

# UNITED NATIONS



GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY



SECURITY  
COUNCIL

Distr.  
GENERAL

A/34/390

S/13477

31 July 1979

ENGLISH

ORIGINAL: CHINESE/ENGLISH

---

GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
Thirty-fourth session  
Item 11 of the provisional agenda\*  
REPORT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

SECURITY COUNCIL  
Thirty-fourth year

Letter dated 30 July 1979 from the Chargé d'Affaires a.i. of the  
Permanent Mission of China to the United Nations addressed to  
the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit to you herewith the text of a speech made by Han Nianlong, Head of the Chinese Government delegation and Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs, at the ninth plenary meeting of the Sino-Vietnamese negotiations on 30 July 1979. I request that this speech be circulated as an official document of the General Assembly, under item 11 of the provisional agenda, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) LAI Yali,  
Acting Permanent Representative of  
the People's Republic of China to  
the United Nations

---

\* A/34/150.

ANNEX

Speech made by Han Nianlong, Head of the Chinese Government delegation and Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs, at the ninth plenary meeting of the Sino-Vietnamese negotiations on 30 July 1979

Nine plenary meetings have been held since the beginning of the Sino-Vietnamese negotiations. At the second plenary meeting, the Chinese side put forward the eight-point proposal for handling relations between the two countries (A/34/213-S/13278, annex), and we have since repeatedly suggested that both sides first take up the five principles of peaceful coexistence and the principle of opposing hegemonism with a view to normalizing the relations between the two countries and restoring the traditional friendship between the two peoples. To date, however, the Vietnamese side fails to respond to our proposals. You arbitrarily refuse to discuss the principle of not seeking hegemony or the five principles of peaceful coexistence. At the same time, you fabricate lies at will, slanderously accusing China of having expansionist and hegemonic designs on Indo-China and even all South-East Asia. You vainly attempt to confuse right and wrong, sow dissension and cover up your true intentions of gobbling up Indo-China, throwing South-East Asia into chaos and serving the Soviet Union's policy of southward drive. That is why our negotiations have so far failed to make any progress.

The five principles of peaceful coexistence, namely, 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, have become universally accepted principles guiding international relations. Opposition to hegemonism is now an important principle for safeguarding world peace and combating a war of aggression, a principle accepted by an increasing number of countries. The five principles of peaceful coexistence and the principle of opposing hegemonism are closely related, and they all have well-defined and specific meanings and content. It will not do if one merely pays lip service to these principles, one must observe them in one's deeds.

Since its founding 30 years ago, the People's Republic of China has consistently pursued a foreign policy of peace and made unremitting efforts to safeguard world peace, develop friendly relations and co-operation between nations and promote the cause of human progress.

Upholding proletarian internationalism, China has supported all oppressed nations and peoples in their struggle against imperialism, colonialism and hegemonism and for liberation and social progress. China has always endeavoured to strengthen unity with the working class and progressive forces of the world, unity with other socialist and third-world countries, and to unite with all the forces in the world that can be united with in a common struggle against the hegemonic policies of aggression and war. China has declared to the whole world that it is willing to establish and develop relations with all countries on the

/...

basis of the five principles of peaceful coexistence and that it will never seek hegemony, nor act like a super-Power. China's foreign policy has stood the test of history and won world-wide credence and praise. China has all along abided by the five principles of peaceful coexistence and the principle of not seeking hegemony. This is an objective fact that no slanders or lies can alter.

