order to ease the tense situation. On the issue of Indochina, the U.S. also tried to sabotage [a peace agreement], but we still approved the armistice. When Foreign Secretary Eden spoke about the Indochina problem in London, he once suggested the establishment of an Asian Locarno Pact, which would be beneficial for collective peace. In New Delhi, I once told Prime Minister Nehru that I approved of this proposal. But on my second visit to Geneva, Foreign Secretary Eden told me that the United Kingdom no longer proposed concluding an Asian Locarno Pact, due to the opposition of the United States. After the Geneva Conference, the U.K. joined the United States in hashing together the Manila Pact, which we opposed. The U.K. doesn't stick with the proposal that we had already agreed to, and instead follows the U.S. to create division. Now, the signatories to the Manila Pact are about to meet in Bangkok, to increase the split. How can this be seen as striving to ease tensions?

□

After the Korean War and the Indochina War had both ended, the U.S. concentrated its forces in Taiwan, directing and assisting Chiang Kai-shek to carry out harassing and destructive attacks against us. Since the arrival of James Van Fleet in June of last year, the U.S. has planned to sign a U.S.-Jiang treaty. The objective in signing this treaty is to occupy Taiwan and the Penghu Archipelago, followed by a second step of starting a new war. This is just like the situation when Japan occupied the Northeast, as well as the situation before the signing of the Munich Agreement when Germany took over Austria. At the time, Foreign Secretary Eden and Prime Minister Churchill both opposed "Munich," but now they want China to accept a "Munich" in the East! To speak bluntly, there are some people who want to create "two Chinas" in the world, to let Chiang Kai-shek, under the protection of the U.S., to reclaim the mainland, and restore [his rule] over the mainland. This is not easing, but rather increasing, the tense situation.

□

The Chinese government has always, up to the present, been committed to improving Sino-British relations. The two countries have different systems, different views of the issues, but this ought not prevent the two countries from peaceful coexistence and friendly cooperation. But we must not harm each other, making it difficult to improve our relations. If the Chinese government is responsible for causing harm to the relations between the two countries, then the Chinese government will not hesitate to correct it and would never cover it up. For instance, after we mistakenly attacked a British aircraft in the airspace over Hainan Island, we apologized and paid compensation. From the standpoint of someone who wishes for Sino-U.K. friendship, I think the British government should do some serious thinking about what it has done that's hurtful and intolerable to the Chinese people.

□

The Chinese government is in favor of and works towards a relaxation of the tense situation. Any measures adopted by the British government which are realistic and conducive to relaxation of tensions will be met with our approval. But you cannot ask us to accept invasion, to allow the U.S. to brazenly and shamelessly manufacture tensions, and freely prepare for a new war. If Foreign Secretary Eden wants an easing of tensions, the Chinese government hopes that the British government will encourage the U.S. government to withdraw its troops from Taiwan, which is the only way to ease tensions. If the British government has difficulties in persuading the United States, the U.S. won't listen, then how can there be an easing of tensions? We

cannot commit this historical mistake we cannot tolerate this American mischief. This kind of bullying by the U.S. pro-war elements is completely unreasonable and cannot be tolerated by the Chinese people, who will not be intimidated. Past facts have already proven this point. Foreign Secretary Eden once told me, there are also people in the U.S. government who want peace. If this is really so, then it might be possible to have a discussion with the U.S. government, with the U.K. serving as a perfect advocate. The Chinese government's attitude is very clear. As long as any country wants to establish normal relations with us, wants to live in peaceful coexistence with us, and abandons aggression towards us, then we will be the first to extend our hand to them, including the U.S..

□

We welcome and hope that Sino-British relations can improve, according to the spirit of my conversations with Foreign Secretary Eden during last year's Geneva Conference.

Trevelyan thanked Premier Zhou for your full explanation, which he will certainly faithfully pass on to Eden. He thanks Premier Zhou for adopting an attitude of restraint during the past several months. However, he also suggested that, in the future if Premier Zhou is dissatisfied with anything, he should raise it directly with him, rather than going through the newspapers; he is always ready for Premier Zhou's summons.

