"A" USSR. Soviet Representative Suggests US-USSR Bilateral Settlement of Korean War. During an exchange of views with a US representative at the United Nations, Jacob Malik, Soviet delegate to the UN, declared on 2 May that the US definitely does not want a peaceful settlement of the Korean War, but that if a settlement were really desired, it might be done through the Paris conference. When asked if this was a proposal to add settlement of the Korean War to the agenda of the Foreign Ministers' meeting, he replied that he was making no proposal but was merely thinking that the Korean dispute, as well as other outstanding matters, could and should be settled by discussions between the US and Soviet Governments. The Soviet position on such bilateral discussions is well-known, he added, avoiding being pinned down more specifically on how to settle the Korean War. He stated twice that any settlement must contain honorable terms for all interested parties. Malik also brought up the subject of Formosa, implying that US action in this regard was the principal reason for Chinese Communist intervention in Korea. (_________________ 5 May 51). COMMENT: Possibly significant in view of Malik's remarks on Soviet-US bilateral negotiations for a Korean settlement is a 30 April Moscow broadcast beamed to the Far East discussing Korean unity, in which the subject to the Russian-American Joint Commission was revived. However, there has been no sign at the Paris conference that Gromyko or any of his principal aides wished to discuss, privately or otherwise, a settlement of the Korean War. Moreover, Malik's emphasis on honorable terms for all interested parties must be taken as a reference to Chinese Communist conditions for settlement, which apparently remains unchanged. This appears to be the first time that any responsible Soviet official has intimated that the USSR could settle the Korean War without at least the direct participation of Communist China and possibly of North Korea.
KOREA. Communist Prisoners Report General Enemy Withdrawal. Prisoners taken recently in the western and central sectors report that elements of the Chinese Communist 12th, 15th, 20th, 27th, and 60th Armies withdrew northwards on the night of 29-30 April. This action, reportedly, was due to heavy losses and failure to receive necessary supplies. Another report of enemy withdrawals was received in the central sector, who reported the northward movement of 28,000.
Chinese Communist east of Chunchon on the night of 30 April-1 May. This sector was last occupied by the Chinese Communist 40th Army (5 May 51). **COMMENT**: The lack of contact with the enemy during the past 3 days in the western and central sector, except for screening forces, lends considerable substance to these reports. Prior to the launching of the enemy's offensive on 22 April, FECOM estimated an enemy logistic build-up sufficient to support a heavy offensive for 10 to 12 days. It seems probable, then, that logistic difficulties are a major factor in the enemy's current lack of aggressiveness.