We have noted that in its three-point proposal (A/34/201-S/13257) the Vietnamese side also refers to the principles of "peaceful coexistence", that is, "respect for independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity; non-aggression, refraining from the use or threat of use of force; non-interference in the internal affairs of the other side". Yet, throughout the negotiations, you have been unwilling to discuss these principles, let alone act on them. For you have put forth these principles not with the true intention of acting on them but in order to hoodwink public opinion. It is common knowledge that words must be checked against deeds so as to distinguish the true from the false. This is the way you are being judged by the people of the world and the great majority of countries. A host of facts proves that your actions run counter to the principles of peaceful coexistence you professed. You have planted in all departments of the Lao Party, Government and army thousands of your "advisers" and stationed tens of thousands of troops in the northern, central and southern regions of Laos, placing that country under your total control. You have dispatched close to 200,000 troops to invade and occupy Kampuchea, prop up the puppet régime, massacre and repress in cold blood all Kampuchean who refuse to be slaves and plunge the Kampuchean people in their millions into an abyss of misery. Can one find in your actions the slightest evidence of respect for other countries' "independence and sovereignty"? Betraying your history and your own statements, you have invaded and occupied some of China's Nansha Islands and nibbled at and intruded into China's border. You have forcibly occupied the Wuyi Island of Kampuchea and taken possession of Kampuchean territories you borrowed during the war against United States aggression, which were commonly known as "sanctuaries". You have annexed large parts of the territory of Laos in the name of friendship. Is there any respect for "sovereignty and territorial integrity" to speak of here? You have kept stepping up armed provocations in China's border areas and creating border conflicts. You have massed heavy troops on the Kampuchea-Thailand border, threatening Thailand and the other countries of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN). You launched a naked war of aggression and put Kampuchea under your military occupation and moved your people en masse into that country in an attempt to perpetuate such occupation. Isn't this a threat and use of force and aggression? Is there any "peace" or "coexistence" here? You have carried out a racist policy of ruthless persecution and forcible export of refugees en masse to deliberately cause trouble in the adjacent countries. Is this consistent with any of the principles of "peaceful coexistence"? In a word, what the Vietnamese authorities practise is out-and-out aggression, expansion and regional hegemonism and by no means "peaceful coexistence".

It must be further pointed out that, in order to cover up its policy of regional hegemonism, the Vietnamese side has resorted to fabrication and sophistry

/...

through its propaganda machine and even at the negotiation table. The plain fact is that the Vietnamese authorities have brought the sovereign State of Laos under their control and that of Kampuchea under their enslavement, yet you have the impudence to assert that there exists a "special relationship". The plain fact is that you have launched a war of aggression, yet you claim that you have gone there to "defend the fruits of socialism". The plain fact is that you are maintaining military occupation of Kampuchea and trying to perpetuate it by moving your people there, yet you claim that you are executing "an honest international duty". The Vietnamese side has even said that "the stationing of Vietnamese armed forces in Kampuchea and Laos fully accords with the Charter of the United Nations and the principles of the non-aligned movement". Here I would like to ask, which Article of the Charter and which principle of the non-aligned movement does your action accord with? This is a downright distortion of the Charter and a great mockery of the non-aligned movement. In fact, this gangster logic is not your own invention. You have taken it over from the big hegemonists, and it is just a Vietnamese version of the notorious theories of "limited sovereignty" and "international dictatorship". The Vietnamese side will not succeed in pitting these fallacies against the principles of peaceful coexistence and of not seeking hegemony. It is only your wishful thinking to use these subterfuges to escape condemnation by international opinion. As early as 1954, President Ho Chi Minh clearly stated that the five principles of peaceful coexistence are fully applicable in consolidating and developing friendly relations among Viet Nam, Laos and Kampuchea. However, by your above-mentioned deeds you have completely betrayed the teachings of President Ho Chi Minh. I would like to point out frankly that if the Vietnamese side continues its present course, it will only cause greater disaster to the people of Viet Nam, Laos and Kampuchea, hasten the bankruptcy of the erroneous policy of the Vietnamese authorities and make themselves all the more despised by the international community.

During the negotiations, the Vietnamese side asserted that "all through the past 30 years" China has "consistently plotted to keep Viet Nam divided, weak and dependent on China", and sought to "annex" Viet Nam, and so on and so forth. Never did we expect that you would make such assertions. It is known to all that the sacrifice and contribution made by the Chinese Government and people in support of the Vietnamese people's struggle for independence, liberation and reunification of their fatherland have been such as can be denied by no one of good faith. The Chinese side never likes to dwell on its aid and support to the Vietnamese people. However, the Vietnamese side has so despicably distorted the history of Sino-Vietnamese relations. We need only to briefly recall here a few important facts to prove the absurdity of your distortion.

China and Viet Nam are joined by common mountains and rivers, and their revolutions have deep-rooted historical links. For more than two decades China and Viet Nam maintained a good-neighbourly relationship of friendship and co-operation, a relationship of solidarity as between comrades-in-arms, one at the front and the other in the rear. The Chinese Government and people have fulfilled their internationalist duty. We feel no qualms upon self-examination, for we have never let the Vietnamese people down.

