

EIRFeature

The real crimes of China's Zhao Ziyang

by Michael O. Billington

It was an understandable shock for millions of people when Henry Kissinger went on national television within hours of the bloody massacre broadcast live throughout the world from Tiananmen Square in June 1989, calling for maintaining full support for the butcher Deng Xiaoping. A year later it was learned that President Bush had dispatched Kissinger's two employees, Lawrence Eagleburger and Brent Scowcroft, within days of the crackdown, as official but secret emissaries to toast Deng Xiaoping for a job well done.

This should not have surprised anyone who knew the actual history of how Kissinger and Bush "opened up" China to the West, starting with Kissinger's secret diplomacy in 1971. Kissinger and his British allies were interested in bringing neither democracy nor economic development to the one-fifth of humanity enslaved by Maoist dictatorship. Rather, as with the colonial powers in the nineteenth century, they wanted only to "open up" access to China's cheap labor and raw materials (best maintained by keeping the population backward), while gaining whatever strategic advantage they could from the immoral relationship. If such access was facilitated by supporting continued police-state rule in China, then so be it.

Similarly, any attempt to truly develop the agricultural and industrial infrastructure of the nation was discouraged, Kissinger's bosses not wishing to see the emergence of another, larger, Japan in Asia. Already in the early 1980s, long before the collapse of the Soviet bloc, the Anglo-Americans were labeling their traditional allies in Asia (Japan, South Korea, Taiwan) as "economic enemies," adopting the old British balance-of-power policy that any nation which became strong was implicitly a threat which had to be defeated.

This report will demonstrate how a "recolonization" process has been carried out against China, not without some success. It will demonstrate that when the Chinese people, despite the U.S. support for Mao and his murderous Cultural Revolution, succeeded in overthrowing Mao and the fanatics around him, there



Zhao Ziyang functioned as a malleable tool of the Anglo-American oligarchy's campaign to open up China for looting. Henry Kissinger (left), David Rockefeller, and Samuel Huntington (right), all of the Trilateral Commission. Kissinger opened the diplomatic channels to China; Rockefeller provided the "free market" fraud; and Huntington provided the political theory for repression.

was a chance for China to discard the Communist Party tyranny altogether. With Kissinger's backing, this effort was thwarted, as Deng Xiaoping's iron fist crushed every whisper of freedom and every effort at real development since that time, while "opening up" China to looting by the U.S. and British banking circles. It will show that Deng Xiaoping disposed of the only reform leader who believed in the development of the people and the economic infrastructure of the nation, Hu Yaobang, in favor of a reformer who functioned as a malleable tool of the bankrupt Anglo-American financial oligarchy, Zhao Ziyang.

The Cultural Revolution

The horror of the Cultural Revolution did not end until after the passing of the hated "Great Helmsman" Mao Zedong. The 10-year nightmare between 1966 and 1976 left millions dead, the collapse of much of the already sparse economic infrastructure, a generation of young adults who had been deprived of their education, and the total discrediting of the Communist Party. The worst effects, however, were not so easily measured. In the words of the director of the Shanghai Conservatory of Music from the poignant documentary film of violinist Isaac Stern's 1979 tour of China: "Ten of our teachers died by suicide because they couldn't stand the humiliation and torture, especially the torture of the mind and the humiliation. Of course we were beaten, we were kicked and beaten in many ways, but, I think, that's all right compared with the humiliation. We were treated as

criminals because we taught them western music."

It was in the middle of this holocaust, in 1971, that Henry Kissinger, functioning as a self-professed asset of British diplomacy, maneuvered the United States into establishing relations with Mao's regime. As we shall see, this included holding up the Maoist police state as the ideal for emulation by other Third World nations. George Bush was one of the first official U.S. emissaries to Beijing, in the midst of the Cultural Revolution, and still considers the butchers his "old friends."

The 'Beijing Spring' after Mao's death

The period between Mao's death in 1976 and early 1979 became known as the "Beijing Spring." Although factional fighting was intense in the battle for succession, the attempt of the Maoist fanatics to hold power without the protection of the would-be emperor was doomed. His chosen successor, Hua Guofeng, expressed the total bankruptcy of morality and ideas among that faction by his infamous slogan for "Two Whatevers": "Resolutely defend whatever policies Chairman Mao has formulated, and unswervingly adhere to whatever instructions Chairman Mao has issued." With Mao dead and the "Gang of Four," who carried out the holocaust in his name, arrested and imprisoned, such mindlessness could not survive. Deng Xiaoping, who had been targeted and imprisoned twice during the Cultural Revolution, took the leadership and commenced what has been called "the reform" in 1979.

However, Deng quickly showed that his commitment to reform did not extend to challenging the dictatorship and mind control of the Communist Party. Between 1976 and 1978, revolutionary forces were unleashed both within the party structure itself and in the population as a whole—especially among the ex-Red Guard youths who were coming to terms with the insanity of the previous years and their own role in it. Deng was tolerant of these forces only until he had consolidated his power—which occurred at the party plenum of December 1978. As we shall see, he immediately moved to crush the Beijing Spring, both in the streets and in the political structure.

