

Originally Processed With FOIA(s):

S

FOIA Number:

S

# FOIA MARKER

**This is not a textual record. This is used as an administrative marker by the George Bush Presidential Library Staff.**

---

**Record Group/Collection:** Donated Historical Materials  
**Collection/Office of Origin:** Bush, George H.W., Collection  
**Series:** Personal Papers  
**Subseries:** United Nations File

---

**OA/ID Number:** 25863  
**Folder ID Number:** 25863-014

---

**Folder Title:**  
Notes 9/18/71 - 11/15/71

---

---

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
<b>G</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>

---

September 18, 1971 - An intriguing aspect of the Middle East policy. Yesterday I talked to Len Garment and he told me about the pressure building up in the Jewish community regarding the UN action on Jerusalem now underway.

In fact we have a very mild resolution, so mild that it now appears that the Arabs will not accept it. This is the result of arrangements Rogers made with the King by which he said we would not stand in the way of a Jerusalem Security Council meeting. The Jewish community, upset, is now demanding more and more. They are presently demanding that we block the meeting. Tekoah came in in a very arrogant fashion and started to publicly attack the United States for promoting the meeting in concert with Jordan. I am continually amazed at the arrogance of the Israelis.

Obviously Mitchell is getting a great deal of pressure from the Jewish community. Mitchell, Kissinger and the President apparently met and asked that I watch the situation very carefully. I am prepared to do this. I think it is correct that these political interests be kept clearly in mind.

He also said that they were getting pressure from Javits. I don't think they are particularly worried about the resolution itself but it just seemed they were getting a great deal tougher. An Israeli transport airplane was shot down today and the Israelis responded across the canal.

One most disquieting note - Mitchell told me that Sisco was trying to run for cover and leave Rogers out to bear the brunt of all this. He indicated that before groups of congressmen Sisco was kind of shifting the blame to Rogers saying that nothing had developed from the initiatives from the Middle East. I told him I did not think this was fair at all. For a long time Kissinger has been telling me that Sisco was leading us toward war in the Middle East. He feels that the White House has not been kept closely informed on the Middle East developments. I am torn on this one because I think the Israelis are showing a total recalcitrance in the face of 242, a total reluctance to do anything and yet there are some tremendous political liabilities here for Nixon. I am sure Teddy Kennedy was over telling Golda Meir just exactly what she wanted to hear on his visit recently. Democratic primary candidates are all raising the Soviet presence as a result of the raids. There will be a great more pressure to provide the phantom jets to Israel. Nixon has little to gain from the Jewish vote

but you could say that he might have something to lose. The Israeli propaganda machine in this country is tremendous and extremely powerful. I believe strongly in an independent Israel but I think since the Arabs have answered 242, the Israelis should indeed respond positively. I worry that Rogers will be made the scapgoat if something goes wrong in the Middle East. Sisco does not keep us well informed here and apparently he is not keeping the White House well informed. This, I think, is a big mistake, mainly the latter. When you make a decision you should have as many people as possible for and endorsing it each step of the way.

China debate - at this point in time the full front is on the China issue. I met with the Chinese minister and had a long talk with him. We are getting full support out of the Republic of China and it will be interesting to see if they convert this full support -- thought quiet support -- into more sponsorship votes. I continue to be plagued by the thought that the United States does not want to win and because Nixon is going to Peking there must be some side deal. This was repeated by Ambassador Yakov Malik when he was over here today.

At this point we have gotten a lot of unhelpful comments out of the Secretariat. The British, I am convinced, are not working against us, but they are straight forward and when people ask them I am afraid they are telling people we can't win. The French I am sure would like to see us lose although Ambassador Kosciusko-Morizet tells me that they are definitely not working against us. The Dutch remain very skeptical, the Belgians will support us. Our shift in policy makes some of the great countries in the Asian area very slow to move - very cautious. At this point both New Zealand and Australia are holding back a little but I think they are both coming through early next week. Japan is more of a question mark. Press reports are saying that Japan will not join us and of course that is hurting our efforts. This is a fascinating project with many facets.

The talks I have with Kissinger about dispelling the myth about the President's wanting to win have been very helpful. I don't think the White House fully realizes the credibility problem on this. It has crossed my mind that they might simply make a big fuss and lose and thus have Peking come here but that indeed can weaken the President as he goes to Peking - perhaps not too much but certainly some. Nixon is under attack from the right because of his visit to China but I don't think that amounts to too much although certainly some. He is not going to

knuckle under to Peking. He doesn't believe in their approach to things and there is no point in trying to make it out that he is soft on Chinese communism.

October 21, 1971 - The problem between the State Department and NSC. The clearance of our speech was another incident. I distinctly felt that the speech was going to be cleared out of the White House. Sunday night, before giving the speech on Monday, the Secretary of State called and we went over it. We agreed to certain changes. At that point I assumed, perhaps unjustly so, that the speech was totally cleared. Five minutes before I was going to give the speech the State Department called with changes the White House insisted upon. Apparently Haig had said that if they weren't cut out of the speech, he would go to the President with them. Rogers later on told me that he had simply agreed to the changes. Haig told me this was some of the same existing problem they had had in the past. It is not a good situation.

