

UNITED NATIONS



GENERAL ASSEMBLY SECURITY COUNCIL

Distr.
GENERAL

A/34/364
S/13449
11 July 1979

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Thirty-fourth session
Item 46 of the preliminary list*
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON
THE STRENGTHENING OF INTERNATIONAL
SECURITY

SECURITY COUNCIL
Thirty-fourth year

Letter dated 11 July 1979 from the Permanent Representative of Viet Nam
to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit to you herewith, for your information, the text of the speech delivered on 5 July 1979 by the Head of the Delegation of the Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, Dinh Nho Liem, at the second meeting of the second round of the Viet Nam-China talks, and request you to have this letter and its enclosure circulated as an official document of the General Assembly, under item 46 of the preliminary list, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) HA VAN LAU
Ambassador Extraordinary and
Plenipotentiary
Permanent Representative of the
Socialist Republic of Viet Nam
to the United Nations

* A/34/50.

ANNEX

Speech delivered on 5 July 1979 by the Head of the Delegation of the Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, Dinh Nho Liem, at the second meeting of the second round of the Viet Nam-China talks

At the opening meeting of the second round of the Viet Nam-China talks, the Vietnamese delegation reaffirmed the reasonable and sensible three-point proposal on the "Main principles and contents of a settlement of the problems concerning the relations between the two countries". We reiterated the fair and satisfactory proposal about the method of discussion, namely, the two sides will raise in turn the issues of interest for exchanges of views at each meeting. We also put forward a new initiative in the form of a draft "Agreement on refraining from armed provocations" with a view to easing the tension at the border between the two countries and bringing about a favourable climate for the talks to make headway.

To our deep regret, while the two peoples and world public opinion were following with keen interest and great expectations the progress of the current round, the Chinese side still clung to the wrongful position and attitude that had been a stumbling block throughout the first round of talks. It kept putting forward crude distortions and slanders against Viet Nam which, right in the last meeting, we flatly rejected. It still tried to evade the three-point proposal and the draft agreement put forward by the Vietnamese side, refused to discuss any issue whatsoever, and adamantly and threateningly insisted on the Vietnamese side's acceptance of its eight points.

The Chinese delegation repeated again and again that the "anti-hegemony" principle was the "crux" of the matter, a "basis" for a settlement of the problems concerning the relations between the two countries. It kept clamouring that the Vietnamese side was "eluding" the so-called anti-hegemony issue. It deliberately forgot that, right in the first round of talks, the Vietnamese side had bluntly told it a harsh fact: speaking of hegemonism, there is only the great-Power hegemonism and great-Nation expansionism that the Chinese rulers have been entertaining for a long time and are now striving hard to carry into effect.

Today we would like once again to elaborate on this issue. The practice of the world peoples' revolutionary struggle and China's activities in the field of foreign relations over the years have clearly shown the following: the Chinese rulers' hegemonism is embodied in ambitions for territorial expansion in various forms: in attempts to impose by every possible means Peking's ideologies, views and lines on other countries; in the interference in the internal affairs of a series of countries through Chinese-fostered political and armed opposition organizations and through fifth columns, consisting of bad elements recruited in the large local communities of overseas Chinese; in aggressions waged directly or through agents, and threats of aggression against other countries with the

/...

contention of "teaching them a lesson"; in the alliance with imperialism and other reactionary forces against the world peoples' struggle for peace, national independence, democracy and socialism.

