Wilson Center | Digital Archive
International History Declassified
digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org

September 21, 1961
Transcript of Conversation between Zhou Enlai and Bernard Law Montgomery

Citation:

"Transcript of Conversation between Zhou Enlai and Bernard Law Montgomery", September 21, 1961, Wilson Center Digital Archive, Zhou Enlai Waijiao wenxuan [Selected Diplomatic Papers of Zhou Enlai] (Beijing: Zhongyang wenxian, 1990), pp. 311-315. Translated by Simon Schuchat.
https://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/260514

Summary:

Premier Zhou speaks with Viscount Montgomery of Alamein about propositions to ease international tensions. Zhou agrees with Montgomery's three propositions one of which is withdrawal of foreign troops from other countries territory. Zhou proposes withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Korea and Taiwan cross straits. Also, on the Taiwan issue, Zhou says that there is only one China and Taiwan is a part of China. Zhou believes that Taiwan issue is a internal domestic issue that should not be discussed by the UN.

Credits:

This document was made possible with support from Chun & Jane Chiu Family Foundation

Original Language:

Chinese

Contents:

Original Scan
Translation - English

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

支持蒙哥马利元帅关于和缓国际紧张局势的三项原则*

（一九六一年九月二十一日）

蒙哥马利元帅（以下简称蒙）：我想问，总理对当前世界局势的看法如何？我经历了两次世界大战，每次战后政治领袖们都说今后再也不会发生战争了，但是两次大战、革命、民族运动又使得世界陷入纷乱之中。西方的政治领导人无法摆脱这种纷乱局面。在陈毅元帅举行的宴会上我提出了三点主张[233]，我认为这可以导致世界摆脱这种纷乱局面。这三点主张过去我分别都说过，但没有一揽子提出来，那天晚上我一揽子提出来了。这当然不会受美国人欢迎，我的很多主张不受美国人欢迎，我并不在乎。我相信，西方多数人，普通的老百姓是会同意我的意见的，许多政府是同意我的意见的。英国政府也同

---

* 这是同英国蒙哥马利元帅的谈话节录。

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

意，只是不敢说，怕得罪美国。我得出一个结论，就是要动员世界舆论来赞成这三点。在外国军队撤退之前，我不相信会有持久和平。只要还有军队留在别国的领土上，并且随时在准备采取军事行动，那就会毒化东西方关系，只能增加东西方的相互怀疑和不信任。一些政治领导人想实现裁军，但他们不懂得只有把军队撤回本国去以后才能实现裁军。他们的做法相反是向国外增派军队，这样就加深了相互怀疑和不信任。我认为这完全是缺乏常识。我相信一般人会同意这一点的。我有这样一个信念，就是只有撤退外国驻军，放弃准备军事行动，才会有持久的和平。如果维持现状，则僵局将继续下去，僵局持续很长，那是危险的。虽然不致有核战争，但也会有其他威胁。总之一句话，他们准备用世界的财富来破坏世界财富，而不是用以提高人民的生活、教育和卫生水平。我认为这简直是发疯。但是，政治领袖们无法走出这种僵局，也许没有那些政客会更好一些。

周恩来总理（以下简称周）：我很高兴地看到你在陈毅元帅的宴会上的讲话，我也看了你写的文章，你归纳成为三项基本原则，我们完全同意和支持。明天晚宴上，我要表示支持你的三项基本原则。

这三项基本原则互相关联，可以分别实行，也可以同时实行。第一，只能有一个中国，台湾是中国的领土。这是公正的主张，是与中国人民和世界进步舆论的呼声一

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

致的。联合国第十六届大会[234]一开始就遇到这个问题，现在已经有两个提案。新西兰提案代表美国的意见，主张根据联合国宪章第十八条把恢复中国代表权问题作为“重要问题”，必须有三分之二的多数通过。其目的是把这个问题挂起来，或者推迟一年，或者交给一个小组委员会去研究，结果仍是拖延。这是适合美国需要的。另一个是苏联的提案，主张恢复中国在联合国的合法代表权，把蒋介石集团驱逐出联合国。我认为苏联的提案与你的主张是一致的。恢复中国代表权问题是个程序问题。谁能代表中国六亿五千万人民？只有如你所说的北京的政府，而不是台湾的蒋介石。如果接受了美国和新西兰的主张，把恢复中国代表权问题当作“重要问题”来讨论，那就是讨论中国的存在与否，就是干涉中国的内政，这是违反联合国宪章的。联大讨论的“重要问题”只能是国际问题，而不能是一国的内政。内政问题怎么能在联大讨论呢？这次联合国的斗争是个考验，考验有多少国家是对中国友好的，站在你的这个主张的立场上的，有多少国家是站在反对你的这个主张的立场上的，有多少国家是动摇于两者之间的。

