

## Clinton's China trip: a triumph, with tragic flaws

by Jonathan Tennenbaum

Were the world not now teetering on the edge of an unprecedented financial and economic catastrophe, and were it not for the fact that U.S. President Clinton has so far failed to address that life-or-death crisis in a really serious way, we would be among the most enthusiastic in applauding Clinton's visit as an historical breakthrough and one of the most brilliant successes of Presidential diplomacy in recent memory. Despite an incredible intensity of attacks against him in the United States (attacks that put even the visit itself into question), Clinton has managed to neutralize much of the anti-China hysteria whipped up by the media and to achieve a very significant improvement in the entire climate of U.S.-China relations, which he correctly views as key to the future of the world in the 21st century. With his talented and statesman-like performance, Clinton towered over his opponents and critics in Washington, showing them to be intellectual midguts, whose hysterical anti-China posturing and vicious intrigues are directly contrary to the most vital interests of the United States.

Unfortunately, history will judge Clinton's China trip not only by his good intentions and the good things he did there, but also by the things he did *not* do, or did wrong, in his tragic adherence to a "globalist agenda" that has brought the world to the edge of Hell. Above all, Clinton missed the historic opportunity to engage China as a key ally of the United States in a "New Bretton Woods" policy to reorganize the bankrupt, collapsing international financial system. That unique opportunity had been amply set forth by Lyndon LaRouche, and built up through the intervention of LaRouche's associates, and of Helga Zepp-LaRouche personally, who had campaigned in China for U.S.-Chinese cooperation for a New Bretton Woods policy and warned the Chinese of the impending Asian financial crisis back in September last year. At the

same time, according to all available indications, Clinton did not take any significant initiative in the direction of the Eurasian Land-Bridge development program, which is absolutely indispensable to the future of the entire Asian region.

In a recent comment, Lyndon LaRouche summarized the problem as follows: "It is very clear that so far, Clinton is not willing to understand the nature of the global crisis, that he is not only not willing to take the risk of taking on the international monetarist gang, but that he refuses to recognize that some of the policies he is pushing, in the name of the strategic partnership with China, are exactly those policies which will lead to his own doom."

### Positive elements

There is no doubt that Clinton's intervention has succeeded — at least for the time being — in positively transforming the entire climate surrounding U.S.-China relations, from the top elites down to the ordinary people of both countries.

On the Western side, the fact that the U.S. President could repeatedly appear live and uncensored on Chinese national television, speaking openly and sometimes undiplomatically about supposedly forbidden subjects such as human rights, Tibet, and so on, and even debating China's top leaders in front of their nation, has broken the lingering stereotype of China as a paranoid police state whose leaders cannot tolerate free discussion. More important still, Americans and others have been given a brief, but significant glimpse into the fundamental reality of today's China which the Western mass media had up to now largely concealed from them: a society undergoing rapid *change*, in which economic development has created real improvements in the lives of most people and a general climate of optimism of a sort not experienced in the West since the 1960s.



*President Clinton greets villagers in Xiahe, China, on June 26.*

However useful this little bit of “culture shock” afforded to U.S. television viewers and others by a glimpse of China’s gigantic nation-building effort might be, it is nothing compared to the impact of actually visiting the country. And, Clinton himself, who has clearly taken a personal interest in China and Chinese history and culture, and who had prepared himself well for the trip, was visibly impressed and probably also surprised by some of the things he saw and experienced.

Among other things, the President may have gained a valuable lesson in the importance of basic economic infrastructure. According to White House press statements, Chinese Premier Zhu Rongji briefed Clinton and Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin in detail about China’s policy of expanded investment into new railroads, roads, bridges, power plants, and other basic infrastructure to promote real economic growth—a policy sometimes referred to as the “Chinese New Deal.” Clinton and Rubin apparently responded positively, and it was decided that by next year, U.S. Commerce Secretary William Daley will bring a delegation of U.S. businessmen and representatives of Federal agencies to investigate perspectives for U.S. participation in China’s infrastructure development. Clinton himself, on a live radio talk-show in Shanghai (which he described as “one of the very most exciting places in the entire world”), called for China to “be much

more disciplined than we were, about making sure you have good, high-quality mass transit systems,” avoiding the decline of the cities and the wasteful overreliance on personal automobiles in the United States and other countries. (One might hope, that by the same token, Clinton will do more to support urgently needed infrastructure reconstruction in the United States itself!)

