

**SPEECH BY HUANG HUA,
CHAIRMAN OF
THE CHINESE DELEGATION,
AT A PLENARY MEETING
OF THE TENTH
SPECIAL SESSION OF THE
UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

**Speech by Huang Hua,
Chairman of the Chinese Delegation,
at a Plenary Meeting of the Tenth
Special Session of the United Nations
General Assembly**

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS PEKING

中国代表团团长黄华
在联合国大会第十届特别会议
全体会议上的发言

*

外文出版社出版（北京）

1978年（32开）第一版

编号：（英）3050—2818

00015

3—E—1475P

First Edition 1978

Printed in the People's Republic of China

CONTENTS

SPEECH DELIVERED BY HUANG HUA, CHAIRMAN OF THE CHINESE DELEGATION AND FOREIGN MINISTER, AT A PLENARY MEETING OF THE TENTH SPECIAL SESSION OF THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY ON DISARMAMENT	1
WORKING PAPER ON DISARMAMENT SUBMITTED BY THE DELEGATION OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA	21

**SPEECH DELIVERED BY HUANG HUA,
CHAIRMAN OF THE CHINESE DELEGATION AND
FOREIGN MINISTER, AT A PLENARY MEETING
OF THE TENTH SPECIAL SESSION OF THE
UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY
ON DISARMAMENT**

(May 29, 1978)

Mr. President,

The present special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament has been called on the proposal of the non-aligned and other small and medium-sized countries. Its convocation is a reflection of the strong dissatisfaction of the third world and the many small and medium-sized countries with the intensified arms race between the superpowers and with their fierce rivalry for hegemony, as well as a reflection of the eager desire of these countries to eliminate the danger of war. The Chinese delegation is ready to join the representatives of other countries in discussing disarmament, which is a question of common concern to all countries of the world, and hopes that this session will make a positive contribution to the peoples' cause of unity against hegemonism in defence of world peace.

In recent years, there has been an upsurge in the anti-hegemonist struggle in which the third world plays the role of the main force. The people of all countries, and the countries and peoples of the third world in particular, have waged an unre-

mitting struggle against the policies of aggression and war of the superpowers and have dealt heavy blows at them. Egypt, the Sudan and Somalia expelled Soviet experts or resolutely abrogated their treaties with the Soviet Union in defence of their sovereignty and national dignity. The people of Zaire, after successfully repelling last year an invasion engineered by the Soviet Union and executed by a force of mercenaries, are now valiantly repulsing a new invasion of mercenaries engineered by the Soviet Union and Cuba. The African countries are strong in their demand for an end to superpower interference in the Horn of Africa. The Panamanian people have won a new victory in regaining sovereignty over the canal. There is a mounting struggle by the people in and around the Indian Ocean against the military presence of the superpowers in that region. The struggle of the third world countries in defence of their maritime rights and their struggle for the establishment of a new international economic order have continued to make headway. The Japanese people are putting up a strong opposition to Soviet hegemonist behaviour and insisting on the recovery of their northern territories. There is a growing tendency among the second world countries in Western Europe and other regions towards unity against hegemonism. All these developments amply show that the main trend in the international arena is the joining of all forces for an intensified fight against superpower hegemonism.

Meanwhile, the two superpowers, each with its immense military capabilities, are locked in an intense struggle on a global scale in which social-imperialism, that late-comer in the race, is pertinaciously taking the offensive. It is rapidly expanding its armaments of all kinds with a view to achieving military supremacy over its rival; at the same time, it is seizing spheres of influence and expanding on a world-wide scale. One superpower is bent on expansion; the other has its vested interests to protect. As the struggle intensifies, they are bound to fight it out some day. The

tense confrontation in Europe, the turmoil in the Middle East, and the gathering storm in Africa are all visible indications of the growth of factors for war. It is in face of the ever-growing menace of war and with a view to safeguarding their independence and security that the third world and the many small and medium-sized countries are opposing the superpowers' contention for hegemony and at the same time strongly demanding that the superpowers stop their arms race and disarm. This is a fully just demand which deserves wide support.

Mr. President,

There is an old Chinese saying, "Review the past and you'll know better the present." So it may not be unprofitable to review the history of disarmament as we discuss the question today.

Hundreds of meetings relating to disarmament have been held since the end of World War II. And from the start of the disarmament decade of the 1970s, disarmament negotiations under a host of names have run on almost without letup, from which there have come out quite a number of disarmament statements, declarations, agreements, resolutions and treaties of one sort or another. Yet, the arms race gets more heated, and the danger of war keeps growing. Why?