第二是两个德国问题。现在只能是两个德国，不可能出现一个德国。现在只有承认第二次世界大战后的既成事实。这是要造成一个和缓的局面所需要的。

第三点更带有关键性，所有外国军队都撤回本国领

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

土。这是一个更公平更彻底的主张。不仅我们赞成，赫鲁晓夫[235]七月八日在对苏联军事学院毕业生的演说中也赞成你的主张。

蒙：我读到了。

周：所有外国军队都撤回本国领土，我们不仅赞成，而且是这样实行的。我们未等美国同意从南朝鲜撤退军队，就从北朝鲜撤出了志愿军。美国军队现在还在南朝鲜。我们没有一兵一卒在国外。相反是美国军队驻在中国的领土台湾和台湾海峡。所以，我们举双手赞成你的主张。

美国最不愿意接受撤退国外驻军。美国在大半个世界建立了军事基地，派驻了军队，如果撤回去了，它对这些地方的控制就垮了。其实，我看不撤退反而会把当地人民得罪了，结果会象毛主席所说的那样，所有的基地都变成了绞索，使美国动弹不得，最后还是被赶走[236]。

美国如果接受你的主张，倒是可以摆脱被动局面，出现有条件的和平共处。如果双方都撤退了国外驻军，也许美国不放心，他们担心一下子撤得很远。他们说，中国离北朝鲜近，只隔条鸭绿江。美国要撤的话，最近也必须撤到日本，或者是撤回太平洋东岸美国本土。我们认为，这也有办法解决。大国可以订立和平公约，安理会有五大国，还可以加上中立国，召开大国会议来讨论、来解决。我们曾经提议亚洲——太平洋地区国家订立互不侵犯的和

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

平公约。所以我们非常赞成你的第三项主张，它可以作为实现全面裁军的前提。

SUPPORT FOR FIELD MARSHALL MONTGOMERY'S
THE THREE PRINCIPLES
FOR EASING THE TENSE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION*[1]
(SEPTEMBER 21, 1961)

FIELD MARSHALL MONTGOMERY (hereafter shortened to Montgomery): I'd like to ask how the Premier sees the current international situation? I've been through two world wars, and each time after the war political leaders all said that there will not be another war, but both times war, revolution, and national movements again caused the world to descend into chaos. Western political leaders have no way to break free of this chaotic situation. At the banquet hosted by Marshall Chen Yi I proposed three principles, which I feel may bring the world out of this chaotic situation. I had mentioned these three principles separately in the past, but I hadn't brought them up all at once, but that evening I presented them together. Of course, the United States won't like them, but then, many of my positions are not welcomed by the U.S., and I don't care. I believe that the majority of people in the West, the ordinary common people, would agree with my opinion, and quite a few governments also would agree with my opinion. The British government also agrees, but it doesn't dare say so, out of fear of offending the U.S. I've come to the conclusion that it is necessary to mobilize international opinion in support of these three points. I don't believe there can be lasting peace before foreign armies withdraw. As long as there are still foreign armies occupying other countries' territory, prepared at any time to carry out military actions, that will surely poison East-West relations, and can only increase the mutual suspicion and lack of trust between East and West. Some political leaders want to achieve disarmament, but they don't understand that only by bringing all troops back to their home countries will it be possible to achieve disarmament. But, on the contrary, they keep increasing the military forces stationed overseas - resulting in increased mutual suspicion and distrust. I think this shows a complete lack of common sense. I believe that ordinary people would agree with this point. I have this conviction, that is only when all occupying forces are withdrawn, and all military preparedness is abandoned, then it will be possible to have a lasting peace. If we maintain the present situation, the stalemate will continue and it will be dangerous if the stalemate continues for a long time. Although there might not be nuclear war, there will be other threats. To put it simply, they are trying to use the wealth of the world to destroy the world's wealth, instead of to raise the standard of people's lives, education and health. I think this is simply madness. But, political leaders have no way to get out of this kind of stalemate; maybe it would be better without those politicians.