The real problem exists between the NSC and the State Department on the Middle East policy. The growing Israeli recalcitrance is a worrisome thing. The incidents that we had at the U.N. on October 21 relating to the shooting at the Soviet Mission and the other incidents is in the judgment of the NSC directly related to Israel's disappointment about our views taken on the Middle East and Rogers' approach to the Middle East settlement. I am very worried for both Rogers and the President on this growing feud.

Al Haig feels that the incidents were orchestrated by the Israelis themselves to demonstrate how upset they are with our policy toward the Soviets. He told me Israel called him early this morning very reluctantly to say they would support us on the IQ but they were only doing it due to pressure. They indicated that they would not support the DR. Today Joe Tekoah came up to me and said with some exuberance that he could support us. I express my gratitude for all of this. It is a very complicated, tough game at this point.

October 31, 1971 - The China Vote. I am dictating this a week after the vote.

1. When we went into the voting I really thought we could win by one or two votes. The villains are documented in our Chirep file - ones who simply did not do what they said they would do. Foremost among these is Cyprus. I recall walking back when I heard that Cyprus was slipping during the voting. I asked the Foreign Minister whether we had a problem. He said, "Yes". I said, "I don't understand this. President Makarios has assured us twice that he would vote with us on the important question." He said, "You and I have never talked about this." I said, "We have talked about this, but what's important is that your President has assured us of his support." I said, "Go ahead and vote for this, but simply remember that we do not view this lightly, and we feel we have a direct and strong commitment."

2. After the vote there was a tremendous amount of discussion about American arm-twisting. I don't know of a single case where we linked in the question of aid or where we made any direct pledge of any kind. We did make very forcefully clear to other countries what we were doing. All the reports talk about undue U.S. pressure and threats etc. but they simply are not true. We have been battling the news media from the very beginning. All of them at the outset said we had no chance at all and when we got within a gnat's eyebrow of the whole thing, then they started talking about undue pressure. It simply is not fair reporting. It is untrue.

3. There is no question in my mind that the Kissinger visit gave our position some incredibility. The minute the President announced his trip to Peking the race to Peking was on, and my list in the Chirep file shows which countries tried to beat us in that race, and thus were unavailable for support. The timing of the planning trip was unfortunate. It was thrust on the White House by long-standing negotiations and uncertainty as to when the UN vote was going to be. There is no question in my mind that Kissinger feels that the bilateral approach to Peking is much more important than the UN. I am convinced he did not deliberately sabotage the UN vote. Kissinger called me up after he got back from Peking. I have never heard him in such an ugly mood, ending up by saying, "I am not amused." The source of his ire seemed to be the fact that he felt I told him the vote would come later, towards October 28. I distinctly remember discussing it with him in a very private meeting. I told him procedures could not be controlled, and the main thing in my mind was that he did not want the vote while he was in Peking.

I had seen the President just the Friday before with Secretary Rogers and during that meeting we agreed when the vote should be. In fact Rogers wanted Kissinger to leave

Peking but not to arrive in New York before the vote took place. Al Haig was very upset about this. He felt that the 24-hour layover in Anchorage would not be well received by Kissinger. Haig called me later and said Kissinger would be terribly upset. In my view it didn't make much difference when Kissinger got back. The only thing I felt was that it wouldn't help to have him in Peking when we were voting, and this I thought was the goal. In any event, when Kissinger got back, he was furious. He called up and behaved in a very Prussian manner with absolutely no sensitivity to the job we had done here. A few days later I saw him at the White House at the Tito dinner and he was very pleasant. On October 30 he called me prior to an appearance on "Issues and Answers" and couldn't have been nicer. He said the President had seen my performance on TV etc. and thought it was good. Maybe he is just an explosive emotionalist, but I did not appreciate his almost tantrum.

I think history will show the Nixon initiative to Peking is the thing that lost the UN vote, although maybe there are things we should have done differently here. I had the feeling Kissinger did not want the President involved and yet there is no question that his involvement did deliver certain votes - in Argentina and Mexico and an abstention out of Morocco.

The problem was that at the last minute we lost other votes we thought we had -- Senegal and Togo were two. Qatar and Omar took the gas clearly. Cyprus was against us. Driss of Tunisia got himself off the hook by offering his crazy amendments and then acting indignant that they were voted on and thus voting against us. Belgium was blackmailed by Peking by announcing diplomatic relations the very next day, much to the humiliation of Ambassador Longerstaey and his wife.

