

CHINA & THE WORLD



2

China on Disarmament

Zhou Enlai the Diplomat

US Policy Towards Taiwan

South-South Co-operation

**West European Countries
— Their Foreign Policies**

China & the World (2)

BEIJING REVIEW
Foreign Affairs Series

First Printing, 1982

China & the World (2)

"Beijing Review" Foreign Affairs Series

Editor: Zhou Guo

Art Design: Su Yangzhang

Published by:

BEIJING REVIEW
24 Baiwanzhuang Road,
Beijing, China

Distributed by:

China Publications Centre
(GUOJI SHUDIAN)
P.O. Box 399, Beijing, China

Printed in the People's Republic of China

CONTENTS

China on Disarmament	5
China's Disarmament Proposal	19
Zhou Enlai in the Arena of Diplomacy — Ma Lie and Wang Ning	22
China-US Joint Communique	43
Chinese Foreign Ministry Spokesman's State- ment on China-US Joint Communique	47
US Policy Towards Taiwan (1949-50) — Zi Zhongyun	51
South-South Co-operation — Towards a New International Economic Order — Xu Mei	80
New Delhi Consultations on South-South Co-operation	93
West European Countries — The Canons of Their Foreign Policy — Guo Fengmin	98

Editor's Note

Most of the articles in this volume first appeared in the Chinese quarterly "Journal of International Studies," published by the Institute of International Studies in Beijing. Some of them have been slightly abridged for reasons of space.

China on Disarmament

—Text of speech dated June 11, 1982 by Foreign Minister Huang Hua, Chairman of the Chinese People's Republic Delegation to the UN General Assembly Special Session on Disarmament

Mr. President,

The Second Special Session of the UN General Assembly devoted to Disarmament is being held under the spotlight of world attention. The non-aligned countries and many small and medium-sized countries have done commendable work for its convocation. Thanks to their initiative and unremitting efforts over the years; the question of disarmament is no longer under the control of the superpowers and has become a matter of common concern involving the participation of all countries of the world.

This question has undoubtedly become more urgent since the First Special Session. Peace-loving people all over the world are waiting to see what positions various governments will take on disarmament and whether they can adopt some practical and effective measures at this session with regard to such pressing issues as halting the arms race and preventing a nuclear war. In this sense, the current session is not only a forum for the discussion of disarmament

ment, but a place to test the good faith of each government towards disarmament.

Acting upon the instructions of the Government of the People's Republic of China, the Chinese Delegation has come to take part in the session in good faith. We are ready to join the distinguished representatives of other countries in a serious exploration of the major issues related to world disarmament, and hope that the session will contribute to a reasonable solution of the question of disarmament and to the maintenance of world peace.

A central task of the session is to review the international situation and what has been achieved in disarmament over the past four years. No objective unbiased observer can deny the fact that there has been sustained international tension during these years. This was mainly due to the acts of expansion and aggression by the hegemonists and to the intensified arms race and fierce rivalry between the two superpowers. One superpower has been pressing forward to expand its sphere of influence. Not wishing to be outdone, the other superpower has exerted its utmost to build up its strength and to try to regain its former position of world supremacy. The two superpowers have been contending for world hegemony. Their rivalry extends to all parts of the globe, thus threatening the independence and sovereignty of small and medium-sized countries as well as world peace and security. As a result, more hot spots have been created, thereby aggravating the already tense international situation. Throughout the 1970s the two superpowers vied with each other for global hegemony and the people of the world fought against hegemonism. Wherever hegemonism rears its ugly head, there is bound to be a struggle against

it. The world has been beset with mounting contradictions and conflicts since the beginning of the 1980s.

No real progress to date. The two superpowers expand their nuclear arsenals and conventional armaments as well. The menace of war becomes more acute.

In the past four years, no real progress has been made in disarmament despite the unceasing struggle waged by the people of the world. The objectives set forth in the Final Document of the First Special Session devoted to Disarmament remain mere words on paper. This is because the two superpowers are not at all sincere about disarmament and have instead stepped up arms expansion. They have started a new round of the arms race, each striving to improve or upgrade its own strategic and theatre nuclear weapons in order to gain superiority over the other. At the same time, they have been developing conventional armaments, vying for the control of strategic areas and stepping up war preparations. Each tries to justify its own arms expansion by that of the other, and this has led to mutual recriminations and accusations. It is only natural that their intensifying arms expansion and war preparations, which threaten international peace and security, have aroused strong worldwide opposition. In recent years the people of Europe, Japan, the United States and elsewhere have launched a mass movement against the nuclear arms race of the two superpowers and for preventing nuclear war. We fully understand and sympathize with their concern for peace and for the prevention of war.

As the arms race intensifies and the menace of war increases, the third world and other small and medium-sized countries demand all the more strongly that progress be made in disarmament and that results be achieved at this session. They are fully entitled to do so because they are always the first to suffer from the two superpowers' rivalry and from the aggression and expansion by the hegemons. For their own security, they have had to expend scarce resources and meagre funds to strengthen their defence capabilities, thus adding to their economic difficulties. They have raised their voices in calling for disarmament and have put forward many positive proposals and reasonable ideas, some of which have been incorporated in the draft Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament before us. It is our opinion that these should be seriously considered and studied in the course of our deliberations.