Premier Zhou Enlai (hereafter shortened to Zhou): I was delighted to hear your speech at Marshall Chen Yi's banquet, and I also read your article, in which you summarized your three basic principles, which we completely agree and support. At tomorrow's banquet, I intend to express our support for your three basic principles.

These three basic principles are interrelated, and can be implemented separately, or can be implemented simultaneously. First, there can only be one China, and Taiwan is Chinese territory. This is a just claim, and in accordance with the public opinion of the Chinese people and progressive world public opinion. This issue was first encountered at The Sixteenth General Assembly of the United Nations, and now there are already two proposals. New Zealand's proposal represents the U.S. position, advocating that the question of restoring China's right of representation be treated as an "important question," which, according to Article 18 of the United Nations Charter, requires a two-thirds majority in order to pass. The objective of this is to shelve the question, or to put it off for another year, or turn it over to a small committee for study, with the result being procrastination. This meets the U.S.'s needs. The other proposal is the Soviet Union's, which advocates restoring China's lawful right of representation at the United Nations and expelling the Chiang Kai-shek [Jiang Jieshi] clique from the United Nations. I believe that the Soviet Union's proposal is in accordance with your principles. The question of restoring China's right of

representation is a procedural question. Who can represent the six hundred and fifty million people of China? Only what you refer to as the "Beijing government," and not the Taiwan of Chiang Kai-shek. If the proposal of the United States and New Zealand is accepted, and the question of China's representation is discussed under the rubric of an "important question", then the discussion will be about China's existence, which will be an interference in China's internal affairs, which therefore would be contrary to the United Nations' Charter. The General Assembly can only discuss international issues as "important questions" and not the internal affairs of a single country. How can domestic political questions be appropriate for discussion by the United Nations? This conflict at the United Nations is a test, a test of how many countries are friendly towards China, how many are for the position that you have expressed, how many countries are opposed to this position, and how many countries are wavering in between the two.

The second is the question of the two Germanies. At present there can only be two Germanies, it isn't possible for a single Germany to appear. At present we can only accept this fait accompli after the Second World War. This is necessary if we are to create a more amicable situation.

The third point is even more critical, that is for all foreign military forces return to their own national territory. This is a more just and more comprehensive position. Not only do we support it, but Khrushchev, in his July 8th commencement address at the Soviet Military Academy, has also voiced his support.

Montgomery: I have read it.

Zhou: We not only support the return of all foreign military forces to their national territory, we have even already implemented it. We withdrew the Chinese People's Volunteers from South Korea without waiting for the United States to agree to withdraw its forces from South Korea. At present American forces are still in South Korea, but we have not a single soldier overseas. On the contrary, the United States has troops stationed on Chinese soil in Taiwan and the Taiwan Straits. So, we raise both hands in support of your position.

The United States is most unwilling to accept the withdrawal of military forces stationed overseas. The United States has built military bases in over half of the world, to station its forces: if they were all to be withdrawn, it would lose control over those places. In fact, I think that not withdrawing its forces will be offensive to the local people, the result will be as Chairman Mao has said, all the bases will turn into nooses, immobilizing the United States, and in the end it will be chased away anyway.

If the United States were to accept your position, it could in fact get out of this reactive situation, and would bring about the conditions for peaceful coexistence. If both sides all withdrew their overseas based troops, perhaps the United States might feel concerned, and worry about removing them too far away all. They say, China is very close to North Korea, just on the other side of the Yalu River. If the United States were to withdraw, the nearest it could withdraw to would be Japan, or to American territory on the eastern shores of the Pacific. We believe there is a way to resolve this. The major countries could make a treaty; the Security Council has the five major countries, and with the addition of some neutral countries, can convene a major power conference to discuss and resolve [this issue]. We have already proposed that the countries of the Asia-Pacific region make a mutual non-aggression treaty. Therefore we are very much in favor of your third proposal, which may be used as a pre-condition for achieving complete disarmament.

* This is an excerpt from a conversation with British Field Marshall Bernard Law Montgomery.