Wei Jingsheng, a nation's conscience

The exuberance that characterized the explosion of free ideas following the lifting of the Maoist fog was mixed with horror at the recognition of what had been done to China. At every level of the population, as some normalcy returned to everyday life, people had to answer the question of what had reduced the Chinese to such a state of barbarism, apparently self-inflicted. The most profound spokesman to emerge from this ferment was Wei Jingsheng, who has rotted in the Chinese Gulag ever since Deng's 1979 crushing of the Beijing Spring. Wei had been a Red Guard, waving the *Little Red Book* and denouncing anyone in authority along with the rest of the mob. But he, like many others, came to see the utter impoverishment of his country in the course of his travels during those years of madness, and thus to recognize that this could not be due merely to "capitalist roaders and class enemies who had found their way into the leadership of the Communist Party," as they were told. During one of these trips he saw the starving peasantry and heard accounts of peasants reduced to cannibalism, eating each other's dying children in order to survive. Wei reflected: "Poor kids! And their parents were even more pitiful. Who made them do this? Who made them send their kids to others as food? Who made them taste the flesh of these innocent children together with the tears and sorrows of their parents? At this time I realized the killer was Mao Zedong. . . . It was he and his followers who used their vicious policies to force the starved and mad parents to eat exchanged children. It was Mao's 'Great Leap Forward' that forced thousands of starved and mad farmers to kill their companions with hoes and eat their flesh. Those people were not the killers; the real killers were Mao and his followers."

This truth reflected the famous argument of Mencius (fourth century B.C.), who asked: "Is there any difference between killing a man with a sword and with the style of government?"

As to the hope that Deng would bring freedom, Wei had no illusions: "If newspapers and the radio have now stopped bashing our ears with their deafening propaganda catchwords on the theme of 'class struggle,' it is partly because this was the magic abracadabra of the 'Gang of Four.' But mostly

because the masses were fed up with it; you cannot make people march any more to that tune. . . . After having suffered this regime with considerable fortitude for 30 years, the people eventually understood, like the monkey who attempts to grasp the Moon, they were condemned to remain forever empty-handed. That was why, as soon as Vice Chairman Deng launched his new program, 'Back to Reality,' the masses supported him with enthusiasm, showing their approval with a voice as formidable as the roaring of the ocean. Everyone expected that Deng, applying his famous principle 'to reach truth from facts,' would submit the recent past to critical investigation, and that he would lead the people toward a worthy future. . . . After that, alas, our odious political system was not amended in the slightest. As for the freedom and democracy that people expected, even the very words cannot be mentioned."

Democracy: Wei's 'fifth modernization'

Wei is best remembered for his famous big character poster placed on the "Democracy Wall" at the height of the Beijing Spring in December 1978, called "The Fifth Modernization" (see accompanying article). Deng Xiaoping repeatedly posed the noble goal of modernization in four areas: agriculture, industry, science and technology, and military defense. Wei expressed the historically demonstrable fact that such progress is impossible in a society where the minds of the citizens are enslaved: "We do not want to be mere tools in the hands of despots with expansionist ambitions, who wish to use us to carry out a modernization geared to their own advantage. The only reason we want to achieve modernization is to ensure democracy, freedom, and happiness for all the people. Without this 'fifth modernization' [democracy], all the other modernizations are nothing but lies. . . . Without democracy, society would sink into a stage of stagnation, and economic growth would encounter insuperable obstacles. . . . Without this preliminary condition, it would not only be impossible to achieve any progress, but it would even be difficult merely to preserve the achievements obtained at a given level of development. The best evidence is provided by the situation to which our great country has been reduced after these last 30 years."

Kissinger's role

These public pronouncements earned Wei Jingsheng the horror of 15 years of psychological and physical torture in a Chinese prison for the crime of "counter-revolution," and thereby the honor of becoming the first crucial martyr of the Deng era. He still sits today in the Chinese Gulag. Some of the other leaders of the Beijing Spring, despite persecution, remained at the center of subsequent efforts to rebuild the Democracy Movement, leading eventually to the Tiananmen demonstrations of 1989. It was a letter from intellectuals and others to the government in early 1989 asking for a pardon for Wei, and Deng's refusal to consider it, that helped galva-

nize the students to confront the tyranny head on.