Under the pressure of world public opinion against nuclear threat, the two superpowers, even while starting a new round of the arms race, have repeatedly professed willingness for disarmament and come up with all kinds of proposals or programmes. How should we view such a phenomenon? Historical experience tells us that a party which gains the upper hand in an arms race would seek to freeze the status quo and maintain its superiority, while the party in an unfavourable position would try to change the status quo, catch up with the other and redress the imbalance. Now one superpower stresses that an arms freeze should come first while the other insists on priority for arms reduction. They appear to be talking about the need to maintain a balance of arms, but in fact each side wants to

attain supremacy and to strengthen its own position in the contest for world hegemony by means of a new round of the arms race.

In this regard, the posturizing on the part of one superpower is particularly noteworthy. Every year it produces an assortment of proposals or plans which are merely variations on the same theme. But what concrete actions has it really taken? None.

One is bound to ask the following questions:

Is it not ironic that the superpower which pledged at the last special session that it "has never unleashed war and will never do so" turned around only one year later to send 100,000 troops to invade and occupy Afghanistan? Surely these troops were not sent there on a sightseeing tour.

Why is it that this superpower which talks glibly about prohibiting the use of nuclear weapons has always refused to undertake unconditionally to "renounce the use of nuclear weapons" against non-nuclear states?

If this superpower is truly willing to implement "confidence-building measures" in Asia, why does it not establish its credibility by withdrawing its troops immediately and unconditionally from Afghanistan and stopping its support for the aggression against Kampuchea?

This superpower has been describing "detente" in such glowing terms. Why then has it effected such a dramatic increase in its nuclear and conventional armaments precisely during the so-called "decade of detente"? Either it was trying to promote "detente" by means of arms expansion, or it was carrying out arms expansion under the camouflage of "detente."

Any cursory comparison between this super-

power's pronouncements and its actions will provide the right answer.

People often say that this superpower is launching a "peace offensive" when it strikes a posture in favour of disarmament. We have a saying in China: It is the mark of a swindler always to present a respectable facade to cover up his misdeeds. The fact that this superpower is so fond of such "peace offensives" does not mean it is genuine about disarmament, or that it is prepared to turn over a new leaf and abandon its policy of aggression and expansion. It is merely trying to cover up the truth, deceive the people of the world and divert their attention from the objectives of disarmament, so that it can press on with its hegemonic policies of nuclear arms expansion, blackmail and war preparations.

China is for genuine disarmament, against aggression or expansionism by superior military strength. Basic principles and measures for halting the arms race.

The Chinese Government and people have always stood for genuine disarmament and made positive efforts towards progress in disarmament. Since the 1960s, the Chinese Government has put forward on a number of occasions its views and proposals on disarmament and on strengthening international security. We have always opposed the arms race and the threat or use of force in international relations, and we are against any country carrying out aggression or expansion by means of superior military strength. We endorse the holding of talks between the Soviet Union and the United States on nuclear arms. We hope that they will adopt

a serious and responsible attitude in the negotiations and produce an agreement that will genuinely help to curb the nuclear arms race and prevent the menace of a nuclear war. We hope they will not repeat the pattern of their past negotiations which left them plenty of room for further improving and developing their respective nuclear arms instead of cutting them back.

In recent years, Chinese representatives have expounded the basic principles of the Chinese Government on disarmament issues at various disarmament meetings. I wish to take this opportunity to reaffirm them as follows:

1. Efforts for disarmament cannot be separated from those for the maintenance of international security. They must be combined with those for the maintenance of world peace and security. In order to create a favourable climate and conditions for disarmament and to achieve real progress in this field, it is essential to uphold the Charter of the United Nations and the norms of international relations. No country is permitted to seek any form of hegemony anywhere in the world. The use or threat of force against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of any state should be strictly prohibited.

2. The two superpowers should take the lead in reducing their armaments. Because they possess the greatest nuclear and conventional arsenals and their rivalry and arms race are menacing international peace and security, hence they bear the primary responsibility for disarmament and should be the first to reduce their armaments. After they have substantially cut back their armaments, the other nuclear states and militarily significant states should

join them and reduce their armaments according to a reasonable proportion and procedure.

3. Nuclear disarmament should be carried out in conjunction with conventional disarmament. It is certainly important to take effective measures to achieve the objective of nuclear disarmament in view of the grave threat to mankind posed by nuclear war, but one should not overlook the fact that conventional arms are used in committing aggression against or otherwise threatening other countries. Only a combination of measures for both nuclear and conventional disarmament can help reduce the danger of war. Simultaneously with nuclear and conventional disarmament, all other types of weapons of mass destruction should be banned.

4. Small and medium-sized countries are all entitled to take what measures they deem necessary to maintain their defence capabilities for resisting aggression and safeguarding their independence. The measures and steps decided at different stages of disarmament must not prejudice or endanger the independence, sovereignty and security of any state.