Ziegler used an unfortunate word when he used the word "glee" to describe what was troubling the President after the vote. It was an ugliness in the chamber. I was hissed when I got up to speak on a procedural motion. Many of the ambassadors mentioned how bad it was. U Thant practically had tears in his eyes -- so much so that I went to see him the next day to tell him that we were going to continue to support the UN and at that point he and Guyer both joined in abhorring the ugly atmosphere. Sir Colin Crowe and Sadruddin Khan both wrote letters on this same subject. It was not pleasant and it was not glee. It was gladiatorial ugliness at its worst. I can certainly understand a country being happy at winning after many years of frustration, but this mood had more serious implications for the UN than that. One thing I have been

One thing I have been proved right on is the genuine outrage in the Congress. Just by seeing Senator Buckley I was accused of blackmailing the UN and any mention we made of finances during the debate, like in the 5th Committee, was referred to as pressure. It was a very delicate operation in the sense that we had to be careful about pressure lest there be a backfire. I recall certain congressmen wanting to come up and see us. The Secretary of State did not feel they should come. Bob Sikes' group which represented 326 congressmen saying "Don't kick out Taiwan" wanted to but Rogers didn't want it. Sikes was upset about this, and I don't blame him. Rogers had an excellent point though. Buckley came up. This really set the UN to talking. I have never seen such a rumor factory like the UN.

Teddy Kennedy took a cheap shot at Nixon, typically political. First, he commended the President for his China response and then he hit him questioning whether it was serious or simply political. I am continually amazed at the dirty, cheap, amateurish politics that Kennedy resorts to and yet he has a big following. It is unbelievable.

I was upset by what Sir Colin told me in great confidence, namely that Dick Pederson and DePalma didn't help a bit. They looked like "bully boys" standing around the arena. They also

told me that Pederson really was rude to him and very tense about it all. I found this most disconcerting. We debated whether to have Pederson here. The Secretary clearing wanted him but was sensitive to my feelings about not wanting it to appear to be taking the reins away from us. I didn't see Pederson do anything out of the ordinary at all. In fact he had seasoned judgment, and I thought it was good but apparently it did not have a good effect on others. Again, I don't think any shifts of votes could be blamed on this at all.

I am amazed at how prolific a writer and unhelpful an individual Charles Yost has been. He continually writes columns against our policy in a very self-righteous tone. I have concluded reluctantly that he must be a "little man."

I continue to worry about the interaction between Kissinger and Rogers. The feeling is really troubling. With Peking coming in it will be interesting to see how much Kissinger tries to hang on to up here. I got the word to the President through Colson that I wanted a direct Presidential input. The word came back that the President understood why I wanted this and the cross pressures we were under. He would be glad to talk to me about it. I refrained from discussing things with Nixon, but this one is important because you have tremendous political pressures on one side and yet we want increasingly better relations with Peking on the other.

At this moment I am tremendously worried about the UN deficit - financing etc. We couldn't get five cents out of the congress for picking up the UN deficit. The UN must take another approach for the time being rather than a total bail-out program.

This weekend I have done three television shows, "Firing Line", "Dick Cavett Show", and "Issues and Answers", plus a major press backgrounder at the UN. The President apparently wants my interpretative backup on Ziegler's statement of "glee" to get that into its proper perspective. I think we were able to do that on both Cavett and Buckley. He also wants a refutation of what Kennedy said accusing Nixon of abandoning leadership - at one point supporting Nixon on China and then trying to hit the President by saying he should forfeit his leadership. Talk of leadership from Kennedy really amuses me, but the country seems to take him seriously.

We are going to have some congressional appearance problems. Gordon Allott wanted me to come to the Senate Policy Committee on Monday or Wednesday. The State Department felt I shouldn't do this before going to the Foreign Affairs Committee. Don Fraser of the subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs wanted me to go to his committee but we got off the hook on that by letting it be known that the full committee had indicated an interest. The State Department thought we should go to the full committee first. It's all very complicated.

Countries Racing us to PRC.

JK  
in private  
Box  
SECRET

- 1. Ecuador - starts with us.
- 2. Peru
- 3. Argentina (RN)
- 4. Tunisia -
- 5. Belgium
- 6. Turkey
- 7. Iran - new relations
- 8. Togo →
- 9. Senegal →
- 10. Austria →

DETERMINED TO BE AN ADMINISTRATIVE MARKING, PER E.O. 12958, SEC. 3.3 (C)

10/7/99 JF

- 1) Trinidad - not want out of step 3<sup>rd</sup> world
- 2) Uganda - Amin start with us - sensible policy 2 weeks later - change mind
- 3) Burundi -  
reestablishing relations
- 4) Pakistan - really worked hard against us
- 5) Iceland - new gov't (includes 2 Comins) stick with Secord.
- 6) Ghana - strong - for us - !!  
always been vs. us  
really supported us.  
flak from other Africans

- 7) Indonesia - Malik unhelpful  
" ruled on amendment not  
receivable - " amendment  
to delete expulsion "
- 8) Italy - coalition politics -  
a plus though
- 9) Kenya - " priority " but that was all
- 10) Laos - French talked Souvanna  
out of it -  
even " logic - clarity UK "
- 11) Libya - start out - great policy  
then " never support a US  
position "
- 12) Luxembourg - good - tough need  
plaudits.
- 13) Malaysia - last year wanted to  
vote vs us - this year  
early " public position " vs us
- 14) Singapore - stay " in 3<sup>rd</sup> would inevitable
- 15) Morocco - Pres call - she said vote  
yes - next day said  
abstain (For minister got taking

- 16) Netherlands - consensus to us to abstain
- 17) Oman - took Arab gas -  
sultan told our Consul  
General (Dahran) with us.
- 18) Portugal - "Kucha" - cost em  
away Africans -  
abst to yes - cost em on Macao -  
by plus - 1<sup>st</sup> time favor
- 19) Qatar - took this gas
- 20) Senegal - Pese Senghor - "do not  
not expel ROC" -  
reneged - "surrounded  
by PRC" -
- 21) Togo - with Senegal
- 22) Tunisia - probably
- 23) race to PRC.

**Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet  
(George Bush Library)**

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION	CLASS.
	(0 pp.)			
01. Notes	Redaction (1 pp.)	10/31/71	C	

<b>COLLECTION</b> George Bush Personal Papers United Nations File
<b>FILE LOCATION</b> Notes 9/18/71 - 11/15/71 <div style="text-align: right; margin-top: 10px;">                     OA/ID Number                      10/7/99                      Foulk                 </div>

**RESTRICTION CODES**

**Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]**

- P-1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P-2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P-5 Release would disclose confidential advise between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

**Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]**

- F-1 National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- F-2 Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- F-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- F-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- F-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- F-7 Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- F-8 Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- F-9 Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

November 15, 1971 - On Monday the Chinese Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Chaio, gave his blast.\* We gave a warm welcoming speech, and then he got up and gave his speech which was clearly hostile to the United States, referring to us as bullies etc. It was not a speech that was unexpected and all the great experts, diplomats, newspeople plus our own people said this was to be expected. After the speech I came over and called the Secretary of State to tell him about the speech. I told him I felt it had to be answered. We were under strict instructions at the time not to answer it. We gave a gracious welcoming speech which received good comment at the UN. If it weren't for the domestic pressures perhaps it would not be necessary to answer Chaio's speech but I told Rogers that my strongly held view was that if we didn't answer it (the UN had just suffered a setback in the Gallup Polls - 36 percent support by the American people -- an all-time low), the UN would vanish off the scale completely.

I called for Kissinger, and he was gone. I talked to Al Haig. He said he talked to Kissinger and they didn't want any immediate reaction. Nothing at all was to be said.

\*See attached

I talked to Rogers again that night. I read him some of the sections from the speech, and he agreed that we had to say something. The problem is that we both knew something had to be done soon. That night I went to Washington. Tuesday I testified before the Foreign Affairs Committee. I spent thirty minutes with Rogers. He called in Marshall Green. Rogers agreed with me as we went over the speech in detail. Marshall started indicating that it was not new. I pointed out to him that Holdridge and Jenkins had indeed predicted the content of the speech but they also had predicted that it would be low key and would not be inflammatory. I think the feeling of the experts was that it was less inflammatory than it might have been. My point was that without any background on how inflammatory they were in the past, this would be grossly misconstrued by the American people, and the President would be ill-served if it appeared that we were unwilling to answer these allegations about our being bullies, super powers trying to dominate the little powers, etc. I told Rogers that the people are interested in the Peking trip, but not just on Peking's terms. If we appear to be pushed around by Peking at every turn, the whole thing can backfire on the President. Rogers in my presence and Green's called Kissinger and repeated essentially this. He told

Kissinger I was upset about it and said he wanted to talk to the President about it. I then went up to the congressional committee. Rogers said he would call me there. Just before the meeting, I got a call from Kissinger. He was furious - asked me why I was putting so much pressure on him and really reacted in a tantrum. He indicated we should get together that afternoon.

Testimony went as we expected - I tried to defend the UN - Congress madder than hell about the China vote, Chiao's statement, etc. I went to the Senate Policy Committee lunch where essentially the same mood prevailed. Almost all the Republican senators were there. They couldn't have been more courteous. The same for the House committee.

I went down to see Kissinger then and had a long and interesting discussion. He started off madder than hell. "I want to treat you as I do four other ambassadors, dealing directly with you, but if you are uncooperative I will treat you like any other ambassador. I reacted very strongly, told him my only interest was in supporting the President, and told him I didn't profess to be an expert in foreign affairs, but I damn sure had a feel for this country and I felt we had to react. He said, "Well, I agree we need a statement." I said, "Well, last night Haig told me we had to avoid a knee jerk reaction."

Kissinger himself had prepared the statement and frankly it was stronger and better than we thought we could get by with at the UN the night before. There were certain words in the statement that would be recognized in Peking. Kissinger then cooled down, and I got one more insight into the tremendous breach between Kissinger and the State Department. He is convinced the State Department wants to do him in. He is convinced the UN debate could have been delayed for a week or two if the State Department really wanted it, though I told him I didn't think this was possible. He said they can find ways to do things if they really want to. He insists the Department is out to "get him" and make him look bad. He is convinced they want to shift the blame of the China defeat to him. I told him though the timing was awkward and people were alleging it made a difference, I couldn't point to one single vote that was changed by the trip. I told him we had done everything we could to separate these issues out and certainly I had done everything I could to keep blame from being placed at his level. He was aware of this to some appreciative degree. He at one point said, "You're going to think I am paranoid on this question." The Middle East keeps cropping up in