Zhou Enlai said, I agree that in the future when I have an issue I will talk with you, but, public opinion is up to the people of our country, especially when it is the U.K. who has brought about Chinese media criticism of the U.K. China has never initiated criticism of the U.K. Between the Geneva Conference and through [Clement] Atlee's visit to China, Mr. Trevelyan ought to know very well how the Chinese public feels about the U.K. China has an old saying, "let the other act first and respond accordingly." This is the Chinese attitude.

Trevelyan said, He wished to make some comments on several of the points that Premier Zhou had just expounded. First, as for Carter's conversation with Huan Xiang, there appears to have been some misunderstanding. The British government is not asking the Chinese government to disregard what is right and wrong, but rather suggests that it seek a way to resolve the problem in view of the actual circumstances. Each side has its own view of the rights and wrongs of the issue, and the U.K.'s suggestion is proof that it is not against either side. The U.K. is proactively asking both sides to exercise restraint. This suggestion is not solely made to China, but also made to the other side.

Zhou Enlai said, suppose one person punches another person with his fists, and a third person steps in to mediate, but instead of asking the first person to lower his fists, he urges the second person not to hit back. How can this be called urging restraint on both sides?

Trevelyan said, when a third person steps in to mediate, he usually ends up being beaten himself.

Zhou Enlai said, Right now the third person is not getting beaten himself, he's just accusing and cursing the second person who is being beaten, instead of asking the first person to stop.

Trevelyan said, Premier Zhou just mentioned that Eden had previously told him that there were people in the U.S. government who wanted peace. At the time, Eden added, Eisenhower was indeed one of those people. The U.K. government believes that it is a mistake for China to see the objective of the U.S.-Jiang treaty as helping Chiang Kai-shek retake the mainland. The U.K. government absolutely believes that

the purpose of the U.S.-Jiang treaty is to serve as a restraint. This is why the U.K. government welcomed it.

Zhou Enlai said, If a bandit enters your house, occupies a room downstairs, and now you say, we can use a treaty to allow him to stay downstairs, just to prevent him from going upstairs. Let me ask, even if he doesn't go upstairs now, will you still feel secure, living downstairs?

Trevelyan said, His point was simply to clarify how the U.S.-Jiang treaty serves as a restraint, which was exactly why the British government is in favor of it.

Zhou Enlai said, a foreign country uses military force to occupy our territory, how can this be called restraint?

Trevelyan said, The U.K. government really believes that the U.S.-Jiang treaty serves as a restraint. There is not a one-in-a-million chance of Chiang Kai-shek retaking the mainland.

Zhou Enlai said, for the present, let's not talk about Chiang Kai-shek retaking the mainland. The U.S.-Jiang treaty serves to legalize the U.S. occupation of Taiwan and the Penghu Archipelago. The U.K. approves, but we will never agree. For the U.K. to accept U.S. aggression is not beneficial for Sino-British relations.

Trevelyan said, The U.K. is not a party to the U.S.-Jiang treaty, so there is no question of "acceptance." The British simply mean to say, you cannot expect the U.S. to withdraw its protection of Chiang Kai-shek. This is an inescapable fact.

Zhou Enlai said, Accepting "Munich" was exactly accepting an existing fact. However, the U.K. even now is refusing to accept the lesson of Munich.

Trevelyan said, He could not agree with this kind of historical comparison. Then, he shifted the discussion to two other points. First, as for what Nutting said, Dart has already given an explanation to the House of Commons, which is that, other than the U.K.'s obligations towards Taiwan, as a member of the United Nations, there is no other obligation. Second, regarding Taiwan's legal status. The Cairo Declaration and the Potsdam Declaration both merely announced an intention to return Taiwan to China, but there is as yet no international agreement to carry out this plan. Therefore, from a legal perspective, Taiwan is not yet Chinese territory. As for Chiang Kai-shek accepting the Japanese surrender, that was merely to remove the Japanese from Taiwan. However, right now we shouldn't look at it from a legalistic point of view, but, we should look for a resolution from a practical point of view. The U.K. recognizes China, and does not recognize Chiang Kai-shek. At one time someone said that the British Foreign Ministry spokesperson had used the phrase "Chinese Nationalist government." We looked into it and found that no such expression had been used. In any case, even if these words were used, it wouldn't have meant anything.