These are the people about whom Kissinger spoke on the day after the massacre: "The turmoil in China cannot be easily encompassed in simple slogans like 'Democracy Against Dictatorship.' Given China's history and culture, democracy is unlikely to have the same meaning in Beijing as in Washington." Kissinger lied, in 1989, as he had in 1979, that "Deng's policy has been, and will continue to be, in the interest of the United States. . . . China must not fall out of its balance, otherwise there is the danger of its population tending toward extremes." This "balance" Kissinger so urgently defends, the dictatorship of the Communist Party, must be defended with no pangs of emotion or morality, he said. Denouncing those who responded "emotionally" to the murder of the cream of China's youth, Kissinger wrote in a syndicated column on June 4, 1989: "For Americans it is important to keep in mind that the opening of China . . . took place during Mao's China, for which morally and politically we felt no affinity whatsoever." Again, as we shall see, that while admitting the immorality of the U.S. policy towards China, he lied when he claimed no affinity with Mao's methods.

Hu Yaobang becomes general secretary

The effort to build a movement to end the dictatorship and create conditions for true economic and social progress was in fact close to realization in 1978 and 1979. Not all of those who were in leadership positions in the Communist Party were oblivious to the fact that the totalitarian form of government itself was the root cause of the holocaust of the Cultural Revolution, nor unaware that an enslaved citizenry cannot sustain real progress. Hu Yaobang, head of the Communist Party and next in line to succeed Deng Xiaoping until his removal from power in 1987, was a figure who (unlike Deng) was opposed to the concentration of power in the hands of a few. Although he repeatedly backed down and compromised in confrontations with Deng, he nonetheless provided a voice and protection to those who believed that democracy and progress were more important than the Maoist or Leninist dogma. He provided a considerable buffer for the intellectuals with the courage to speak out during the 1980s—in fact, his ouster as general secretary of the Communist Party in 1987 came simultaneously with the purge of three outspoken journalists and political opponents of the Deng regime.

It was Hu's death on April 15, 1989, and the funeral rallies, which sparked the revolutionary outpouring of student and worker resistance to Deng and his henchmen that spring.

Hu took a fundamentally opposite view of man from the Deng leadership. He insisted that education was primary, that each citizen had the right and the necessity to develop his intellect. In this regard he argued against throwing the country open to vast labor-intensive projects to earn quick

money at the expense of the in-depth development of the nation as a whole, including especially the educational development of the capacities of the entire work force. He developed a close working relationship with the Japanese and to a lesser extent with Europe, but he maintained a distance from the radical free trade ideologues from the United States and Britain, and refused to visit the United States. He also distrusted the growing "condominium" arrangement between the U.S. and the Soviets.

Despite his compromises with Deng, he maintained a close relationship with the people. More than any other leader, he traveled regularly and widely throughout China, visiting 1,500 of the 2,000 counties in that vast country.

Hu Yaobang had risen to leadership as head of the Youth League in the 1950s. During the holocaust which began in 1966, he spent two and a half years in the "cow shed," a term which referred to the incarceration of those condemned as "monsters and demons" by the Red Guards. Following two more years at manual labor, he spent three years recuperating from a severe illness, during which time he intensely studied the ancient Chinese classics and reflected on his country's fit of bloody madness. Both he and Deng Xiaoping were rehabilitated in 1973, only to be purged again in 1976 until after Mao's death and the arrest of the Gang of Four later that year.

Hu gathered around him a group of young intellectuals and scientists. After his first rehabilitation, he prepared a report on the work of the Chinese Academy of Science which defended education against the insane closure of the universities imposed by the Maoists. "The Dictatorship of the Proletariat does not apply to science and technology," he said. He argued that "practice is the *only* criterion for truth" in his battle with the "Two Whatevers" idiocy of Mao's defenders. When it was argued that the reversals of the Cultural Revolution could not go so far as to directly contradict Mao himself, Hu countered with his own slogan, the "Two Regardlesses": "All that is not true and all that is wrongly concluded and wrongly handled must be corrected according to facts, regardless of when and under what circumstances it was done, and regardless of which persons at what levels did it."

After the final demise of the Gang of Four, he took responsibility for an attempt to eliminate every remnant of the Cultural Revolution. In 1978 he said: "There are more than 10 million cadres and ordinary people who need to be vindicated and rehabilitated. The corpses of some have long since turned to dust, but they have not yet been cleared of their alleged crimes as spies or special agents. Their families still bear this burden." Deng was ambivalent about pursuing the rehabilitation process too fast and too far, but Hu nonetheless hired 1,000 cadres to spread out across the nation to reverse every false judgment.

Perhaps most important, Hu supported a series of articles and publications which called for democracy as an essential precondition for the Four Modernizations, even before Wei

The staggering economic backwardness in this recent photo taken immediately outside Canton contrasts with the glitter of the foreign enclaves in the Special Economic Zones. Inset: Pavilion built for a 1980 Chinese trade exhibit in New York to push the process industry approach to the SEZs.



Leni Rubinstein

Jingsheng's famous call for the "Fifth Modernization."