his complaints about the Department I told him that we were not having a damn thing to do about the Middle East at the UN right now. For 2 or 3 minutes we had a very heated and somewhat spirited exchange. After that he calmed down and was pleasant, charming and most cooperative. He told me about the channels he used for working with Peking, told me the extreme sensitivity of this, told me that there were many who would like to see the whole Peking thing blow up and thus "bring him down". When he spoke, he said he was speaking for the President. He said the best thing to do was to set up the program where he would keep me fully informed, but if I did not think what we were doing was best for the President to then come back and he personally would go into the President and see what his reactions were. There a final decision would be made. In other words, we would be given a clear policy input. I told him I had great affection and loyalty to Bill Rogers, and I did not want to see it cross threaded here. I said, "Henry, I simply am not going to get caught in the middle of this thing between you and Rogers." He said, "You're right. You shouldn't, and we will work to see that that doesn't happen." He expressed respect for Rogers but was most concerned about "the people in the State Department."

He suggested that it might be productive for me to sit in on some of his meetings on the Chinese thing so we could develop a future line. We talked about telling Red China we will "turn Bush loose" if certain things happen. All in all it was one of the most constructive talks I have ever had with Kissinger. I see in him some of the same qualities that Arthur Goldberg and Zagorin have only in a much more sophisticated way. He is charming and bright, but he can be totally dictatorial and rude. I told him very clearly when he got upset that I was not trying to screw things up, I was trying to serve the President and that was the only interest I had. He ought to get that through his head. I was not trying to get any power or enter into any dispute between him and the State Department. I said it so forcefully that he seemed taken back and he really cooled down. The conversation ended in a very good way. Kissinger needs allies, and I am one of them. I also must and intend to remain loyal to Rogers. It is not easy, and it is a problem that I am not able to talk to anyone about in order to get advice.

That night late, as I got off the airplane coming back, I planned to read the statement before the cameras. Rogers

told me he thought the statement should have been given at the hearing before the cameras. I called him right after the hearings. The press and cameras weren't there. He said, "Well, then give it at the State Department." Then he said give it in New York but have the cameras there. He thought the cameras ought to be there. We called McCloskey later on to work out some details, and McCloskey felt we might do it either that night or the next day in a non-contrived way, but he felt the cameras should be there. I get off the plane in New York and get a phone call from Haig saying the President did not want any television. I passed out the releases at the tennis match I was attending and at the UN simultaneously and told the camera people we were not able to do it because of time and because there had been a change in plans. Apparently one of the announcers came on Channel 4 (NBC at 11:00 p.m.), read the statement himself, and said that Bush said he was not able to give the statement himself, and said that Bush said he was not able to give the statement because of "orders from Washington". Forty-five minutes later I got a call from Al Haig somewhat apologetically saying he had a call from New York and a reaction from,

as he phrased it, "either the boss or the President."  
I am convinced it was Kissinger not the President saying, "What the hell is going on with this statement." He said that his report was that I had said that the White House had told him not to give the statement, and that they wanted to get a press line in case they were asked about it the next day. I told him I hadn't said that but one of our press men had been with me when his call had come in and perhaps he had talked but I didn't think so. I checked with King and Pete Roussel and neither had mentioned it. Both were with me when I talked to the cameramen. In checking they found that perhaps the cameramen peeked because I wouldn't read the statement into the camera. Perhaps he made this statement on his own. It was not in the script that we had sent over from NBC. This is simply an example of how uptight they are on China. This is the only station that it was mentioned on. Of course the next day the press pushed very hard to know what parts of the speech we were disappointed in, whether the statement had been cleared by the White House. All I told Nick King to tell them was that it had full Washington clearance. They will keep pushing on this point - dotting every "i" and crossing every "t" when it comes to China.

Last Wednesday night I got another call from Haig saying, "This is the fire brigade," inquiring about the Pakistan-India resolution being offered by New Zealand and the Netherlands. Kissinger was convinced the State Department was trying to slip a resolution in that was detrimental to the Pakistan-India situation. I was not fully briefed on the New Zealand resolution so I told him I would call him back. I checked with Bennett who said: 1. We had gotten original orders to support New Zealand's resolution which was supposed to be purely humanitarian. 2. There were a couple of troublesome paragraphs in it. One disturbed the Paks, calling for them to do what they could to straighten out the political situation, and the other disturbed the Indians by urging them to cooperate thus equating them in their minds with the Paks. Bennett said that at 7 o'clock that night we were still waiting for instructions. Haig's point was that Kissinger was very concerned that this would inflame the situation and get both sides furious and through it we would end up in the Security Council. I told Haig what Bennett had said and he seemed mollified because apparently Kissinger had talked to Sisco that evening and told him that we weren't to go forward on this. I'll

have to check the instructions and be sure to follow up, but here was a case where the department apparently moved forward without White House clearance in authorizing us to support the resolution and yet Kissinger is convinced that in some way it was a reckless move. A couple of weeks ago I talked to Chuck Colson and told him I wanted to talk to the President directly with nobody there to get some guidance on this China situation. I think he is ill-served to have me under total wraps here, and yet I certainly think the trip is terribly important and we must not over-react or react in such a manner that the trip can be jeopardized. What I can't understand, however, is that Peking should feel free to say anything it wants, repeat its diatribe, repeat its rhetoric, blast us in every way and then have us unable to respond. Surely they would understand if we rejected the falsehoods against our country. I am convinced that we have got to do this not just for the UN but for the President. It is going to take a little working around to get this cleared. I talked to Rogers Tuesday night after the press release, and he told me he was going to have to get some flexibility for me up here.