The Chinese rulers claim that they "do not want any inch of territory from other countries". As a matter of fact, it is they who have published universally-known books and maps presenting as lost Chinese territories extensive areas of other countries, among them the whole territory of Viet Nam, Lao, Kampuchea, Mongolia, Burma, Thailand, Malaysia, Bhutan, Nepal, and parts of the territory of India, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Japan. The current map of the People's Republic of China published by China itself includes into Chinese territory the vast expanses of the Eastern Sea (South China Sea) up to the vicinity of Indonesia, the Philippines, Malaysia, Viet Nam, and all islands and archipelagoes therein. This bears out their great ambition to monopolize the Eastern Sea. The Chinese rulers started in 1962 a war of aggression against the Republic of India, over 36,000 square kilometres of whose territory are still occupied by Chinese troops. They provoked in 1969 armed conflicts at the border with the Soviet Union, on which they have laid continuing territorial claims under the label of "contested areas". They sent in 1974 military forces to occupy the Vietnamese Hoang Sa (Paracels) islands, and are claiming sovereignty over other Vietnamese islands in the Eastern Sea. For many years now, they have grabbed in various forms many places on the Vietnamese border. At present, Chinese troops are still occupying over 10 additional points they grabbed after the war of aggression against Viet Nam starting on 17 February 1979. All these facts have given the lie to the Chinese side's contention about "not having a single soldier on the territory of other countries", and fully exposed its policy of territorial expansion.

The Chinese rulers claim that they "stand for equality among all countries, big and small" and that "they do not seek hegemony". As a matter of fact, they have banked on China's being a great Power, and have resorted to all possible political, economic and military devices in an attempt to impose their ideologies, views and lines on other countries and to drag them into their orbit. In case of non-compliance, they make an about-face and turn friends into foes. Viet Nam, Laos, Cuba, Albania etc. ..., are typical cases in point. Furthermore, the Chinese rulers aspire after leadership over the many countries forming what they call "the third world". They want China to be "the revolutionary centre" of the world and to rally all the peoples in a so-called "international united front against the super-Powers" which is to be placed under their control.

The Chinese rulers claim that they "do not manipulate or interfere in the internal affairs of other countries". As a matter of fact, many countries, particularly in South-East Asia, were driven into an awkward predicament or encountered great difficulties in coping with the activities of China, which was supplying money and weapons and was using compliant organizations and the underground army, recruited from among overseas Chinese, as instruments of political and economic pressure and subversion against local administrations.

/...

The abortive coup in Indonesia (1965), the incidents involving overseas Chinese in Indonesia (1959 and 1965-1966), India (1962-1963) and Burma (1967), the organization of and assistance to armed opposition activities in Burma, Thailand, Malaysia, Afghanistan, which were the subject of many protests lodged by the Governments concerned and which is now the subject of a strong protest lodged by the Afghan Government with the Chinese Government - all these facts constitute undeniable evidence. Chinese rulers also claim that they are "opposed" to imperialism. However, it is common knowledge that China, as an "Eastern NATO", is frenziedly seeking an all-round alliance with its global strategy directed at the socialist countries, the national liberation movement and peace and progress in the world. The Chinese rulers support the Fascist Pinochet clique, help Mobuto and made friends with Shah Pahlavi, now overthrown by the Iranian people. To oppose the revolutionary movement in various parts of the world, they are achieving a close co-ordination and distribution of work with the United States imperialists, whom they urge to maintain occupation forces in a number of countries with a view to interfering in the internal affairs of the latter.

