

---

Interview: Gen. T'eng Chieh

---

# How we can overthrow the mainland China dictatorship



*This interview—Part I in a series—was conducted by C.M. Lao, publisher of the Chinese Flag Monthly, in Taipei, June 14, 1989. General T'eng is an elder statesman of the Kuomintang party in the Republic of China on Taiwan. He was a close adviser to Chiang Kai-shek, and is today Taiwan's leading military strategist.*

**Lao:** The democracy movement in mainland China since April 15 first saw some university students in Beijing in mourning for Hu Yaobang. One month later came the Tiananmen massacre of June 4. Now, Communist Chinese government officials are issuing warrants for a deathhunt against the democracy movement people, and it seems that they want to wipe them out. This terrible slaughter has shaken the entire world with terror, and this is one of the great events of universal history. Every Chinese is sad and concerned about this question.

In Taiwan, our bastion of Chinese national recovery, there have been three top leaders who have made public statements. . . . First, President Lee T'eng-hui; then, Gen. Hau Bo-chun, the chief of the General Staff; and third, Prime Minister Lee Huan. All of them represent the government's policy, a policy concerned with our future direction. We saw President Lee's statement of June 8 in all the major newspapers. He said that the situation in mainland China is in flux, and that we should pay careful attention to the development of this situation, while keeping a high level of alert. We have to respond according to the Chinese proverb: "counter-motion by no motion" [an English approximation might be: "to assume a low-profile defensive position while waiting for the right moment to go over to the offensive"—ed.], continue to give the mainland movement for democracy all necessary support, and fulfill its potential. . . .

General Hau gave an interview to Chinese Television (CTV) in a program called "90 Minutes" on June 9. This included many important things, but the most important is that he said that we will never give Communist China any excuse to take military action. That means that we are taking a military position based on the doctrine of strategic defense.

On June 13 in the morning, Prime Minister Lee made his first report to the Legislative Yuan. The basic point of our mainland policy, he said, is anti-Communism, opposition to the Communist system, and resistance to the Communist regime. Therefore, what we are talking about is not mainland China policy. What we are talking about is the implementa-

tion of our mainland China policy. Prime Minister Lee pointed out that our program for the mainland has four points. First, we should be active and preemptive, and not merely respond to the Communist united front initiatives. Second, we should prevent the infiltration of Taiwan by the Communists, in order to preserve our national security. Third, we should carefully plan to increase the active part of our mainland China program. Fourth, we should help give mainland China democracy, economic freedom, social equality, and a free press.

This means that Prime Minister Lee is separating our mainland China policy from our mainland China activities. The so-called mainland China policy is our continuous, anti-Communist government policy. Then, the mainland China activities can include many programs. But no matter how, we have to follow the above-mentioned four principles.

Since you are the leading ideologist of the revolution, and have been the teacher of our top-ranking military leaders, can you tell us what you think the meaning of these three speeches is?

**Gener**  
of grand strategy, and they are quite correct.

**Lao:** But some people think that what President Lee said about "counter-motion by no motion" is too negative. Why do you say that he is correct?

**General T'eng:** Basically, our anti-Communist policy is active, and aggressive. But the anti-Communist war is a total war, guided by politics, and assisted by military factors. In total war, each sector has different questions and different situations to be faced. So that will create different centers of war according to the changing situation. In regard to the changes in mainland China, we have been put into a no-motion position. Therefore, to face this changed situation, we have to figure out a correct policy. "Counter-motion by no motion" is suitable to deal with the present moment in our mainland China work.

**Lao:** When General Hau made his statement, some people asked whether he was talking about defense only, and not attack. After the massacre at Tiananmen, lots of people made public interventions to demand that the government consider sending troops to mainland China to recover it. Especially in Hong Kong, there was a very strong reaction. What are your views on this?