Ruan Ming, a close associate of Hu Yaobang now in exile in the United States, in discussions with Harvard historian Merle Goldman and others, has described a series of extraordinary developments surrounding a "Theory Conference" held between January and April 1979 under Hu's sponsorship. As late as December 1978, at the closing session of the famous Third Plenum that marked the beginning of the period of "reform," Deng Xiaoping had expressed his ostensible belief in the need for some democracy: "Democracy has to be institutionalized and written into law, so as to make sure that institutions and laws do not change whenever the leadership changes or whenever the leaders change their views or shift the focus of their attention." Hu and his associates had been called on to write the communiqué of the plenum which launched the reform. With this backing, Hu called a Theory Conference with great hopes of dramatic changes in China.

Although Hu apparently never met with Wei Jingsheng, he did meet with others from the Beijing Spring movement, and had gone to the Democracy Wall to read the posters. The "Fifth Modernization" theme, that without democracy, modernization was impossible, was widely presented and discussed at the first part of the 1979 Theory Conference (preceding a break in the conference for the Spring Festival in February). The Cultural Revolution was described by some speakers as a fascist dictatorship, and the roots of that fascism were traced back to the 1950s. Even Deng's speech from this first half of the conference said that democracy had not been realized in any socialist society, and that "we should develop the good points of the bourgeoisie in this respect." He even praised the role of elective systems in the West, although his intent was clear in his conclusion that "we should find a way to let people *feel* that they are the masters of the country."

Deng Xiaoping strikes

Despite public declarations that the freedom to speak out was assured under Deng's slogan "Back to Reality," the Chinese lived in constant trepidation that there would be a repetition of the infamous Maoist ploy in 1956 which went under the slogan: "Let a hundred flowers bloom, a hundred schools of thought contend." At that time, after a year of encouraging freedom of criticism, Mao launched the "anti-rightist" campaign: Having entrapped almost anyone with a brain into speaking out, he purged or imprisoned them all. Mao compared his "cleverness" to luring snakes out of their holes.

The days and weeks following the Spring Festival break in the Theory Conference saw Deng unleash a similar reaction. During the break, Deng visited the United States and met with the Trilateral Commission team running the Carter administration, headed by National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski. The dominant theme of U.S. policy at that time was the geopolitical "China card"—a British-modeled balance-of-power scheme intended to use China against Soviet interests in Asia at the same time that a "condominium" was constructed among the U.S., the U.S.S.R., and China.

Within two weeks of Deng's return to China, he launched an invasion into Soviet-backed Vietnam, which had occupied Cambodia the previous month and removed the Chinese-backed Khmer Rouge regime from power. The Khmer Rouge reign had been essentially a Cambodian version of Mao's genocidal Cultural Revolution, in which any sign of intelligence or independent thought was punished by torture or death. The Chinese invasion of Vietnam created a situation where any domestic criticism of the Khmer Rouge "version" of the Cultural Revolution could be treated as treason in a time of war.

Wei Jingsheng was suddenly arrested, under the pretense of his opposition to the invasion. His trial six months later simply accused him of the "crime" of being opposed to dictatorship. His refusal to plead guilt to any crime resulted in the bestial 15-year sentence.

Meanwhile, Deng also plotted to destroy the movement emerging from Hu's Theory Conference. He packed the second half of the conference with conservative forces—those who were to become called the "hardline" faction—and had a speech prepared for him that launched a new "anti-rightist" campaign. He announced the bombastic "Four Cardinal Principles"—keep to the socialist road, dictatorship of the proletariat, leadership of the Communist Party, and uphold Marxism, Leninism, Mao Zedong Thought—making clear that there would be no "Fifth Modernization" under Deng Xiaoping.

Hu Yaobang made no public effort to counter this. According to his associates now in exile, he believed that he had no power base to resist Deng, neither over the "Four Cardinal Principles" nor over the wretched treatment of Wei Jingsheng and other dissidents. In later years, when hardliners demanded the purge of his close collaborators, he would resist, but only until the top leaders (either Deng or Chen Yun, the leader of the "hardline" or "leftist" faction) got involved, at which point he claimed powerlessness to resist without losing his own position. Ultimately Hu's power base was undermined by this step-by-step process, leading to his own loss of power in 1987.

Zhao Ziyang, the New Age tool

A crucial, previously untold aspect of the defeat of Hu Yaobang's policies was the Anglo-American role in the sponsorship of Zhao Ziyang, who had emerged as the darling of the New Age, free trade, post-industrial society gurus in the United States and Britain. Exposing this fact today is crucial to the effort to replace the communist regime, which continues to implement Zhao's program despite the fact that Zhao has been removed from power. It is even more crucial in preventing the destruction of any potential post-Communist Chinese state by the "shock therapy" tactics of the free-traders, as is now happening to the emerging free nations of eastern Europe under the direction of the Bush administration and IMF economists. In fact, as we shall see, the same people who used their control of Zhao Ziyang to destroy any chance for a successful transformation in China are now in the forefront of the "shock therapy" destruction of eastern Europe, intent on preventing the emergence of a strong Eurasian-wide economic alliance.