The most typical manifestation of their great-Nation expansionism and great-Power hegemonism is their policy towards Viet Nam, Laos and Kampuchea. With regard to Kampuchea, the Chinese rulers have for a long time now nurtured a scheme to turn it into an important military base, an effective springboard for the annexation of the other countries on the Indo-Chinese peninsula and for expansion to South-East Asia. Right from the early 1960s, they secretly fostered the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary clique into a shock force to further this design. Immediately after the Kampuchean people's total victory in the patriotic war against United States aggression, they imposed, through the stooge Pol Pot-Ieng Sary clique, their hegemony on that country in place of the United States imperialists' rule. They carried out an extremely ruthless policy of genocide, thoroughly destroyed the base of the Kampuchean society and rigged up the so-called Peking-type "pure socialism" in an attempt to consolidate their domination over the Kampuchean people. They poured into Kampuchea important quantities of weapons and war matériel and sent in 20,000 military advisers to take in hand the training and command of the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary army. They resorted to an extremely perfidious and wicked neo-colonialist policy, using Kampucheans to suppress and kill Kampucheans and to fight the Vietnamese. The peoples of Kampuchea and the world are demanding from them an answer on the massacre of 3 million Khmers and the barbarous treatment of the remaining 4 million. With regard to Viet Nam, throughout the past 30 years, the Chinese rulers unceasingly pursued a scheme to keep Viet Nam partitioned, weak and dependent on China so as to facilitate its annexation. Having failed to buy over and to pressure Viet Nam into their orbit, they shifted more and more overtly to a systematic policy of hostility to Viet Nam. Using the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary army, they launched an aggressive war against Viet Nam from the south-west. Along with this criminal war, they stepped up armed provocations and military pressure at the northern frontier of Viet Nam, which they were thus in a position to attack from two directions. They rigged up the problem of "victimized Chinese residents" and instigated reactionaries among the Hoa to foment troubles and to undermine Viet Nam from within. At the same time, they sought a pretext to

/...

cut off aid and recall all specialists in an attempt to weaken Viet Nam in the economic field. After the failure of all these perfidious schemes and particularly after their heavy defeat in Kampuchea, they mobilized 600,000 troops and launched a ruthless war of aggression against Viet Nam from the north under the signboard of "counterattack in self-defence". That was the culmination of their long-term policy of weakening and annexing Viet Nam, which fully laid bare their great-Power expansionism and hegemonism.

With regard to Laos, after the failure of the scheme of partitioning that country and dragging it into Peking's orbit, the Chinese rulers have unceasingly sought to foment troubles and subversive attempts and to organize and foster reactionary elements opposed to the People's Democratic Republic of Laos.

At present, the Chinese rulers are seeking by every possible means to prop up a handful of Pol Pot-Ieng Sary remnant bandits in an attempt to reimpose their genocidal régime on the Kampuchean people. They are sending reinforcements to border areas adjacent to Laos, threatening aggression against that country, rallying reactionary forces to set up a so-called "socialist party of Laos", and intensifying their interference in the internal affairs of Laos. They continue provoking a tense situation along Viet Nam's border, and are acting hand in glove with United States imperialism in a world-wide anti-Viet Nam campaign. They are striving hard to incite ASEAN countries against Viet Nam, to drive a wedge between the former and the latter in an attempt to divert vigilance from their vicious schemes and acts in the whole of South-East Asia. A number of Chinese leaders have gone so far as to threaten Viet Nam with another and even many more aggressive attacks. However, the Peking rulers' schemes and tricks have failed and are doomed to total failure.

All the above facts fully bear out the following: it is the Chinese rulers, and not anybody else, who have pursued for a long time now great-Nation expansionism and great-Power hegemonism against Viet Nam, Laos, Kampuchea and other South-East Asian countries, against the revolutionary and peace movement in the world, and they have now emerged as the most bellicose elements. Their hegemonistic schemes and acts run completely counter to the Chinese people's constant desire to live in peace, friendship and equality with the other peoples of the world.

In order to cover up their own hegemonistic actions, the Chinese rulers have ceaselessly attributed to Viet Nam a so-called "regional hegemonism", in the first place, with regard to Kampuchea and Laos.

It should be pointed out that Viet Nam, Laos and Kampuchea are close and friendly neighbours who have been fighting against the French imperialists, the Japanese Fascists, the United States imperialists formerly or Chinese expansionism now. The facts of history have shown that all aggressors have used our country as a springboard to invade the others and have carried out a "divide-and-rule" policy, pitting the Indo-Chinese against one another, in order to conquer one country after another and eventually to conquer all the three countries. In the struggle against

/...