A positive signal, appreciated by the Chinese side, was Clinton’s unequivocal public affirmation of the One-China policy of the United States. Clinton stated clearly, that U.S. policy is for a peaceful reunification of Taiwan with the mainland, and that the U.S. recognizes the so-called “Three No’s”: no two Chinas, no support for Taiwan independence, and no support for Taiwan’s membership in international organizations involving statehood. Clinton correctly pointed out that these are not new policies, but represent the long-standing position of the United States. But, as one Chinese observer remarked, the U.S. administration had many times affirmed these same principles in high-level discussion, but they had never been stated so clearly in public, and certainly not for a nationwide audience in China itself.

The agreement by both sides, to suspend targetting of their nuclear missiles toward each other, while of minor military significance, is symbolic of a new relationship freed from the vestiges of Maoist fanaticism and the Cold War.



*President Bill Clinton and President Jiang Zemin at the State Banquet in the Great Hall of the People in Beijing, on June 27.*

Apart from such political elements, much has been made of the “human angle” of Clinton’s visit, for example, the extraordinarily friendly, open, and relaxed atmosphere of interaction between the young President and his wife, and all sorts of Chinese people. Chinese observers, though, emphasize Clinton’s televised appearance at the elite Beijing University (known in China as “Bei Da”) as a unique singularity in the trip, which has created a sensation in the country. On this occasion, Bei Da students threw some very sharp and critical questions at the U.S. President, showing to the world that the new generation of Chinese intellectuals are patriotic and independent-minded, and are not going to dance to anybody’s tune.

### **Exposing the hypocrisy of the ‘human rights campaign’**

At various points during the trip, Clinton clearly broke the rules of Western media-enforced “political correctness,” to acknowledge some basic truths, often raised by people

in China, but which have been virtually ignored in the Western press.

Most important, Clinton repeatedly and publicly acknowledged the simple truth, that China’s successful economic development, which, as he said, “has lifted hundreds of millions from poverty,” has de facto greatly improved the human rights of the Chinese population.

In another significant break with anti-China hysteria, Clinton publicly voiced a high regard for the quality of China’s leadership, particularly Jiang Zemin and Zhu Rongji, and acknowledged the legitimacy of Chinese leaders’ concern that China’s development not be disrupted by political instability in the country. While strongly criticizing the Chinese government’s actions in Tiananmen in 1989, Clinton distanced himself clearly from those who only use the cry of “democracy and human rights” as a pretext to whip up anti-China sentiment, or worse, to try to destabilize China. Instead, he argued that future development of a healthy democratic-representative system should be a way to enhance, and not weaken, the stability and economic strength of China.

During his trip, Clinton spoke passionately of the virtues of democracy and the American Founding Fathers’ ideal of “life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.” Making this a central

theme of his whole visit, was obviously not just a concession to the—admittedly massive—pressure from the neo-conservatives and media-orchestrated “public opinion” in the United States. It is clear that Clinton sincerely wants to be an historic instrument for bringing China and the United States closer together in a positive sense, and helping China to realize what he sees as the highest and most universal political ideals.

When asked by a reporter at the end of the trip, if he thought democracy would ever come to China, Clinton responded enthusiastically, “Oh yes!” and expressed his enthusiasm at the enormous strides made by China in that direction. Earlier, in his speech at Beijing University, Clinton had declared, “Over the past four days, I have seen freedom in many manifestations in China. . . . I have visited a village that chose its own leaders in free elections. . . . I’ve heard people speak their minds and I have joined people in prayer in the faith of my own choosing. In all these ways I felt a steady breeze of freedom.” At the same time, Clinton re-

flected the justifiable objections in China and elsewhere, against ultraliberal notions of “pure individual freedom” which destroy morality and run counter to the well-being of society as a whole.

In stressing these points, and responding with seriousness to the arguments of his Chinese interlocutors, Clinton has dispelled some of the ugly stench of British-style, neo-colonial hypocrisy which exudes from the press and political circles in U.S. and other Western countries on the topic of so-called “democracy and human rights” in developing countries. That attitude is deeply resented in China, not only by its leaders, but also by its young people and intellectuals—as Clinton experienced first-hand in his meeting at Beijing University and elsewhere.