The United States established official relations with China on Jan. 1, 1979. The first U.S. ambassador to China arrived on March 1, 1979, just two weeks after the Chinese invasion of Vietnam, the arrest of Democracy Wall leader Wei Jingsheng, and Deng Xiaoping's crushing of the potential democrats among the elite. As with Kissinger's first trips

to China in 1971 and his later support for the Tiananmen massacre, the United States responded to acts of police state tyranny with diplomatic rewards.

Zhao Ziyang rapidly emerged as the spokesman for the "free trade" lie that the only alternative to the failure of the Marxist centrally controlled economy was to throw open the nation to unregulated free trade—leaving room for discussion only on how fast this should be done. Hu Yaobang and a group of his collaborators explicitly opposed this policy, insisting that the Japanese model of directing credit into the development of agricultural and industrial infrastructure was necessary to assure the development of the physical economy and the uplifting of the population.

The first test between these two opposite approaches to reform developed over the creation of the Special Economic Zones (SEZs) in 1979. While both Hu and Zhao supported the creation of these zones, they disagreed as to their purpose and their structure. Originally, the zones were to be called "Special Zones for Export," which would encourage foreign investments in Chinese industry and facilitate expanding exports. Hu Yaobang also intended for the zones to function as experiments in democratic political structures. But by 1980, after Deng's crushing of the Beijing Spring, the name was changed to "Special Economic Zones," and all discussion of political freedoms was cut off.

On economic policy, Hu warned that the zones could easily become a revival of the old nineteenth-century colonial concessions if they were not used as a locomotive for developing China's own domestic industrial capacity. He denounced what he called the "two ends outside," referring to industries which imported raw materials and semi-finished goods from "outside" the country and merely processed them into exports, returning the product to the "outside." This, he warned, would simply utilize the cheap labor of a desperate Chinese population, without improving either the population or the national economy in the long run. The fact that these zones were set up in four of the same locations where the British had their opium-trading "concessions" in the nineteenth century contributed to the sense of potential disaster.

His warnings have proven all too accurate. Initially, the reform brought considerable relief from the economic collapse of the Cultural Revolution years, primarily due to the termination of the disastrous communalization of agriculture. Allowing the peasantry to run their own farms and raising the price paid to the farmers for their produce led to a rapid increase in grain production and an easing of the extreme destitution of the peasantry. But by 1984, the government had ended the special investments in agriculture, diverting more and more funds to facilitate the needs of the growing process industries in the special zones. These zones, like colonial Shanghai, were boom towns for fast money, cheap labor, drugs, and a new, relatively rich elite, while the rest of the country stagnated and then fell back. Today the aging basic industry sector is bankrupt, the infrastructure in



Hu Yaobang, former Communist Party general secretary, in the official photo issued after his death on April 15, 1989. Hu believed in liberating the creative powers of the population. The outpouring of popular sentiment around his funeral led to the democracy strikes in Tiananmen Square so brutally crushed on June 4.

water, energy, and transportation has collapsed, the peasantry is increasingly marginalized, and well over 100 million redundant rural workers wander the country in search of subsistence—while the booming free trade zones are held up as proof of a successful economy!

Alvin Toffler's kookery

This was precisely what Deng Xiaoping and Zhao Ziyang's western backers intended. Perhaps the most revealing western influence on Zhao is that of Alvin Toffler, the popular cult "futurologist," author of *Future Shock* and *Third Wave*. Toffler is an unabashed advocate of the "post-industrial society," using pseudo-scientific jargon about the "information age" and technetronic society to justify the collapse of industrial society, and the death of millions of human beings that must accompany that collapse.

Zhao had Toffler's book *Third Wave* translated into Chinese and circulated to his associates and student followers. The book argues that the first wave was agricultural society, the second, industrial society, and the emerging third wave is the post-industrial services and information age. China, Toffler argues, is in the fortunate position of getting into the third wave without needing to pass through the industrial age, since the "pollution-belching smokestacks that the socialist world has made its first priority now represent the 'reactionary' past." Toffler describes industrial production and large infrastructure projects as "backward elements, when compared with the third wave, post-smokestack production systems that are now possible."

This mindless New Age apology for the collapse of investment in the physical economy was part of the popular cover for the 1980s binge of speculative looting in the United States, led by the junk bond boom and similar "post-industrial" swindles, creating the current depression. In China, it created a "theoretical" justification for scrapping any plans for achieving long-term development in favor of cheap-labor process industries which produced quick loot for investors. A *New Republic* puff piece on Toffler in China said: "Toffler assures the reformers that it's OK for Third Wavers to skip the Second Wave (industrialization) and to be making apparently only First Wave (agricultural) progress. The changes involved in the Third Wave, he says, 'actually resemble First Wave conditions: dispersion of the population out of the cities; more work in the home; small-scale production; linking rural development to high technology.'"