5. Disarmament agreements should provide for strict and effective international verification. For the sake of building trust and ensuring full compliance by the signatories, such agreements should include effective verification measures. Sanctions should be applied in the event of any violation of the agreements.

6. All states may participate in the settlement of disarmament issues on an equal footing. As disarmament has a bearing upon the security and interests of all states, big or small, nuclear or non-nuclear, militarily strong or weak, every state is entitled to participate on an equal footing in the

deliberations and negotiations on this matter and in supervising the implementation of the agreements reached.

In view of the strong demand of the people of the world for halting the arms race and preventing a nuclear war, and in conformity with my Government's consistent position on disarmament and the basic principles I just outlined, I should like to put before this session the following essential measures for an immediate halt to the arms race and for disarmament:

— An agreement should be reached by all the nuclear states not to use nuclear weapons. Pending such an agreement, each nuclear state should, without attaching any condition, undertake not to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear states and nuclear-weapon-free zones, and not to be the first to use such weapons against each other at any time and under any circumstances.

— The Soviet Union and the United States should stop testing, improving or manufacturing nuclear weapons and should reduce by 50 per cent all types of their nuclear weapons and means of delivery.

— After that, all other nuclear states should also stop testing, improving or manufacturing nuclear weapons and should reduce their respective nuclear arsenals according to an agreed proportion and procedure.

— Conventional disarmament should be effected simultaneously with nuclear disarmament. As a first step, all states should undertake not to use conventional armaments for intervention or aggression against and military occupation of any country.

Prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons has its merit but is not enough, nor reassuring. The goal must be reduction and total destruction.

In our view, in order to achieve real progress in disarmament, it is essential to proceed from the present world armament levels and identify the main orientation, targets and objectives of disarmament and to take fair, reasonable and practical measures towards this end.

As the nuclear arms race is continuing unabated and the stockpiling of nuclear weapons has reached a dangerous level of overkill and over saturation, it is unrealistic to try to achieve general and complete nuclear disarmament overnight. Therefore, the first step in nuclear disarmament should be the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons to be followed by their progressive reduction and ultimate destruction. Since nuclear weapons are developed, tested and deployed for possible use, the danger of nuclear war will diminish if all nuclear states undertake not to use them. If the nuclear states refrain from threatening non-nuclear states and undertake unconditionally not to use nuclear weapons against them, then these states will have no need to possess nuclear weapons or seek foreign nuclear protection. If a nuclear state does not first ask itself whether it is posing any threat to non-nuclear states but holds them responsible and demand that they undertake not to threaten it, wouldn't that be as absurd as putting the cart before the horse?

It is certainly inadequate just to prohibit the use of nuclear weapons. The possible use of nuclear weapons cannot be precluded merely by prohibition without taking further steps to reduce and finally

destroy them altogether. This is why, in our opinion, the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons must be linked with their reduction and destruction.

It is our view that conventional disarmament should be effected simultaneously with nuclear disarmament. Given the immense destructiveness of a nuclear war and its grave threat to the security of mankind, it is understandable that people focus their attention mainly on opposing the nuclear arms race and preventing the threat of a nuclear war. But one can only assume two circumstances in which a nuclear war may break out: either the nuclear powers engage each other in a nuclear war from the very beginning, or they may begin by a conventional war which may escalate to a nuclear conflict. If we direct our efforts solely to the prevention of a nuclear war and relax our vigilance against a conventional war, that may still leave open the possibility of the outbreak of a nuclear war. The superpowers often use their conventional armaments as a means of aggression and expansion. Obviously, if we neglect conventional disarmament, we will not be effective in preventing the hegemons from carrying out aggression and expansion by means of conventional arms.

Furthermore, we are of the opinion that priorities should be set in both nuclear and conventional disarmament. The two superpowers should be the first to reduce their arms substantially. For they possess the biggest arsenals in the world, and only they are capable of waging a nuclear war. Since countries vary in size and military strength, should we require the stronger states to reduce their armaments so as to ensure the security of the weaker ones, or demand equal and simultaneous reduction

of arms by all countries? In our view, the threat of war can be reduced only when the two superpowers take the lead in substantially cutting back their nuclear and conventional armaments. This principle particularly applies to nuclear disarmament.

The views that I have just outlined indicate the obligation China is prepared to undertake for disarmament. In point of fact, the Chinese Government has long since repeatedly pledged to the world that at no time and under no circumstances will China be the first to use nuclear weapons and that it undertakes unconditionally not to use such weapons against non-nuclear states. This amply shows the good faith of the Chinese Government on the question of disarmament. I would like to announce here that if the two superpowers take the lead in halting the testing, improving or manufacturing of nuclear weapons and in reducing their nuclear weapons by 50 per cent, the Chinese Government is ready to join all other nuclear states in undertaking to stop the development and production of nuclear weapons and to further reduce and ultimately destroy them altogether.

Guidelines of China's foreign policy: Unite with the third world and all other peace-loving countries; oppose hegemonism; and maintain world peace.

The basic principles of the Chinese Government concerning disarmament and the essential measures for disarmament I have just outlined emanate from China's foreign policy of peace.

The fundamental guidelines of China's foreign policy are: Unite with the third world and all other