At the same time, without wanting to cast doubts on Clinton’s good intentions, we must admit that his statements on some crucial points were not entirely truthful. While acknowledging that the Chinese government’s policy of sovereign national-economic development and reform has dramatically improved the real human rights of the Chinese population, Clinton failed to mention the other side of the coin: Namely, that the lives of hundreds of millions of people in Southeast Asia, Russia, and countless other nations, are right now being destroyed as a result of the very same policies of radical free trade and financial globalization, *which Clinton himself repeatedly endorsed* during his visit.

As a result, informed Chinese are asking, and justifiably so: If Clinton is really serious about working for the well-being of nations, then why doesn’t he do something about George Soros and other international speculative interests, who have played a key role in destabilizing the economies of entire nations and throwing them into poverty and social chaos? If Clinton wants to be trusted in his campaign for freedom and democracy, why doesn’t he do something about the dirty destabilization operations which the British and the George Bush-linked “Project Democracy” apparatus in the United States routinely run throughout the world under the cover of so-called “democracy”? Operations for which Soros is a major sponsor. These include long-standing British-intelligence networks around Tibet’s Dalai Lama, whom Clinton regrettably chose to promote during his trip to China.

Then there is the most sensitive, tell-tale issue of all: Why does the Clinton administration, while campaigning for freedom, democracy, and the rule of law around the world, do nothing to end the rampant police-state practices within the U.S. government’s own Department of Justice, including the blatantly political prosecution of Lyndon LaRouche and his collaborators, some of whom are still in prison today?

### **Building on quicksand: the globalist agenda**

Unfortunately, the main *programmatic content* of what the Clinton administration proposes as a basis for a new strategic partnership with China, is flawed to the point of being

downright suicidal for both countries and for the world as a whole.

Instead of attacking the International Monetary Fund as a total failure and major cause of the world financial crisis, Clinton pledged that the United States and China would “work through the IMF” to solve the Asian financial crisis. Rather than denouncing “free trade” as a disaster, Clinton still called for China to accede to “strong conditions” for entry into the World Trade Organization, by radically opening up its markets. Fortunately, China has this time once again resisted ill-advised administration pressure for radical liberalization of its markets as a condition for WTO membership—a step which, if taken, would disastrously undermine the very economic and social stability of China, which U.S. long-term strategy now urgently depends on. While, Clinton finally acknowledged some of the reasons why Chinese leaders *must* resist “free trade,” his comments on the financial crisis otherwise revealed no serious understanding of the nature, causes, and deadly consequences of the threat it now poses to the entire world.

A second top agenda item pushed by the U.S. side was “environmental protection,” particularly control of carbon dioxide emissions, on the grounds of the completely unproven, pseudo-scientific theory of “global warming.” Unless accomplished through a massive expansion of nuclear energy—something which the Clinton administration has so far shown no serious signs of supporting—such a policy would impose ruinous costs on the Chinese and other developing economies. A third major agenda item from the American side was to integrate China fully into the so-called “global non-proliferation regime,” which effectively denies access by the majority of developing countries to advanced, so-called dual-use technologies, and imposes a discriminatory regime of “technological apartheid.” There was also an ill-advised attempt, under the guise of proposed cooperation to control the threat of a nuclear weapons race in South Asia, to draw China into a position which would immediately be seen in India as meddling in its vital affairs, and could needlessly aggravate the problems between Asia’s most populous nations.

I do not mean to blame Clinton personally for all the details of these ill-advised policies. We must admit the theoretical possibility, at least, that some confidential understandings were reached, for example, among Clinton, Rubin, and Zhu Rongji, which go in a more positive direction. But the drift of Clinton’s public positions, bespeaks a disastrous commitment to “crisis management” via supranational institutions; a policy which not only cannot possibly work, but also would mean the destruction of China and the United States as sovereign nations. Clinton evidently doesn’t realize, that he is thereby adopting the agenda of his own worst enemies, and that the destruction of the institution of the U.S. Presidency—which is the immediate goal of the campaign of scandals and legal attacks against Clinton in the United States—is ultimately an inseparable feature of the same globalist agenda

which Clinton himself has been promoting in China and elsewhere.