Colson talked to the President about this and told me the President understood perfectly why I wanted to talk to him alone and would be willing to talk to me on this basis. I will find a time to do this although I hate to bother the man.

(Translation)

SPEECH BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE DELEGATION OF THE  
PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA AT THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF  
THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. President,

Fellow Representatives,

Allow me first of all, in the name of the Delegation of the People's Republic of China, to thank you, Mr. President, and the representatives of many countries for the welcome they have given us.

Many friends have made very enthusiastic speeches expressing their trust in, as well as encouragement and fraternal sentiments for, the Chinese people. We are deeply moved by this and we shall convey all this to the entire Chinese people.

It is a pleasure for the Delegation of the People's Republic of China to be here today to attend the 26th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations and take part together with you in the work of the United Nations.

As is well known to all, China is one of the founding members of the United Nations. In 1949, the Chinese people overthrew the reactionary rule of the Chiang Kai-shek clique and founded the People's Republic of China as a matter of course. It was only because of the obstruction by the United States Government that the People's Republic of China was deprived of its lawful rights in the United Nations for a long time and the Chiang Kai-shek clique, long repudiated by the Chinese people, was able to usurp China's lawful seat in the United Nations. This was a gross interference in China's internal affairs as well as a wilful trampling on the Charter of the

United Nations. Now such an unjustifiable state of affairs has finally been put right.

On October 25, 1971, the current session of the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted by an overwhelming majority the resolution restoring to the People's Republic of China all its lawful rights in the United Nations and expelling forthwith the representatives of the Chiang Kai-shek clique from the United Nations and all the organizations related to it. This ~~represents~~<sup>proves</sup> the bankruptcy of the policies of hostility towards the Chinese people and of isolating and imposing a blockade on them. This is a defeat of the plan of the U.S. Government in collusion with the Sato Government of Japan to create "two Chinas" in the United Nations. This is a victory for Chairman Mao Tsetung's revolutionary line in foreign affairs. This is a common victory for the people all over the world.

Upholding principle and justice, the 23 sponsor countries of the resolution, Albania, Algeria, Burma, Ceylon, Cuba, Equatorial Guinea, Guinea, Iraq, Mali, Mauritania, Nepal, Pakistan, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, the People's Republic of the Congo, Romania, Sierra Leone, Somalia, the Sudan, Syria, the United Republic of Tanzania, the Arab Republic of Yemen, Yugoslavia and Zambia have made unremitting and fruitful efforts to restore China's legitimate rights in the United Nations; many friendly countries which supported this resolution have also made contributions to this end. Some other countries have expressed their sympathy

for China in various ways. On behalf of the Chinese Government and people, I express heartfelt thanks to the Governments and people of all these countries.

26 years have elapsed since the founding of the United Nations. 26 years are but a brief span in human history, yet during this period profound changes have taken place in the world situation. When the United Nations was first founded, there were only 51 member states and now the membership has grown to 131. Of the 80 members that joined later, the overwhelming majority are countries which achieved independence after World War II. In the past 20 years and more, the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America have waged unflinching struggles to win and safeguard national independence and oppose foreign aggression and oppression. In Europe, North America and Oceania, too, mass movements and social tides for the change of the present state of affairs are rising. An increasing number of medium and small countries are uniting to oppose the hegemony and power politics practised by the one or two superpowers and to fight for the right to settle their own affairs as independent and sovereign states and for equal status in international relations. Countries want independence, nations want liberation and the people want revolution, this has become an irresistible trend of history.

Human society invariably makes constant progress, and such progress is always achieved through innumerable revolutions and transformations. Take

the United States, where the United Nations Headquarters is situated. It was owing to the victory of the revolutionary war of 1776 led by Washington that the American people won independence. And it was owing to the great revolution of 1789 that the French people rid themselves of the yoke of feudalism. After mankind entered the 20th century, the victory of the 1917 Russian October Socialist Revolution led by the Great Lenin opened up a broad path to freedom and liberation for the oppressed nations and peoples of the world. The advance of history and social progress gladden the hearts of and inspire the peoples of the world and throw into panic a handful of decadent reactionary forces who do their utmost to put up desperate struggles. They commit armed aggression against other countries, subvert the legal governments of other countries, interfere in other countries' internal affairs, subject other countries to their political, military and economic control and bully other countries at will. Since World War II, no new world war has occurred, yet local wars have never ceased. At present, the danger of a new world war still exists, but revolution is the main trend in the world today. Although there are twists and turns and reverses in the people's struggles, adverse currents against the people and against progress, in the final analysis, cannot hold back the main current of the continuous development of human society. The world will surely move towards progress and light, and definitely not towards reaction and darkness.