Zhou Enlai said, Taiwan's status is not in question; even the White Paper which the U.S. government issued and the statements made by Truman all accept this point. Once the Chinese government representative Chen Yi had received the Japanese surrender, Taiwan was already returned to China. This is an ironclad fact. To say that Taiwan has not yet been restored to China is to grossly hurt the feelings of the Chinese people. This is not what the British government used to say. This change of tune is a recent development, made to exonerate the U.S. and give it the authority to occupy Taiwan. As for Nutting's remarks, it isn't that simple. His meaning was, if China goes to liberate Taiwan, Britain will go to war with China. British public opinion has already made this clear. Let's not debate this right now, we'll just see how things

develop.

Trevelyan said, He did not agree with this explanation. Nutting merely meant to say, if there were to be an attack on Taiwan, it could lead to a more widespread conflict, to the extent of involving the United Nations.

Zhou Enlai said, The United Nations has not, as yet, made any resolutions regarding Taiwan. Did Nutting want the United Nations to pass a resolution taking Taiwan from China, and making it a U.S. protectorate?

Trevelyan said, there is no such intention.

Zhou Enlai said, if there is no such plan, then if the U.S. no longer occupies Taiwan, and China liberates Taiwan, how would this widen the conflict? How would it involve the United Nations? Do we have to accept whatever the United States does?

Trevelyan said, The U.K. is merely asking everyone to acknowledge the facts.

Zhou Enlai said, The U.S. understands the U.K.'s weakness, and therefore, after the facts are made up, it expects the U.K. to accept them, and then the U.K. expects everyone else to accept them.

Trevelyan rephrased his comment, saying, The United Kingdom is not asking you to accept the facts, but rather to consider the facts. Then he reiterated that, while the U.S.-Jiang treaty serves as a restraint, however, you cannot expect the U.S. to withdraw its protection from Chiang Kai-shek. He also said, even after considering these facts, it is still possible to work towards easing tensions. The U.K. does not feel pessimistic or hopeless, but it believes that only by considering the facts is it possible to find a way out.

Zhou Enlai said, if one considers the facts, then the only way for tensions to ease is for the United States to withdraw its military forces. If Foreign Secretary Eden wants tensions to ease, then he ought to direct his efforts to persuading the United States to withdraw its military forces. You can't ask everyone to be tolerant just because the U.S. has made up the facts. If the U.K. urges the U.S. to withdraw its military forces, and the U.S. doesn't listen, then of course the U.K. is not at fault. However, if the U.K. says that the U.S. is right and that China is wrong, that would harm Sino-British relations.

Trevelyan said, as for the U.K., we are not making any moral judgments. The message that I relayed from Eden simply to explain the only path to an improvement in the situation.

Zhou Enlai said, What the British representative said in Parliament and what Nutting said clearly placed the blame on China.

Trevelyan said, He could not agree. He said, the verbal message that he has passed on today is the only expression of the British government's opinion. As for the Manila Pact, that is defensive, the same as the Chinese defense arrangements with the Soviet Union.

Zhou Enlai said, As for Foreign Secretary Eden's verbal message, we have already given our response. Please convey what we have said to Foreign Secretary Eden. The Manila Pact is not the same as our proposal for an Asian Locarno Pact, it creates division, so consequently many Asian countries have expressed their opposition.

Countries outside of Asia use the Manila Pact to assist certain Asian countries in forming a group, but many Asian countries have not joined, therefore this cannot be explained in the same way as the Sino-Soviet Treaty. When countries outside of Asia come to someone's region and provide protection that was never asked for, and establish military bases on someone's territory, how can this be explained as defensive in nature? The U.S. is currently sabotaging the Indochina agreement in Southern Vietnam. The U.S. aid to the Bao Dai government and its training of Bao Dai's army, are all damaging to the Indochina agreement.

Trevelyan said, He was not familiar with the Vietnamese situation about which Premier Zhou spoke. As for the areas of dissatisfaction that Premier Zhou raised today, he would convey them to Eden.

* This is an aide-memoire of a conversation with British Representative to China Humphrey Trevelyan. After this, Zhou Enlai had two further conversations with Trevelyan, on January 28 and February 15. In these three conversations, he clarified the Chinese government's strict position on the Taiwan problem, and criticized the British government's policy towards China.

* Carter id unknown; Huan Xiang (1910-1989), Chinese diplomat.

* Not the Communist Foreign Minister, but a KMT general.