It is relevant to note, that in the weeks leading up to Clinton's trip, while "crazies" in the U.S. Congress and around independent counsel Kenneth Starr went wild in their attempt to sabotage the China visit, Clinton's more insidious enemies, like Sir Henry Kissinger, Alexander Haig, and Brent Scowcroft, as well as Zbigniew Brzezinski, came out strongly in favor of a new U.S. relationship with China as the absolute cornerstone of "globalist" geopolitical strategy. One might ask: Has the administration gone for a rotten compromise in the search for support of its China policy?

In the coming days and weeks, the reality of the global financial and strategic crisis will assert itself with relentless force. We would hope that Clinton and others will take Lyndon LaRouche's words to heart, and drop the rotten consensus policies which have so far prevented the administration from dealing effectively with the existential crisis facing the world. If so, the positive elements of what Clinton has accomplished in China can be mobilized in support of the most urgent task, to save the world economy by a New Bretton Woods agreement in the immediate period ahead.

---

## Documentation

---

# President Clinton's dialogue with China

**Excerpts from the joint press conference of Presidents Bill Clinton and Jiang Zemin on June 27, in the Great Hall of the People in Beijing. The conference was televised live on Chinese national television:**

**President Jiang:** Ladies and gentlemen, just now I've held official talks with President Clinton. The two sides have held an extensive and in-depth exchange of views on China-U.S. relations and the major international and regional issues. The talks were positive, constructive, and productive.

The successful exchange of visits between the two heads of state of China and the United States marks a new stage of growth for China-U.S. relations. This not only serves the common interests of China and the United States, but also will be of important significance to promoting peace, stability, and prosperity in the Asia Pacific and the world at large.

Peace and development are the main themes of contemporary times. In the new historical conditions, the common interests between China and the United States are increasing, not decreasing. The foundation for cooperation between the two countries is reinforcing, not weakening. . . .

President Clinton and I have decided that China and the United States will not target the strategic nuclear weapons under their respective control at each other. This demonstrates to the entire world that China and the United States are partners, not adversaries. . . .

President Clinton and I have reached a broad range of agreements and consensus on further increasing exchanges in cooperation between China and the United States in all areas in our bilateral relations. We have agreed to take positive steps to promote the growth of the mutually beneficial economic cooperation and trade between China and the United States, and to expand the exchanges and the cooperation between the two countries in the energy, environment, scientific, educational, cultural, health, legal, and the military fields; and also to enhance the people-to-people exchanges and friendship. . . .

As China and the United States have different social systems, ideologies, values, and culture traditions, we have some difference of views on certain issues. However, they should not become the obstacles in the way of the growth of China-U.S. relations. The world is a colorful one. The development paths of the countries in the world should be chosen by the people of the countries concerned. . . .

I believe that through the concerted efforts of both sides, we will make constant progress in the direction of building a constructive, strategic partnership between China and the United States oriented toward the 21st century.

**President Clinton:** . . . Over the past five years, President Jiang and I have met seven times. Mr. President, your leadership is helping us to transform our nations' relationship for the future. Clearly, a stable, open, prosperous China, shouldering its responsibilities for a safer world, is good for America. . . .

I reaffirmed our long-standing One-China policy to President Jiang and urged the pursuit of cross-strait discussions recently resumed as the best path to a peaceful resolution. In a similar vein, I urged President Jiang to assume a dialogue with the Dalai Lama in return for the recognition that Tibet is a part of China and in recognition of the unique cultural and religious heritage of that region. . . .

It is well known that the principal area of our difference in recent years has been over human rights questions. America recognizes and applauds China's economic and social transformation, which has expanded the rights of its citizens by lifting hundreds of millions from poverty, providing them greater access to information, giving them village elections, greater freedom to travel and to choose their own jobs, and better education for their children.

As I said again to President Jiang, we Americans also firmly believe that individual rights, including the freedom of speech, association, and religion are very important, not only to those who exercise them, but also to nations whose success in the 21st century depends upon widespread indi-

vidual knowledge, creativity, free exchange, and enterprise. . . .