**General T'eng:** I have already said that the total war against the Communists at the present moment is guided primarily by politics and secondarily by military factors. In other words, political warfare and not military action is our main tool for solving problems. To prevent bloodshed, we try to use all political methods to solve the problem, since this is most in consonance with the hopes of the people. Therefore, we should not permit the enemy to focus on military warfare or on attacking us. Besides, defense is the precondition of attack. We need to have a very strong military defense, for then we can free our hands for political attack. In this political attack situation, military defense is not limited to traditional military defense. Therefore, what General Hau said is completely correct.

**Lao:** What do you think about Prime Minister Lee's statement?

**General T'eng:** What Prime Minister Lee says is not only 100% correct, but also very clear and detailed. Mainland policy is anti-Communist. But how can we oppose the Communists? The question is, how to carry out this task. The task has myriad facets. Our work must be reasonable and effectively developed. But when we carry out our task, we must hold on to our principles. Prime Minister Lee established four principles, including attack, defense, the strategic timetable, and target selection. Generally speaking, what the three top leaders have said is quite correct. If we carry out the task accordingly, that will be the most effective method. Now everybody in the world has already shown an anti-Communist attitude, so for us it is much easier than before. If we can unite the people and follow our principles, then we can achieve success.

**Lao:** Now the Chinese people have courageously shown their determined anti-Communist attitude. This is absolutely the first time in the history of anti-Communism that this has happened. What is the result?

**General T'eng:** Everybody knows that the Communists confiscated the property of all the people and made them into slaves. The people who were victimized were totally opposed to this. Because of the secret police security and very cruel control measures, the mainland Chinese for a very long period did not dare to manifest their anti-Communism in public.

In the first decades, each person was under Communist control in their thinking, job, and daily life. That means that everything was controlled by the Communists. But the most powerful method is food control. If you get food, then you can eat your meals. If people can't eat, then how can you expect them to rebel?

The second powerful method is control over transportation and communications. At the very beginning, the Communists limited the ability of people to travel and move their residence. Even to go from one village to another, people needed a travel permit. It is like needing a passport to travel overseas. Therefore, the people could not move around free-

ly, and they were isolated. So how could you expect one isolated person to rise up in an anti-Communist rebellion? Owing to these two powerful methods of control, the people lost the possibility of anti-Communist action.

But now the objective situation has changed. The Communist closed-door policy cannot be applied. They are forced to open up to foreign countries. After the opening to the outside world, the people can no longer be controlled by food supply and the limits on transportation and communication. Therefore, the people can now join together in rebellion against the Communists and show in action what is in their hearts. So the simple demands for democracy by the students became the demands of the entire population. Demands for democracy are anti-Communist in essence. But they do not explicitly express an anti-Communist thrust.

**Lao:** Yes, your explanation is very much to the point. All people can show an anti-Communist attitude because the food controls are no longer functioning. In the free world, the average person cannot understand why the food control is so powerful. . . . Recently in the newspapers lots of people were pointing out that the student movement for democracy in mainland China is due to contact with the free world and envy of the standard of living of the democratic countries. But they missed something else which is very important.

During the Maoist period, food control was very, very tight. Each individual home had a household record book. Food was distributed by the government according to this household record book. You had to go to a specific food supply station with this record book. The record book indicated the ration of food that each person could get in a month. For example, adults could buy 25 catties of rice [a catty is about 20.8 ounces—ed.]

and not one gram more, and not at any other food supply station. The only exception was that if you did not buy a certain quantity of food, you could exchange that quantity of food for a food coupon. But this kind of food coupon only circulated in a limited area. If you wanted to get a food coupon that could circulate in an entire province, or even nationwide, you had to get a very special migrant worker permit. That means that the food coupon system limited the free activities of the people. When you eat at a restaurant, you have to present the food coupon first, before you can order anything. For example, for one bowl of fried rice, you had to hand in a food coupon worth one-half catty to get it, and then you had to pay the bill with money as well.

With this kind of high security food control, what will happen? The Communist Party can order the people around and nobody can disobey. If anyone dares to do so, the government will switch their household residence to a poor farming village, or even to a wilderness province near the border. If they refuse to go, they go on a blacklist of those persons who receive no food rations. Even though they may have money, they cannot buy food. Their relatives and their friends cannot help them, because the food that they receive is not

even enough for themselves. . . .