As everyone knows the third world and other small and medium-sized countries have put forward many reasonable proposals and suggestions for disarmament. These include the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, the destruction of nuclear weapons, the establishment of nuclear-free zones and zones of peace, the prohibition of all chemical and biological weapons, the prohibition of the establishment of military bases and stationing of troops on foreign soil, etc. If these proposals and suggestions were put into effect, they would undoubtedly help consolidate international peace and security. But on the issue of disarmament the superpowers have always shown duplicity, saying one thing but doing quite another. They preach disarma-

ment but are actually carrying on arms expansion on a massive scale. It will be recalled that the Soviet Union and the United States issued a joint statement in 1961 listing eight principles as a basis for negotiations on disarmament, in which they spoke of "general and complete disarmament," peddling it in the most fascinating terms. Now, 17 years have passed. Have they put into practice the principles advertised in their joint statement? No, not even a single one. Facts are the superpowers are not at all working for general and complete disarmament, but for general and complete arms expansion. Suffice it to point out that the military expenditures of both the Soviet Union and the United States have shot up. These were respectively 20 billion and 40 billion dollars in 1961, but reached more than 120 billion and 100 billion in 1977. Their spendings roughly equal the sum-total of the military expenditures of all the 150-odd other countries. Social-imperialism, that most ardent preacher of disarmament, has made the biggest strides in the arms race. Over this period, the Soviet Union increased its strategic missiles more than 14 fold, nearly doubled its naval tonnage, and augmented its military force by nearly 10,000 tanks, several thousand military aircraft and more than a million men. A Soviet leader even said boastfully that with its powerful armed forces, "the Soviet Union is ready to wage an all-out war employing each and every kind of weapon." In terms of the momentum of arms expansion, even the other superpower pales in comparison.

Last year the Soviet Foreign Minister thought it very smart to claim that the Soviet Union had advanced more than 70 disarmament proposals in recent years, attempting thereby to show its sincere desire for disarmament. But what sort of proposals were these? They were either hollow talk about the "non-use of force" and the "deepening and consolidation of international detente," or illusory bubbles about "banning environmental warfare" and "prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of

weapons of mass destruction," or schemes with glaring loopholes calculated to evade the real issue such as the proposal "to prohibit the emplacement of nuclear weapons on the sea-bed," which excludes nuclear submarines, or stratagems to restrict others and serve its own ends such as those stressing "nuclear non-proliferation" and a "nuclear test ban." They are all worthless proposals designed out of sinister motives and totally alien to the purpose of genuine disarmament. The more proposals of this kind the Soviet Union puts forward, the more its hypocrisy and treachery show up.

What are the lessons of history to be drawn from the long struggle around disarmament? They are as follows:

- 1) Lack of sincere desire on the part of the superpowers is the key reason why there has been no progress in disarmament over such a long period. The superpowers invariably camouflage their arms expansion with rhetoric about disarmament. We should not give credence to their fine-sounding words but should call on them to take practical measures of disarmament.

- 2) The people of the world want genuine and not sham disarmament. The superpowers, however, cook up all sorts of disarmament hoaxes to lull the people of the world, to tie the hands of other countries, and by these each of them wants to restrain the other party. It is necessary to constantly expose these hoaxes so that they do not confuse the issue.

- 3) The superpowers will not accept in good faith any proposal for genuine disarmament. Even if some agreements are reached, the superpowers will refuse to be bound by their terms. Hence, one should by no means entertain illusions about disarmament.

Mr. President,

The superpowers obviously anticipated that the representatives of small and medium-sized countries would voice a strong demand for genuine disarmament at this forum. So they have continued to play tricks to evade the pressure of world opinion, divert public

attention and stall progress at this session. On the question of nuclear disarmament in particular, they deliberately dwell on side issues to obstruct the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons. They vigorously advocate the "complete prohibition of nuclear tests" and "consolidation of the system of nuclear non-proliferation" as "major steps" to reduce the danger of a nuclear war. But who will be taken in by them? The Soviet Union and the United States have conducted hundreds of nuclear tests, both in the atmosphere and underground, which constitute about 90 per cent of all the nuclear explosions carried out in the world. A complete test ban now would not in the least touch their nuclear arsenals or restrict their continuing the production, development, stockpiling of nuclear weapons or their use of them. How can it reduce the danger of a nuclear war? Even more fraudulent is their claim that non-proliferation will reduce the threat of a nuclear war. Can it be asserted that this threat comes from the non-nuclear small and medium-sized countries and not from the two superpowers whose nuclear weapons are deployed for instant attack? As we all know, the Soviet Union and the United States contrived the "partial nuclear test ban treaty" and the "Treaty on Nuclear Non-Proliferation" in the 1960s. As a result, the many non-nuclear countries have been hampered, and even their right to the peaceful use of atomic energy has been restricted, while the Soviet Union and the United States have continued the expansion of their nuclear armaments at full steam. The Soviet Union in particular has made a dash and caught up. The ruse of the two superpowers in contriving these treaties has become obvious to more and more people. Can it become more credible by extending the test ban and consolidating the nuclear non-proliferation system? Recently the Soviet Union came up in seeming earnest with a proposal for so-called "cessation of the production of all types of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction." This is but a new trick which likewise cannot