Earlier this morning, during my official welcome, I could hear and see the many echoes of China's past and the call of its promising future, for Tiananmen Square is an historical place. There, 100 years ago, China's quest for constitutional government was born. There, in 1919, young people rallied against foreign occupation and launched a powerful movement for China's political and cultural renewal. There, in 1976, public mourning for Zhou Enlai led to the Cultural Revolution's end and the beginning of your remarkable transformation. And there, nine years ago, Chinese citizens of all ages raised their voices for democracy.

For all of our agreements, we still disagree about the meaning of what happened then. I believe, and the American people believe, that the use of force and the tragic loss of life was wrong. . . .

The question for us now is how shall we deal with such disagreements and still succeed in the important work of deepening our friendship and our sense of mutual respect.

First, we Americans must acknowledge the painful moments in our own history when fundamental human rights were denied. We must say that we know, still, we have to continue our work to advance the dignity and freedom and equality of our own people. And, second, we must understand and respect the enormous challenges China has faced in trying to move forward against great odds with a clear memory of the setbacks suffered in past periods of instability. . . .

*Response to a questioner, asking about the Chinese position on human rights:*

**President Jiang:** China and the United States have differences of views and also have common ground on the human rights issue. More than 2,000 years ago, a great thinker of China's Han Dynasty, Dong Zhongshu, once said, "Of all the living things nurtured between Heaven and the Earth, the most valuable is human beings." So the Chinese nation always respects and maintains the dignity and rights of the people. Today the Chinese government solemnly commits itself to the promotion and the protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

The United States is the most developed country in the world, with a per-capita GDP approaching \$30,000 U.S. dollars, while China is a developing country with a population of 1.2 billion, with a per-capita GDP of less than \$700 U.S. dollars. As the two countries differ in social system, ideology, historical tradition, and cultural background, the two countries have different means and ways in realizing human rights and fundamental freedoms. So it's nothing strange that we may have some difference of views over some issues.

China stresses that the top priority should be given to the right to subsistence and the right to development. Meanwhile, efforts should be made to strengthen democracy and the legal

system building, and to protect the economic, social, cultural, civil and the political rights of the people.

I listened very carefully to what President Clinton said just now, and I noticed that he made mention of the political disturbances that happened in Tiananmen in 1989, and he also told the history of Tiananmen and told of the things that happened in Tiananmen.

With regard to the political disturbances in 1989, the Chinese people have long drawn a historical conclusion. During my visit to the United States last year and also on many international occasions, I have stated our position that with regard to the political disturbances in 1989, had the Chinese government not taken the resolute measures, then we could not have enjoyed the stability that we are enjoying today. . . .

In the two decades since the reform and opening up program was started, the National People's Congress of China has adopted more than 320 laws and acts, thus, constantly strengthening the legal protection of the democracy, fundamental freedoms, and the various rights enjoyed by the Chinese people. Over the past two decades, another 200 million people in China were lifted out of poverty.

No country's human rights situation is perfect. Since the founding of new China, the fundamental changes and the tremendous achievements that have been achieved, that have been scored in the human rights conditions in China are for all to see. . . .

**President Clinton:** I would like to add a comment. First of all, I think this debate and discussion today has been a healthy thing and a good thing. Secondly, I think to understand the priority that each country attaches to its own interpretation of this issue of human rights, you have to understand something of our history. . . . So I am trying to have a dialogue here that will enable both of us to move forward so that the Chinese people will get the best possible result. . . .

**Excerpts from a speech and questions and answers to students of Beijing University, June 29:**

**President Clinton:** . . . As I'm sure all of you know, this campus was once home to Yenching University, which was founded by American missionaries. . . . We feel a special kinship with you. . . .

Over the last 100 years, this university has grown to more than 20,000 students. Your graduates are spread throughout China and around the world. You have built the largest university library in all of Asia. Last year, 20% of your graduates went abroad to study, including half of your math and science majors. At the dawn of a new century, this university is leading China into the future. . . .

Just three decades ago, China was virtually shut off from the world. Now, China is a member of more than 1,000 international organizations—enterprises that affect everything from air travel to agricultural development. You have opened your nation to trade and investment on a large scale. Today,

40,000 young Chinese study in the United States, with hundreds of thousands more learning in Asia, Africa, Europe, and Latin America.