/...

When the Vietnamese people found themselves in an extremely difficult situation, who was the first to come out and give them firm support and all-out aid in their just struggle? Who was the first to extend recognition to the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam? Who helped the Vietnamese people win the "border campaign" in 1950? Who helped the Vietnamese people win the battle of Dien Bien Phu? After the restoration of peace in Viet Nam in 1954, China supported the socialist construction in northern Viet Nam and provided you with tremendous aid, for which your leaders expressed thanks on many occasions. Do you mean to say those expressions were from the first hypocritical lies? The Chinese Government and people gave all-out support and aid to the liberation struggle in southern Viet Nam and to the just struggle of the Vietnamese people to reunify their fatherland. We gave the south Viet Nam liberation armed forces large amounts of arms, ammunition, foreign exchange and logistic supplies; we staunchly supported the South Viet Nam National Front for Liberation and the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Viet Nam in their diplomatic activities; we helped in every way for Vietnamese leaders to travel between northern and southern Viet Nam when the two parts were still separated. When, after the Beibu (Tonkin) Gulf incident in 1964, the United States started a massive invasion of southern Viet Nam and wanton bombing in the north, we again went all out to help defend the air space of northern Viet Nam. The Chinese people ensured uninterrupted transport to north Viet Nam at the cost of blood and lives. When the United States mined Vietnamese ports, Chinese sailors risked their lives to ship food and other supplies to the Vietnamese people. You are fully aware that the Chinese leaders, in order to help the Vietnamese people win early victory in their anti-imperialist struggle, gave every consideration to your needs and took great pains to meet them. In order to support Viet Nam's struggle against United States aggression, the Chinese Government and people made maximum national sacrifices and willingly suffered privations. The bones of Chinese martyrs in their thousands remain on Vietnamese soil. We gave you arms and ammunition and economic, material and foreign exchange aids amounting to tens of billions of Renminbi yuan to help you defeat the enemy, heal war wounds, rebuild the national economy and maintain adequate military strength. Was all this for "annexing Viet Nam"? Vietnamese leaders once said, "China had supported Viet Nam's revolutionary struggle from the outset. Without China's support, the Vietnamese revolution could not have developed as it had" and "it would be impossible to carry on the struggle against United States aggression". They also said that "China's great and precious support had contributed immensely to the strengthening of both northern and southern Viet Nam's economic and defence potentials and combat strength". There were many more such statements, too numerous to quote. Yet the Vietnamese side has now so unscrupulously distorted history and even sunk to perfidy and revealed an inveterate hatred against China when it tried to describe the more than two decades of "comradely and brotherly" Sino-Vietnamese relations as a plot to "annex Viet Nam". This shows that you are deliberately trying to fan up nationalist hatred and hostility against China. In point of fact, you have done so only because China does not countenance your regional hegemonism, does not permit your grabbing Chinese territory, does not endorse your control over Laos and invasion of Kampuchea and does not approve of your

/...

attempt to lord it over South-East Asia. We can think of no other motives behind your behaviour.

In the course of these negotiations, the Vietnamese side has heaped vilifications on China, tried hard to twist the facts about the origin of the deterioration of Sino-Vietnamese relations and evade the essence of a solution of the relations between the two countries. It is highly questionable whether there is any sincerity on the Vietnamese side for negotiations.

Besides, it must be pointed out that the Vietnamese export of refugees was condemned by all the participating countries at the Geneva international meeting. In those circumstances, the Vietnamese authorities were compelled to make a show of willingness to consider and exercise temporary restraint. But actually they were still playing tricks and unwilling to stop the export of refugees. The international community is still very much concerned about the Vietnamese authorities' inhumane policy of exporting refugees and is generally suspicious of their vague promises. The Vietnamese authorities must forthwith solve the problem of refugees at its source by stopping the export of refugees to China and other countries.

The Chinese side would like to reiterate that, for the Sino-Vietnamese negotiations to be productive and our relations to be improved and restored to normal, one must start with the crux of the trouble in these relations. We are willing to discuss with you, in the first place, the five principles of peaceful coexistence and the question of not seeking hegemony, so as to lay a sound basis for the fundamental settlement of the disputes between the two countries.