Zhao Ziyang not only bought this nonsense—he fought for it. When the conservatives attacked the Toffler book as "spiritual pollution," Zhao called together a conference of scientists and party leaders to force the issue. He won, and the book was subsequently published for mass distribution, becoming a bestseller. The *New Republic* claims that the book was the bible for the young economists around Zhao, who formulated the policies for the Special Economic Zones approach. The think tanks manned by Zhao's young followers, such as the Institute of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, were rabid supporters of Toffler, Daniel Bell, Ilya Prigogine, and others of the systems analysis and information theory proponents tracing back to the Frankfurt School.

Hu offers a different approach

Hu Yaobang responded by circulating another book with the opposite approach: *Japan's Decisive Century, 1867-1967*, written by Japan's first postwar prime minister, Shigeru Yoshida, a collaborator of Gen. Douglas MacArthur. Hu pointed especially to the emphasis on education, to the need to educate the population if any process of development were to be achieved, rather than exploiting only the unskilled brute powers of a backward population.

Yoshida directly compared the post-World War II economic recovery in Japan with the late nineteenth-century Meiji period, when Japan rapidly adopted western technology and emerged from feudalism as a major world power in a few decades. Hu pointed to Yoshida's emphasis on education, with "equal opportunity to all," as crucial to Japan's success, both in the Meiji period and after the defeat in the Pacific War. Yoshida also insisted that the progress in the Meiji period was only possible "because it stood on a firm foundation inherited from the past. For example, the well-developed virtues of hard work and frugality were the legacies of Confucianism."

He even argued that the breakdown of the development process that led to the eventual degeneracy into an imperialist military regime was due precisely to the failure to maintain

the moral traditions associated with Confucianism.

Economically, Yoshida insisted that the relaxation of regulations and controls was only possible after the application of "technological innovation . . . through increased investment in equipment, which would, in turn, raise productivity and increase the competitive power of Japan's exports." This technology-driven advance of productivity is the opposite of the cheap-labor policy of the special zones.

Yoshida insisted that while the foundation of an economy was still weak, that it must "ensure that only those items that could be regarded as essential to the country's rehabilitation would be imported." Again, the "two outsides" policy of process industries followed the exact opposite approach.

Hu argued that these policies were essential to China's successful modernization, and that the Chinese people were fully capable of such a transformation. He also concurred with Yoshida that a large and densely concentrated population "no longer constituted a problem—provided it represented an efficient labor force."

"Reformer" Zhao Ziyang and the hardline Marxists shared the opposite view of the work force, which looked only to the value that could be extracted from the available bodies. They were backed up in this bestial view by the western monetarists who were pushing the "free trade" line. In May of 1981, David Rockefeller chaired an international conference of the Trilateral Commission held in Beijing. At that meeting, Chase Manhattan Bank's chief, William C. Butcher, told Xinhua News Agency that China's reform would only succeed if they rejected large industry or great development projects in favor of labor intensive production. Heavy industry and infrastructure, he said, "take two great things, a great deal of energy and a great deal of money, neither of which are abundant in China."

The two opposite approaches to reform in China thus became identified with the Japanese method on the one hand and the Anglo-American free trade policies on the other. It is ironic that the Japanese economy had developed through the conscious application of the policies once known as the American System of Political Economy, as developed by Alexander Hamilton and his followers, while the policies pursued today by the U.S. are exactly the opposite: the colonial policies of "free trade" associated with Adam Smith and British imperialism, against which the United States fought a successful revolution!

Hu Yaobang is removed

To a great extent, Hu Yaobang was identified in the minds of the Chinese, more so than Deng Xiaoping, as the person who overturned the policies of the Cultural Revolution. It was therefore not a simple matter to purge him, since neither the majority of party leaders nor the population would tolerate any return to those dark days. His removal from the top leadership was accomplished only by slowly destroying his base of support, then moving unconstitutionally (there is a

Constitution in China which is maintained for display purposes) to remove him from office. Although he was officially next in line to Deng, and supposedly enjoyed Deng's official support, the more traditional Marxists, led by Chen Yun, had obtained Deng's agreement at each step as they removed each of Hu's supporters, then dumped Hu himself. Between 1983 and 1987, leaders within the Communist Party Academy, the Ministry of Culture, and the newspaper *People's Daily*, all supporters of Hu, were forced out of office.

It is important to note here Hu Yaobang's role in bringing the world's highest level of culture into China after the holocaust of the Cultural Revolution. The Ministry of Culture, under Hu's influence and often with Hu's personal involvement, invited the world's greatest classical music artists to tour and teach in China. Throngs of eager Chinese filled the halls, even for rehearsals, as the freedom to participate in the creation of beauty was restored. It is exemplary of his character that when Prime Minister Nakasone visited China, Hu invited him to his home, where his daughter played Mozart on the piano for their Japanese guest.