eliminate the threat of a nuclear war. Let's leave aside the problem of verification. Even if the two superpowers do stop producing nuclear weapons, they can fight a nuclear war all the same with the numerous atom bombs and hydrogen bombs already in their possession. In a word, their proposals in various guises serve the single purpose of consolidating their positions as nuclear overlords, so that they may freely subject other countries to nuclear threat and nuclear blackmail.

The superpowers are playing up the prospect that a new agreement will be reached at their "strategic arms limitation talks," and describing it as a "major contribution" to the strengthening of international peace. This is a deliberate falsehood. For anyone willing to face up to realities, the history of SALT since they began in 1969 has been a history of strategic arms race between the Soviet Union and the United States, no more and no less. The previous SALT agreement reached after hot bargaining provides neither for reduction in quantity nor restriction on quality, but was designed to ensure expansion and improvement of their strategic arms to a higher level. In recent years, they have vied with each other in improving their strategic arms and rapidly developing MIRVs and, what is more, they have worked hard to develop new types of strategic weapons such as the Backfire bomber, the cruise missile and mobile multiple-warhead missiles. In the eight years of SALT, the Soviet Union has brought its once backward nuclear arsenal up to a par with that of the other superpower. How can this be described as an effort to limit the nuclear arms race? Any forthcoming agreement between the Soviet Union and the United States will at best be one with quantitative but no qualitative limits and envisaging continued "upward equilibrium" in respect of MIRVs. A U.S. leader is more frank in admitting that the Soviet Union and the United States have just been "working out new game rules" for the nuclear arms race. What is there to boast about in such agreements?

Mr. President,

It is only natural that an increasing number of small and medium-sized countries should demand that disarmament begin with the reduction of the arms of the two superpowers, whose nuclear as well as conventional arsenals far exceed any other country in the world. Each of them possesses thousands of strategic nuclear weapons, tens of thousands of tanks and military aircraft, hundreds of principal warships and huge stocks of other conventional weapons. What is more, in order to gain military supremacy, they are both stepping up the development and commissioning of more sophisticated nuclear and conventional weapons, constantly augmenting and strengthening their ground, sea and air forces, energetically expanding and grabbing military bases abroad and reinforcing their troops stationed overseas. While engaging in the arms race themselves, the superpowers are seeking to put the blame on other countries. The Soviet propaganda machine has even slandered the third world as being the "source of the arms race" and called for "vigilance" against the "extent the arms drive has reached in the 'third world.'" This is the trick of a thief crying "Stop thief." Have not the superpowers advocated the principle of "equal security" in disarmament? Since the hegemonist powers, the Soviet Union and the United States, claim that their security can be assured only through a military equilibrium between themselves, the small and medium-sized countries are all the more justified to demand that these powers be the first to reduce their super-arsenals, for they are threatened by the superpowers' superior military strength.

The two superpowers, the Soviet Union and the United States, are deliberately confusing the issue by advocating disarmament by all. Their armaments already far exceed their defence needs and are being used as tools of aggression and expansion and tools in the struggle for hegemony. They are subjecting countries in all parts of the world to threats of force, military control and even

armed aggression and they are busily preparing to unleash a new world war. Their armaments should certainly be cut drastically. As for the many small and medium-sized countries, armaments are their means of defence to safeguard their independence and security against aggression. Many third world countries still lack adequate defence capabilities, they need to strengthen their national defence. So what arms do they have to reduce? Even the second world countries in Western Europe and elsewhere, which are faced with the grave threat of annexation and invasion by Soviet social-imperialism, have the need to strengthen their defence capabilities. Disarmament must start with the two superpowers. This is a fundamental principle on the question of disarmament today. It is also the chief yardstick of real progress in disarmament. The superpowers are trying to use "general disarmament" as an excuse for their refusal to cut their own armaments. This will never do.