Mr. President and Fellow Representatives,

The Chinese people have experienced untold sufferings under imperialist oppression. For one century and more, imperialism repeatedly launched wars of aggression against China and forced her to sign many unequal treaties. They divided China into their spheres of influence, plundered China's resources and exploited the Chinese people. The degree of poverty and lack of freedom suffered by the Chinese people in the past are known to all. In order to win national independence, freedom and liberation, the Chinese people, advancing wave upon wave in a dauntless spirit, waged protracted heroic struggles against imperialism and its lackeys and finally won the revolution under the leadership of their great leader Chairman Mao Tsetung and the Chinese Communist Party. Since the founding of the People's Republic of China, we, the Chinese people, defying the tight imperialist blockades and withstanding the terrific pressure from without, have built our country into a socialist state with initial prosperity by maintaining independence and keeping the initiative in our own hands and through self-reliance. It has been proved by facts that we the Chinese nation are fully capable of standing on our own feet in the family of nations.

Taiwan is a province of China and the 14 million people who live in Taiwan are our fellow-countrymen by flesh and blood. Taiwan was already returned to the motherland after World War II in accordance with the Cairo Declaration and the Potsdam

Photocopy from George Bush Presidential Library

Proclamation, and our compatriots in Taiwan already returned to the embrace of their motherland. The U.S. Government officially confirmed this fact on more than one occasion in 1949 and 1950, and publicly stated that the Taiwan question was China's internal affair and that the U.S. Government had no intention to interfere in it. It was only because of the outbreak of the Korean war that the U.S. Government went back on its own words and sent armed forces to invade and occupy China's Taiwan and the Taiwan Straits, and to date they are still there. The spreading in certain places of the fallacy that "the status of Taiwan remains to be determined" is a conspiracy to plot "an independent Taiwan" and continue to create "one China, one Taiwan", which is in effect to create "two Chinas". On behalf of the Government of the People's Republic of China, I hereby reiterate that Taiwan is an inalienable part of China's territory and the U.S. armed invasion and occupation of China's Taiwan and the Taiwan Straits cannot in the least alter the sovereignty of the People's Republic of China over Taiwan, that all the armed forces of the United States definitely should be withdrawn from Taiwan and the Taiwan Straits and that we are firmly opposed to any design to separate Taiwan from the motherland. The Chinese people are determined to liberate Taiwan and no force on earth can stop us from doing so.

Mr. President and Fellow Representatives,  
The Chinese people who suffered for a long time from imperialist aggression and oppression

have consistently opposed the imperialist policies of aggression and war and supported all the oppressed peoples and nations in their just struggles to win freedom and liberation, oppose foreign interference and become masters of their own destiny. This position of the Chinese Government and people is in the fundamental interests of the peoples of the world and is also in accord with the spirit of the United Nations Charter.

The U.S. Government's armed aggression against Viet Nam, Cambodia and Laos and its encroachment upon the territorial integrity and sovereignty of these three countries have aggravated tension in the Far East, and met with strong opposition of the people of the world, including the American people. The Chinese Government and people firmly support the peoples of the three countries of Indochina in their war against U.S. aggression and for national salvation and firmly support the Joint Declaration of the Summit Conference of the Indochinese Peoples and the 7-point peace proposal put forward by the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Viet Nam. The U.S. Government should withdraw immediately and unconditionally all its armed forces and the armed forces of its followers from the three countries of Indochina so that the peoples of the three countries may solve their own problems independently and free from foreign interference; this is the key to the relaxation of tension in the Far East.

To date, Korea still remains divided. The Chinese People's Volunteers have long since withdrawn from Korea but up to now the U.S. troops still remain in south Korea. The peaceful unification of their fatherland is the common aspiration of the entire Korean people. The Chinese Government and people firmly support the 8-point programme for the peaceful unification of the fatherland put forward by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in April this year and firmly support its just demand that all the illegal resolutions adopted by the United Nations on the Korean question be annulled and the "United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea" be dissolved.

The essence of the Middle East question is aggression against the Palestinian and other Arab peoples by Israeli Zionism with the support and connivance of the superpowers. The Chinese Government and people resolutely support the Palestinian and other Arab peoples in their just struggle against aggression and believe that persevering in struggle and upholding unity the heroic Palestinian and other Arab peoples will surely be able to recover the lost territories of the Arab countries and restore to the Palestinian people their national rights. The Chinese Government maintains that all countries and peoples that love peace and uphold justice have the obligation to support the struggle of the Palestinian and other Arab peoples, and no one has the right

to engage in political deals behind their backs bartering away their right to existence and their national interests.

The continued existence of colonialism in all its manifestations is a provocation against the peoples of the world. The Chinese Government and people resolutely support the people of Mozambique, Angola, and Guinea (Bissau) in their struggle for national liberation, and resolutely support the people of Azania, Zimbabwe and Namibia in their struggle against the white colonialist rule and racial discrimination. Their struggle is a just one, and a just cause will surely triumph.