When the first major student demonstrations since 1979 broke out in 1986 and 1987, the crisis was used to call a meeting of the elder statesmen, who demanded Hu's resignation. This directly contradicted the methods prescribed in the Constitution for removing officials from office. In fact, Hu was partially responsible for the demonstrations, in the sense that he believed that public demonstrations were essential as a means of preventing the reemergence of Maoist style tyranny.

Zhao Ziyang, his supposed "fellow reformer," encouraged the purge, complaining that Hu was interfering with his push for shock therapy economic policies!

Hu remained a Politburo member, but was essentially powerless. When he died suddenly in the spring of 1989, his death intersected a mounting rage in the population over the intensifying repression and the collapsing economy. The students remembered Hu as the only leader who believed that individual freedom was essential for development, just as Wei Jingsheng had demanded democracy as the Fifth Modernization. Students and intellectuals had at that time launched a new effort to have Wei Jingsheng released, after 10 years of torture in Chinese prisons. Thus Hu's funeral served as a catalyst for the heroic mass demonstrations in Tiananmen Square which have irreversibly changed history.

It is well known that when the demonstrations were crushed on June 4, Zhao Ziyang was generally held responsible for the "counter-revolution," and removed from office. It is true that Zhao refused to support the original declaration of martial law preceding the crackdown (which had labeled the students as counter-revolutionary), much to his credit. This is considered by the regime to be Zhao's "crime," although he has not been officially charged, because his economic policies and his connections in the West are still supported by the regime. In fact, these economic policies and



Zhao Ziyang (right) speaking with Hua Guofeng in 1980, shortly after the 1976-79 "Beijing Spring" ended.

connections in the West constitute his real crimes. Were Zhao's policies to dominate a post-Deng regime, or after a Soviet-style collapse of the Chinese Communist Party, the result would be a disaster, of the sort which has begun to unfold in Poland and threatens civil war and chaos in the former Soviet Union, under the Anglo-American "shock therapy" and free trade policies.

This is further demonstrated by Zhao's embrace of the most extreme of the "shock therapy" gurus during the period between Hu Yaobang's fall in 1987 and the Tiananmen events in 1989.

Zhao's 'New Authoritarianism'

Zhao began to advocate a policy he termed the "New Authoritarianism," which argued that in the process of transforming an undeveloped country into a modern one, it would be necessary to forgo democratic freedoms and rights in order to provide the government with adequate authority to push through the often painful reforms. To justify this blatant defense of dictatorship he referred to the eminent U.S. source of the proposal: the Trilateral Commission's Samuel P. Huntington. Huntington had authored a book, entitled *Political Order in Changing Societies*. Zhao lifted the idea of a "New Authoritarianism" from the book, with a view to implementing "marketization under dictatorial auspices," in the words of one historian.

Huntington not only defended dictatorship in the Third World as a means of enforcing debt collection, but was infamous as the sponsor of the proposal for a suspension of the

Constitution in the United States, in favor of a form of fascism. In the Trilateral Commission's 1974 *The Crisis of Democracy*, Huntington wrote that the United States had allowed a decline in governmental authority due to the "separation of powers" doctrine of the U. S. Constitution, which "provides a variety of points of access to governmental decision-making for economic interest groups," such as business, farm, and labor organizations. This had to be eliminated, Huntington wrote. Because an economic crisis was emerging in the West, he argued, the "excess of democracy" meant that "the government will not possess the authority to command the resources and the sacrifices necessary to meet that threat." His proposal was labeled "fascism with a democratic face" by Lyndon LaRouche.

Zhao had Huntington's books translated and circulated widely, and the "New Authoritarianism" became a subject for general discussion. Hu Yaobang's close collaborator Ruan Ming, who had been one of the first purged for precisely his opposition to such policies, confronted Huntington on this issue years later at Harvard. Huntington weakly claimed he hadn't intended it to apply to China!

Milton Friedman's totalitarianism

The other leading advocates of "free trade" were no less open in their support for the continued strongarm methods of the Communist Party under Deng Xiaoping and Zhao Ziyang. Milton Friedman repeatedly visited China from 1981 through 1989, receiving various honors and broad circulation of his books in Chinese. His preference for the colonial days-of-old was apparent in his adulation of the British colony of Hong Kong as the perfect model of free enterprise, with no government intervention on the free flow of drug money, and no bothersome constitutional rights of the citizenry to worry about. In his meetings, including a well-publicized two-hour interview with Zhao in September 1988, "Chinese Milton" (as he was dubbed by his friends at William Buckley's *National Review*) proposed the idea of recreating the Hong Kong experience all over China. This in fact became Deng Xiaoping's slogan in expanding the Special Zones along the coast: "Build many Hong Kongs."