the common enemies, for the sake of their respective vital interests and the victory of their respective revolutions, the peoples of Viet Nam, Laos and Kampuchea have relied on one another and have achieved co-operation and mutual assistance on the principle of mutual respect for independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Animated by pure feelings of international solidarity, the Vietnamese armed forces have on three occasions fought shoulder to shoulder with the people's armed forces of Kampuchea and Laos against the common enemies and won victories on the first two occasions; they pulled back home upon fulfilment of their international obligations. It will be the same this time. After the danger of aggression and intervention created by the Chinese rulers' expansionism and hegemonism has been removed and the independence, sovereignty and security of Viet Nam, Kampuchea and Laos secured, the Vietnamese armed forces will be brought home in agreement with the People's Revolutionary Council of Kampuchea and the Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Laos. Their presence in Kampuchea and Laos is entirely just and consistent with the Charter of the United Nations and the principles of the non-aligned movement. This question belongs only to bilateral relations among three sovereign countries; it has absolutely no bearing on other countries and on the Viet Nam-China talks.

Posing the "anti-hegemony" principle in an attempt to raise the so-called "Kampuchean problem" at the current talks, the Chinese side has crudely interfered in the relations between Viet Nam and Kampuchea. This is a repetition of a trick used formerly by the French colonialists and the United States imperialists, an attempt to undermine the militant solidarity among the three Indo-Chinese peoples and to compel Viet Nam to give up its correct international obligations so as to facilitate the pursuance of Chinese expansionism and hegemonism.

Why have the Peking rulers, the biggest expansionists and hegemonists, so noisily clamoured in recent years about "not seeking hegemony and opposing hegemony"? It is worthy to note that they have put forward this slogan at a time when the various peoples are spearheading their struggle at imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism, apartheid and zionism, whereas they are frenziedly seeking an alliance with imperialism, in the first place with United States imperialism, and other reactionary forces. They have misrepresented the struggles of the Asian, African and Latin American peoples for national independence and social progress as hegemonic rivalries between the super-Powers. Obviously, by hoisting the "anti-hegemony" signboard, the Peking rulers are attempting to side-track the world peoples' revolutionary struggle, to side-track world public opinion, which is sternly condemning their collusion with imperialism against the revolution and against peace, and to cover up their own expansionist and hegemonistic schemes.

Therefore, the Vietnamese side holds that anti-hegemonism should be discussed with the following contents:

(a) Non-expansion of territory in any form whatsoever. Immediate ending of the state of affairs in which territories are grabbed to other countries.

/...

(b) Non-aggression, non-use of force or of threat to use force to "punish" any country or "to teach it a lesson".

(c) Non-imposition of one's own ideologies, views and lines on other countries. Non-use of any trick whatsoever, including economic aid, to compel other countries to relinquish their policy of independence and sovereignty. Non-interference in the relations of one country with another.

(d) Non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries' opposition organizations, boosted by oneself, by the instrumentality of one's overseas nationals or in other form whatsoever.

(e) Non-alliance with imperialism and other reactionary forces against peace, national independence, democracy and socialism.

We have expounded above some views of ours about the anti-hegemony issue to shed more light on its essence.

Everybody realizes that, although the Peking rulers have yet to announce the withdrawal of their troops, their policy of hostility to the Vietnamese people has remained unchanged. While the talks between the two countries were under way in Ha Noi, and at this very moment when they are being pursued in Peking, the Chinese side massed and is massing troops and war matériel close to Viet Nam's border, is still stationing troops in a number of points on Vietnamese territory, and ceaselessly indulging in daily armed provocations and violations of the Vietnamese territory on land, on sea and in the air. The situation in border areas of the two countries has remained very tense and constantly fraught with the danger of resumed hostilities. As we have repeatedly made clear, the problem now facing us is to remove this dangerous situation immediately.