Your social and economic transformation has been even more remarkable, moving from a closed command economic system to a driving, increasingly market-based and -driven economy, generating two decades of unprecedented growth, giving people greater freedom to travel within and outside China, to vote in village elections, to own a home, choose a job, attend a better school. As a result, you have lifted literally hundreds of millions of people from poverty. Per-capita income has more than doubled in the last decade. Most Chinese people are leading lives they could not have imagined just 20 years ago. . . .

As you build a new China, America wants to build a new relationship with you. We want China to be successful, secure, and open, working with us for a more peaceful and prosperous world. I know there are those in China and the United States who question whether closer relations between our countries is a good thing. But everything all of us know about the way the world is changing and the challenges your generation will face tells us that our two nations will be far better off working together than apart.

The late Deng Xiaoping counseled us to seek truth from facts. At the dawn of the new century, the facts are clear. The distance between our two nations, indeed, between any nations, is shrinking. Where once an American clipper ship took months to cross from China to the United States, today, technology has made us all virtual neighbors. . . .

From the windows of the White House, where I live in Washington, D.C., the monument to our first President, George Washington, dominates the skyline. It is a very tall obelisk. But very near this large monument there is a small stone which contains these words: "The United States neither established titles of nobility and royalty, nor created a hereditary system. . . ."

This created a new political situation, unprecedented from ancient times to the present. How wonderful it is. Those words were not written by an American; they were written by Xu Jiyu, Governor of Fujian Province, inscribed as a gift from the government of China to our nation in 1853.

I am very grateful for that gift from China. It goes to the heart of who we are as a people—the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, the freedom to debate, to dissent, to associate, to worship without interference from the state. These are the ideals that were at the core of our founding over 220 years ago. These are the ideas that led us across our continent and onto the world stage. . . .

In China, you have made extraordinary strides in nurturing that liberty, and spreading freedom from want, to be a source of strength to your people. Incomes are up, poverty is down; people do have more choices of jobs, and the ability to travel—the ability to make a better life. . . .

The question is, where do we go from here? How do we

work together to be on the right side of history together? More than 50 years ago, Hu Shi, one of your great political thinkers and a teacher at this university, said these words: "Now some people say to me you must sacrifice your individual freedom so that the nation may be free. But I reply, the struggle for individual freedom is the struggle for the nation's freedom. The struggle for your own character is the struggle for the nation's character." We Americans believe Hu Shi was right. . . .

One of our founding fathers, Benjamin Franklin, once said, "Our critics are our friends, for they show us our faults." Now, if that is true, there are many days in the United States when the President has more friends than anyone else in America. [Laughter.] But it is so. . . .

The new century is upon us. All our sights are turned toward the future. Now your country has known more millennia than the United States has known centuries. Today, however, China is as young as any nation on Earth. This new century can be the dawn of a new China, proud of your ancient greatness, proud of what you are doing, prouder still of the tomorrows to come. It can be a time when the world again looks to China for the vigor of its culture, the freshness of its thinking, the elevation of human dignity that is apparent in its works. It can be a time when the oldest of nations helps to make a new world.

The United States wants to work with you to make that time a reality.

**Q:** Mr. President . . . in our view, since China is opening up in reform, we have had better understanding of the culture, history, and literature of America. . . . But it seems that the American people's understanding of the Chinese people is not as much as the other way around. . . . So my question is, as the first President of the United States visiting China in 10 years, what do you plan to do to enhance the real understanding and the respect between our two peoples?

**President Clinton:** First of all, I think that's a very good point. And one of the reasons that I came here was to try to—because, as you can see, a few people come with me from the news media—I hope that my trip would help to show a full and balanced picture of modern China to the United States, and that by coming here, it would encourage others to come here and others to participate in the life of China. . . .

I think there is no easy answer to your question. It's something we have to work at. We just need more people involved and more kinds of contacts. And I think the more we can do that, the better. . . .