After the 1988 meeting with Zhao Ziyang, Friedman reported: "We have a good impression of this person and his wisdom. He has profound knowledge of economic problems and is determined to enlarge the scope of the market. He is willing to experiment and learn, and listen humbly to the suggestions and opinions of other people. *At the same time, he has, if possible, to safeguard the supreme authority of the Communist Party. Wonderful skill is needed for him to do so*" (emphasis added).

Zhao arranged for some of the young economists in the think tanks associated with him to travel to Chile, another of Milton Friedman's favorite "free economies." Chile's economy was set up by Friedman and his associates from the University of Chicago following the imposition of a military

dictatorship in 1973. As in Hong Kong and Beijing, Friedman's form of "freedom" works best under a dictatorship or overt colonialism!

George Soros and Zhao Ziyang

Another primary sponsor of Zhao's policies was George Soros, a Hungarian-born billionaire who made his money as a Wall Street speculator. Soros has been a primary promoter and financier of the Jeffrey Sachs "shock therapy" in eastern Europe, with branches of his Soros Foundation in Hungary, Ukraine, Romania, and Russia. He has promoted various schemes to open up these nations to unrestrained looting by western speculators, while opposing the reconstruction of industrial infrastructure. These schemes include a proposal for a western-sponsored Soviet central bank which would issue a new convertible ruble, allowing the old ruble to "inflate away," and an "International Management Institute" in Kiev, set up in collaboration with an executive board member of the genocidal Club of Rome.

Soros is an ardent advocate of the Alvin Toffler style of "post-industrial" economics, "chaos theory," and other New Age quackery. He describes hydroelectric dams and steel mills built under Stalin as "pyramids built by a modern pharaoh."

This same George Soros financed the "Fund for the Reform and Opening in China" with the sponsorship of Zhao Ziyang. In fact, Soros considers a primary cause of the difficulties in Russia to be the lack of "an accomplished economist" like Zhao Ziyang, with his think tank of "brilliant young intellectuals at his disposal."

The Fund for Reform and Opening in China helped "educate" some of the young economists around Zhao in radical free trade shock therapy. When Zhao was purged during the Tiananmen Square demonstrations in 1989, the fund was also shut down, amidst accusations of CIA connections. Soros is now trying to redeem his good name with Deng Xiaoping, according to his office in New York.

Kissinger, again

Kissinger's admiration for dictatorship in China was not limited to the policy of keeping the population backward in order to hold labor costs close to zero. Perhaps even more important is his belief that the nations of the Third World should follow the model of China's brutal population control policies, including emphatically the use of coercion and force to deal with uncooperative families who resist the "one child only" policy.

This was made explicit in the "First Annual Report on U.S. International Population Policy," prepared by the National Security Council under Henry Kissinger in May 1976, which argued that population growth in non-white nations of the world constituted a national security threat to the United States. The report describes an "ideal program," which, without acknowledging it, is a virtual text book copy of the Chi-

nese coercive birth control program under Mao, and continued under Deng.

One of the books popularized during the 1970s and '80s in order to support this policy was the fraudulent *Limits to Growth*, published by the malthusian Club of Rome. The book used blatantly false statistics and incompetent computer models to "prove" that the emerging global depression was not due to bad economic and financial policies, but was due entirely to population growth and to industrial progress itself. As many as a million copies of this book in Chinese were circulated, advocating the intentional forced contraction in food production, industrial development, and population growth.

Such filth provided "theoretical" justification for the Chinese one-child policy, which has become even more coercive under Deng Xiaoping's years in power. Zhao Ziyang, among others, went beyond the demand for forced population control, advocating Nazi-style eugenics to "improve the quality of the population." This has led to the mass sterilization of those considered not genetically pure.

Some of Hu Yaobang's collaborators rightly viewed the Club of Rome as the enemy of civilization. For himself, Hu argued that the size of the population would not be a problem if the educational level of the entire nation were raised dramatically.

Eurasian development?

The discredited leaders of the bankrupt American and British economies are desperately attempting to control the process of transformation taking place in the liberated ex-communist nations of Eurasia. Their purpose is to prevent an economic alliance of Eurasian nations based on the scientific and cultural policies developed during the Christian Renaissance in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, which they know would threaten their continued domination over the emerging new world order. Their method is free trade shock therapy, threats, and war. Its practitioners, upon inspection, are the same individuals who supported Deng Xiaoping in crushing the impulse of freedom in China again and again.

Today the Zhao Ziyang program for "marketization under dictatorial policies," as developed by Kissinger and his associates, is being carried out without Zhao himself in command, although he is still in the wings. Li Peng, who carried out Deng's order to fire on the students at Tiananmen, and who has been portrayed as the opponent of Zhao's economic reform policies, is now proudly promoting them! Rumors of Zhao's "rehabilitation" are increasingly more frequent.

The economic and cultural consequences of these policies threaten a new holocaust on the Chinese people. Those who are committed to the true liberation of China would do well to support the effort to win the battle for freedom in Europe against the practitioners of the shock therapy, and create the conditions for uniting East and West in an era of true development.