Mr. President,

The Chinese people and the people of all other countries firmly demand peace. It has been the consistent stand of the Chinese Government that China will live in peace with all countries on the basis of the Five Principles of mutual respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, mutual non-aggression, non-interference in each other's internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit, and peaceful coexistence. We do not threaten anyone, much less commit aggression against anyone. China is a developing country as well as a socialist country and belongs to the third world. Like other third world countries, we eagerly desire to lift our country from economic backwardness and are resolutely opposed to a world war. The Chinese people badly need an enduring peaceful international environment for the great task of developing China into a modern and powerful socialist country by the end of the century. China will never commit aggression against other countries even when it becomes a powerful socialist country. This is

dictated by China's socialist system and by Chairman Mao's revolutionary line. But being confronted with imperialist, and especially social-imperialist aggression and threats, we cannot but strengthen our preparedness against war while carrying on construction. How can we afford to relax and go to sleep when a superpower has deployed a million troops along our border? Our war preparedness is not intended for aggression but for defence against aggression. Some people make the slanderous charge that we are warlike and want to provoke a world war. This is truly preposterous. Is China stationing hundreds of thousands of troops on other countries' territories? Has China sent out fleets to all oceans to make a show of force? Has China staged one offensive military manoeuvre after another in different parts of the world? The absurd slanders against China do not merit refutation.

The Chinese Government and people have always stood for genuine disarmament and have made positive efforts for it. We have not only supported all rational proposals of disarmament and put forward a number of suggestions of our own, but also taken a series of concrete measures which accord with the wishes of the people of all countries.

We have always stood for the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons, and have on many occasions stated that we will at no time and in no circumstances be the first to use nuclear weapons.

We have always firmly supported the demands of small and medium-sized countries for the establishment of nuclear-free zones and peace zones, and have undertaken a due commitment towards the Latin American nuclear-free zone.

We have always stood for the dismantling of all military bases on foreign soil and the withdrawal of all armed forces stationed abroad. We have no military bases and no troops abroad, and we will never ask any country for military bases or station our troops on the territory of any other country.

We have always stood for the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of biological and chemical weapons, and we firmly uphold the 1925 Geneva Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare.

We have always held that all countries have the right to develop nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, and we are firmly opposed to the attempt of the superpowers to hamper on the pretext of nuclear non-proliferation the development by other countries of their own nuclear industry.

We have always been opposed to the practice of using military aid to extort privileges, pose armed threats or make exorbitant profits, and we ourselves have never resorted to it.

We have solemnly declared that we will not seek hegemony in any part of the world. Our Constitution includes the explicit provision that China "will never seek hegemony or strive to be a superpower." And we have publicly declared to the people of the whole world that if one day China should play the tyrant in the world, they should work together with the Chinese people to overthrow it.

The principled position of the Chinese Government and people on the question of disarmament is open and aboveboard. Our deeds and words are in accord, and we always live up to our words. We firmly support all the rational proposals put forward by the small and medium-sized countries; but we must thoroughly expose the disarmament hoaxes of the superpowers. That is what we did in the past and what we will continue to do in the future.

Mr. President,

People call for disarmament in the hope that it will reduce the danger of war. Hence the worth of a disarmament measure lies not in its face value but in its real effect. Any measure that helps to safeguard international peace and security and postpone the outbreak of a war should be supported; conversely, any measure

that serves the interests of either superpower in seeking hegemony and preparing for war must be opposed. Here is the difference between genuine disarmament and sham disarmament.

The people of the whole world eagerly demand nuclear disarmament and the elimination of the danger of a nuclear war. We do not believe in the horror story spread by the superpowers that a nuclear war will destroy all mankind, but like the people of other countries, we Chinese are firmly opposed to a nuclear war. Everyone knows that the only way truly to free mankind from the threat of nuclear war is through the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons. Over the years we have repeatedly called on all countries to declare that they will prohibit and destroy nuclear weapons completely, thoroughly, totally and resolutely, that is, no use, no export, no import, no manufacture, no testing, no stockpiling of nuclear weapons and the destruction of all existing nuclear weapons. And we have proposed the holding of a conference of the heads of all countries to discuss the question of the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons, and first of all to conclude an agreement on the non-use of nuclear weapons. But the superpowers have not responded to our proposals, and the talks on nuclear disarmament have been going on for more than a dozen years without any substantive progress. We believe that, in order to reduce the threat of nuclear war to the small and medium-sized countries in the absence of an agreement on the non-use of nuclear weapons, a measure of urgency is for all nuclear countries to undertake not to resort to the threat or use of nuclear weapons against the non-nuclear countries and nuclear-free zones. This is a reasonable and practical measure. Non-nuclear countries pose no threat to nuclear powers, why shouldn't the nuclear powers undertake not to use nuclear weapons against them? If the superpowers even refuse to take this minimum action, it will only prove that their statements about