**Q:** Mr. President, as a Chinese, I'm very interested in the reunification of my motherland. Since 1972, progress has been made on the question of Taiwan, but we have seen that the Americans repeatedly are selling advanced weapons to Taiwan. And to our great indignation, we have seen that the United States and Japan have renewed the U.S.-Japan security

treaty. And, according to some Japanese officials, this treaty even includes Taiwan Province of China. So I have to ask, if China were to send . . . missiles to Hawaii, and if China were to sign a security treaty with other countries against one part of the United States, will the United States agree to such an act; will the American people agree to such an act? [Applause.]

**President Clinton:** First of all, the United States policy is not an obstacle to the peaceful reunification of China and Taiwan. Our policy is embodied in the three communiqués and in the Taiwan Relations Act. Our country recognized China and embraced a One-China policy almost 20 years ago. And I reaffirmed our One-China policy to President Jiang in our meetings.

Now, when the United States and China reached agreement that we would have a One-China policy, we also reached agreement that the reunification would occur by peaceful means, and we have encouraged the cross-strait dialogue to achieve that. Our policy is that any weapon sales, therefore, to Taiwan, must be for defensive purposes only, and that the country must not believe—China must not believe—that we are in any way trying to undermine our own One-China policy. It is our policy. But we do believe it should occur—any reunification should occur peacefully.

Now, on Japan, if you read the security agreement we signed with Japan, I think it will be clear from its terms that the agreement is not directed against any country, but rather in support of stability in Asia. . . . I believe that it is not fair to say that either Japan or the United States has a security relationship that is designed to contain China. Indeed, what both countries want is a security partnership with China for the 21st century.

**Q:** Mr. President, with regard to the question of democracy, human rights, and freedom, actually this is an issue of great interest to both the Chinese and American peoples. But, to be honest, our two countries have some differences over these issues. In your address just now, you made a very proud review and retrospection of the history of the American democracy in human rights. And you have also made some suggestions for China. Of course, for the sincere suggestions, we welcome. But I think I recall one saying, that is we should have both criticism and self-criticism. So, now I'd like to ask you a question: Do you think that in the United States today, there are also some problems in the area of democracy, freedom, and human rights, and what your government has done in improving the situation? [Applause.]

**President Clinton:** I do, and, first of all, let me say, I never raise this question overseas in any country, not just China, without acknowledging first, that our country has had terrible problems in this area—keep in mind, slavery was legal in America for many years—and that we are still not perfect. I always say that, because I don't think it's right for any person to claim that he or she lives in a perfect country.

We're all struggling toward ideals to live a better life. So I agree with the general point you made. . . .

**Q:** Mr. President, . . . I don't think the individual freedom and the collective freedom will contradict each other. But in China the prosperous development of the nation is actually the free choice of our people, and it's also the result of their efforts. So I think that freedom, real freedom, should mean for the people to freely choose the way of life they like and also to develop. And I also think that only those who can really respect the freedom of others can really say that they understand what freedom means. [Applause.]

I don't know whether you agree with me or not.

**President Clinton:** First of all, if you believe in freedom, you have to respect the freedom of others to make another choice. And even societies that have rather radical views of individual freedom recognize limits on that freedom when it interferes with preserving other people's rights. . . . People have the freedom to choose and you have to respect other people's freedom and they have the right to make decisions that are different from yours. And there will never be a time when our systems and our cultures and our choices will be completely identical. That's one of the things that makes life interesting.

#### **President Clinton on Shanghai Radio, June 30:**

*While in Shanghai, President Clinton and Mayor Xu of Shanghai were guests on a popular radio talk show. A very informal and lively discussion developed, with questions from callers. Here are Clinton's opening remarks and a few excerpts from the discussion:*

**President Clinton:** First of all, I want to thank the Mayor for welcoming me to Shanghai, and say I very much enjoyed my first morning here. We did go to the library, my wife and I did, and we met with a number of citizens from in and around Shanghai who are involved in one way or another in China's remarkable transformation. And they helped us a lot to understand what is going on in China. I also want to say a word of appreciation to President Jiang for the very good meeting we had in Beijing and for making it possible for me to reach out to the people of China through televising our press conference together, and then, of course, I went to Beijing University yesterday, Bei Da, and spoke with the students there and answered questions. And that was also televised. And then to be here in Shanghai, one of the very most exciting places in the entire world, to have the chance to begin my visit here with this radio program is very exciting. So I don't want to take any more time. I just want to hear from the questioners and to have a conversation so that when it's over, perhaps, both the American people and the people of China will understand each other better.