Because of this, Mao quite often decided according to his whim to move millions of people to the peasant villages or the wilderness border provinces when he was in power. After the Cultural Revolution, he was able to send millions of Red Guards to the wilderness border provinces, thanks to this same food control system. This system is a thousand times more powerful than military forces. Military power can only control a limited number of persons, but not all the people. Military power can control people only temporarily, and not over the long term. But by using food control tactics, with the military forces as the backup, Mao was able to control China for a long time.

Ever since Deng Xiaoping seized power, he has used the economic policy of the open door. This has brought a progressive loosening of the food control system. Today in mainland China, there are 800 million farmers. Today, after the Communists abolished the communes [Mao's collective farms—ed.], farmers have received some farmland. Because of their hard work, normally they can reach self-sufficiency and have extra farm products to sell on the free market. So in those small farming villages, a large number of individual family economic units have been springing up like bamboo shoots.

According to the calculations of a professor from the Chinese University in Hong Kong, there are approximately 17 million individual family economic units. This figure means that, compared with the level of the 1950s, the number of private enterprises has doubled. Those so-called individual family economic units have made a great contribution to the Chinese economy, and they have been encouraged by Deng Xiaoping. Some people say that after the massacre at Tiananmen, there is a large possibility that mainland China will return to the Mao period. But in my own view, that is impossible, because the Communists will not be able to take back the farmland from those 800 million farmers, and there is no way to wipe out those individual family economic units.

Compare this with the 1950s, when Mao Zedong was able to use his dirty tricks to exploit the people's illusions about the Communist Party that made them want to contribute and sacrifice themselves. Then, the farmers automatically gave up their land to form the communes, and the private companies were willing to be subordinated to joint ventures with the government. But today, the whole situation is entirely different. Since we have 800 million farmers and 17 million individual family economic units, the Communists cannot use their food control system any more.

And, under these circumstances, it is impossible for Communist China to reestablish control over the communication and transportation of the population. Therefore, even though the Communists are using these horrible massacre methods, they can only stop the democracy movement temporarily. Even though they use a Big Lie propaganda campaign to cover up, this can fool only a few people. Effective control won't exist for very much longer.—*To be continued.*

## London insiders say Thatcher won't last

by Mark Burdman

Highest-level London sources have informed *EIR* that the prevailing factions in the British and American establishments have made a decision to wreck the British government of Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher as rapidly as possible.

The sources stress that Thatcher does not fit into the particular form of "Anglo-American special relationship" desired both by the Bush administration and by leading City of London and Foreign Office influentials, typified by Midland Bank's Sir Michael Palliser, a former senior official at the British Foreign Office and a close associate of Henry Kissinger. Whatever confusion there may be in Thatcher's own personal views on the future of the NATO military alliance, she is most uneasy about prospects for large-scale American troop withdrawals from the continent, and is inclined to intervene, in her own way, to prevent these withdrawals.

In the eyes of the Bush administration and its counterparts in Britain, her reluctance has cast her in the role of a major stumbling block for American disengagement from continental Europe and for realizing the Kissinger-Bush "New Yalta" concept of reordering European affairs.

*EIR's* sources report that an array of scandals are beginning to erupt, and will continue to erupt, initially targeting Mrs. Thatcher's immediate family and perhaps members of her cabinet, as a step toward going after the prime minister herself later.

The first of these, is a peculiar story involving ties between Attwoods, a private firm whose deputy chairman is Denis Thatcher, Mrs. Thatcher's husband, and a U.S. company called National Waste Disposal, which is allegedly tied to the mafia. While many of the allegations in this case are approximately three years old, in early July Britain's Channel 4 suddenly decided to broadcast a show about the mooted Attwoods mafia connections. The Channel 4 account was then summarized in a news feature in the London *Financial Times*.

On July 9, the *Observer*, the weekly Sunday newspaper owned by the disreputable Tiny Rowland's Lonrho Corporation, ran a story labeled "Exclusive," presenting ostensible