In point 1 of the three-point proposal, the Vietnamese side has put forward urgent measures to secure peace and stability in the border areas of the two countries. These include non-concentration of troops close to the border, separation of the armed forces of the two sides, cessation of all acts of war provocation and all forms of hostile activities violating the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the other side, and threatening its security, establishment of a demilitarized zone and setting up of a joint commission of the two sides to supervise and control the implementation of the above-mentioned measures. These are regarded by public opinion at large as urgent, practical and fair steps to be taken in the first place after the war, in order to prevent the danger of renewed hostilities. Nevertheless, they have not elicited any response from the Chinese side.

At the opening of the second round of talks, considering the great tension that persists along the border, pending continued discussions by the two sides on measures to secure firmly peace and stability in border areas and on other fundamental questions in the relations between the two countries, and in order to create a favourable atmosphere for the talks, we took a new initiative and proposed that the two delegations reach an immediate agreement on an undertaking by the two

/...

sides to refrain from espionage and reconnaissance activities in any form whatever on each other's territory, to refrain from offensive activities, armed provocations, firing from one territory to the other on land, on sea and in the air and to refrain from any activity endangering the security of the other.

This is another constructive proposal of the Vietnamese side which aims at easing border tensions in the interests of the two peoples and in response to the South-East Asian peoples' desire for peace and stability. It is fully consistent with the requirement set by the Chinese side at the last meeting about "ending the tension and creating a favourable atmosphere for the talks". To our regret, the Chinese side negatively reacted to our proposal right after we made it.

It is necessary to point out that, in order to justify their war of aggression against Viet Nam, the Chinese side claimed that, because of Viet Nam's "armed provocation", China was compelled to "counter-attack in self-defence". Before the two sides sat down for talks, the Chinese side suggested, on six occasions, through its statements and notes of 17 February, 1, 5, 19 and 31 March and 6 April 1979, that, at these talks, the two sides were to discuss "practical measures to ensure peace and tranquillity along their border". Yet, contrary to its own proposal, the Chinese side has failed to put forward any measure whatever to remove armed provocations, prevent renewed hostilities or to ensure peace and stability along the border. Furthermore, it has eluded and even rejected the measures proposed by the Vietnamese side. This change in the Chinese side's opinion cannot but demand attention from public opinion.

One wonders why the Chinese side adamantly avoids the Vietnamese side's practical proposals aimed at stopping armed provocations and securing peace and stability in border areas, while clamouring continually, even at the last meeting, about so-called "repeated Vietnamese armed provocations and intrusions along the Sino-Vietnamese border". Obviously, the slanderous charges against Viet Nam are designed to cover up its own trouble-making activities and provocations along Viet Nam's border, and its actual scheme of maintaining a permanent border tension as a means of pressure in the talks and in order to give itself an eventual pretext for aggression against Viet Nam at any moment.

Any objective observer can notice that in the current strained and complex state of the Viet Nam-China relations, the most rational way to a settlement is, in the first place, to ease the dangerous situation, which might lead to a new outbreak of the war. In this way, favourable conditions will be created to settle step-by-step other fundamental problems in the relations between the two countries. This is a usual approach in international relations. It is also the approach proposed by China itself to India in 1959 and 1962.

The Chinese side has often professed a desire for a border of peace and friendship with Viet Nam, and an international juncture of peace and stability. Let it match its words with practical deeds and go back to the purposes of the talks, as suggested by itself on six occasions.

/...

A/34/364
S/13449
English
Annex
Page 8

The two peoples and world public opinion are demanding from the Chinese side a positive response to the Vietnamese three-point position, first of all to the initiative made by the Vietnamese Government delegation at the last meeting with regard to an immediate agreement between the two sides on refraining from armed provocations in border areas.

The Vietnamese side is constantly animated by a desire of goodwill to bring the talks forward. To enable this second round to enter immediately into practical discussions with an eye to the solution of specific issues, we hope that the Chinese side will respond to our previous proposal to the effect that the two sides will raise, in turn, problems of interest for exchanges of views at each meeting, reach agreement, where this is possible, and leave aside those problems on which agreement is not yet feasible.

Everybody is awaiting the answer of the Chinese side.