The independence of a country is incomplete without economic independence. The economic backwardness of the Asian, African and Latin American countries is the result of imperialist plunder. Opposition to economic plunder and protection of national resources are the inalienable sovereign rights of an independent state. China is still an economically backward country as well as a developing country. Like the overwhelming majority of the Asian, African and Latin American countries, China belongs to the Third World. The Chinese Government and people resolutely support the struggles initiated by Latin American countries and peoples to defend their rights over 200-nautical-mile territorial sea and to protect the resources of their respective countries. The Chinese Government and people resolutely support the struggles unfolded by the petroleum-

exporting countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America as well as various regional and specialized organizations to protect their national rights and interests and oppose economic plunder.

We have consistently maintained that all countries, big or small, should be equal and that the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence should be taken as the principles guiding the relations between countries. The people of each country have the right to choose the social system of their own country according to their own will and to protect the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of their own country. No country has the right to subject another country to its aggression, subversion, control, interference or bullying. We are opposed to the imperialist and colonialist theory that big nations are superior to the small nations and small nations are subordinate to the big nations. We are opposed to the power politics and hegemony of big nations bullying small ones or strong nations bullying weak ones. We hold that the affairs of a given country must be handled by its own people, that the affairs of the world must be handled by all the countries of the world, and that the affairs of the United Nations must be handled jointly by all its member states, and the superpowers should not be allowed to manipulate and monopolize them. The superpowers want to be superior to others and lord it over others. At no time, neither today nor ever in the future, will China be a superpower subjecting others to its aggression, subversion, control, interference or bullying.

Photocopy from George Bush Presidential Library

The one or two superpowers are stepping up their arms expansion and war preparations and vigorously developing nuclear weapons, thus seriously threatening international peace. It is understandable that the people of the world long for disarmament and particularly for nuclear disarmament. Their demand for the dissolution of military blocs, withdrawal of foreign troops and dismantling of foreign military bases is a just one. However, the superpowers, while talking about disarmament every day, are actually engaged in arms expansion daily. The so-called nuclear disarmament which they are supposed to seek is entirely for the purpose of monopolizing nuclear weapons in order to carry out nuclear threats and blackmail. China will never participate in the so-called nuclear disarmament talks between the nuclear powers behind the backs of the non-nuclear countries: China's nuclear weapons are still in the experimental stage. China develops nuclear weapons solely for the purpose of defence and for breaking the nuclear monopoly and ultimately eliminating nuclear weapons and nuclear war. The Chinese Government has consistently stood for the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons and proposed to convene a summit conference of all countries of the world to discuss this question and, as the first step, to reach an agreement on the non-use of nuclear weapons. The Chinese Government has on many occasions declared, and now on behalf of the Chinese Government, I once again solemnly declare that at no time and

under no circumstances will China be the first to use nuclear weapons. If the United States and the Soviet Union really and truly want disarmament, they should commit themselves not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. This is not something difficult to do. Whether this is done or not will be a severe test as to whether they have the genuine desire for disarmament.

We have always held that the just struggles of the people of all countries support each other. China has always had the sympathy and support of the people of various countries in her socialist revolution and socialist construction. It is our bounden duty to support the just struggles of the people of various countries. For this purpose, we have provided aid to some friendly countries to help them develop their national economy independently. In providing aid, we always strictly respect the sovereignty of the recipient countries, and never attach any conditions or ask for any privileges. We provide free military aid to countries and peoples who are fighting against aggression. We will never become munition merchants. We firmly oppose certain countries trying to control and plunder the recipient countries by means of "aid". However, as China's economy is still comparatively backward, the material aid we have provided is very limited, and what we provide is mainly political and moral support. With a population of 700 million, China ought to make a greater

contribution to human progress. And we hope that this situation of our ability falling short of this wish of ours will be gradually changed.

Mr. President and Fellow Representatives,

In accordance with the purposes of the United Nations Charter, the United Nations should play its due role in maintaining international peace, opposing aggression and interference and developing friendly relations and cooperation among nations. However, for a long period the one or two superpowers have utilized the United Nations and have done many things in contravention of the United Nations Charter against the will of the people of various countries. This situation should not continue. We hope that the spirit of the United Nations Charter will be really and truly followed out. We will stand together with all the countries and peoples that love peace and uphold justice and work together with them for the defence of the national independence and state sovereignty of various countries and for the cause of safeguarding international peace and promoting human progress.

UNITED STATES DELEGATION  
TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

NOTE TO CORRESPONDENTS

Press Release USUN-189(71)  
November 16, 1971

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR GEORGE BUSH  
UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Yesterday's inaugural address of the representative of the People's Republic of China was a disappointment for all those who wish to see the United Nations promote the goals of peace and progress.

There was nothing new in the intemperate language -- the phrases are familiar to those who have seen the standard propaganda of the People's Republic of China. What was surprising -- and disturbing -- was the decision to launch participation in this world body by firing these empty cannons of rhetoric.

Without mutual respect and a serious attempt to narrow differences, little can be done to reduce the turmoil in the world and to meet the aspirations of its peoples. This will be the approach of the U.S. Government.

\* \* \* \* \*