*Taking off from Clinton's visit to the Shanghai library, there was a lively back-and-forth between Clinton, Shang-*



hai's Mayor Xu, and callers, on the importance of education and the possibilities of modern communications technology. Toward the end, the moderator remarked that many people are hesitant to invest in education, because it is a slow process, whereas business investments give quick profits.

**President Clinton:** Well, it is a long payback period, but it has the highest payback of any investment. If you invest in a child's education—maybe they're five years old when they start, and maybe they're in their early 20s when they get out of university—that's a long time. And you have to hire all these teachers along the way and pay for all the laboratory facilities and all that. But there's nothing more important. And then the young person gets out into world in which ideas create wealth and gives back to society many times over. So people shouldn't look at it just as one person investing in another; it ought to be China investing in its future, the United States investing in its future, together investing in a peaceful, stable, prosperous world. Education, ideas, information—they give us the capacity to lift people out of poverty and to lift people out of the ignorance that make them fight and kill each other. . . . Yes, it takes a long time to pay out in the life of one child. But the payouts for a country are almost immediate.

*To a Chinese caller's question on the traffic and pollution problem caused by the increase in cars in Shanghai:*

## LAROCHE ON THE NEW BRETTON WOODS

"The present fatally ill global financial and monetary system must be radically reorganized. It can not be reformed, it must be reorganized. This must be done in the manner of a reorganization in bankruptcy, conducted under the authority not of international institutions, but of sovereign governments."

A 90-minute videotape with excerpts from a speech by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. given on March 18, 1998.

**\$35** postpaid  
Order number  
EIE 98-002

EIRNewsService  
P.O. Box 17390,  
Washington, D.C.  
20041-0390

To order, call  
**1-888-EIR-3258**  
(toll-free).

We accept Visa or MasterCard.

**Shanghai Mayor Xu:** . . . We are often debating this issue when we talk about traffic in the city, because there are 13 million people in the city of Shanghai and it is very, very densely populated. So our basic policy is to develop the public transportation system—that's our priority—like the subway system, buses, all these types of public transportation. . . . We didn't encourage people to buy, private citizens to buy cars. We just relaxed the regulations on and the restrictions on individuals buying cars. . . . As the Mayor, I'm also afraid of there being too many cars. . . .

**President Clinton:** . . . I once told President Jiang, I said, my biggest concern is that China will get rich in exactly the same way America got rich, but you have four times as many people, so no one will be able to breathe, because the air pollution will be bad. . . . I think, for one thing, you should be much more disciplined than we were about making sure you have good, high-quality mass transit, because in the cities where we have good mass transit, people use it. So, if you have good mass transit, then I think people should be free to have cars, and it's a nice thing to have, but they won't have to drive them so much and you won't have the pollution problems. . . .

**Clinton on Jiang Zemin, from his press conference in Hong Kong, July 3:**

**President Clinton:** I have a very high regard for his abilities. I remember not so many years ago, the conventional wisdom was that he might be a transitional figure. And after I met with him the first time I felt very strongly that his chances of becoming the leader of China for a sustained period were quite good, because he's a man of extraordinary intellect, very high energy, a lot of vigor for his age, or indeed for any age. And I think he has a quality that is profoundly important at this moment in our history, when there's so much change going on.

He has a good imagination. He has vision; he can visualize; he can imagine a future that is different from the present. And he has, I think, a very able partner in Premier Zhu Rongji, who has enormous technical competence and almost legendary distaste for stalling and bureaucracy and just staying in the same path—if it's not working. So, my view is that the potential we have for a strategic partnership is quite strong. . . .

So, I believe that there's a very good chance that China has the right leadership at the right time, and that they understand the daunting, massive nature of the challenges they face. They want us to understand that there is much more personal freedom now, in a practical sense, for most Chinese than there was when President Nixon came here over 10 years ago. But I think they understand that this is an unfolding process and they have to keep going.

. . . The Chinese leaders, I've always been impressed, have an enormous sense of history and they're always looking for parallels and for differences. It's a wise thing. Our people need to understand more of our own history. . . .