

China reacts to Pacific destabilization; it's time to restore Sino-U.S. good faith

by Mary Burdman

Loonies in the U.S. Congress, led by troglodyte U.S. Sen. Jesse Helms (R-N.C.), and treasonous networks in the U.S. military and intelligence establishment linked to British geopoliticians and former President George Bush, are running amok in the Pacific. This crew is trying to set up situations so fraught with tension, that China and other Asian nations could be drawn into a confrontationist mode against the United States—a disaster for all sides.

In this context, the assertion of “state-to-state” relations between China and Taiwan made by Taiwan’s President Lee Teng-hui on July 9, was the political equivalent of a terrorist bombing, aimed at raising the stakes in cross-strait relations so as to try to *force* a wholly unnecessary conflict. Lee Teng-hui’s provocation was made amidst an ongoing shift of U.S.-Japanese military relations, seen in China, Russia, and other nations of the Pacific as the East Asian flank of NATO’s expansion into eastern Europe, the Balkans, and toward Central Asia. In the past months, the Japanese Diet (parliament) has ratified the new U.S.-Japanese Defense Guidelines, the United States and Japan agreed to joint research on Theater Missile Defense (TMD), and U.S., Japanese, and South Korean forces carried out massive military maneuvers in the northeast Pacific during the first weeks of August. The latest provocation came on Sept. 5, when members of the Japanese group Seinensha landed on Diaoyu Island, an uninhabited Chinese territory claimed by Japanese right-wingers.

Helms and the Bush crowd are the instruments of the fanatical British-American-Commonwealth (BAC) oligarchy, which is facing the near-term prospect of an “end-game” collapse of their financial system, and is desperately trying to stop the consolidation of an alternative economic-financial policy centered around China and other nations, at the risk of igniting world war.

A very well-informed European source told *EIR* that, at a conference in Northern Virginia this summer, an admiral of the U.S. Navy made the claim that the United States must now prepare for a war against China within the next six to ten years.

On Aug. 31, the *Australian Financial Review* published an interview with Richard Armitage, formerly Assistant Secretary of Defense in the Bush administration and now a top adviser to George W. Bush’s bid for the Presidential nomination, said that Australia must stand ready to give military

support to the United States, if Washington goes to war with China (see *National News*).

The gravest danger in the Pacific is the potential for miscalculation, if the region’s nations fail to prepare for the *civilizational* crisis looming in the coming world financial crash. The danger is that these nations underestimate the strategic insanity of the British-American-Commonwealth axis, which is determined to preserve its dominant international power even after the system goes.

Right now, the Congressional and military/intelligence crazies, whose policies have nothing to do with the true interests of the United States, are trying to destroy what remains of President Clinton’s efforts to create a strategic relationship with China. They are trying to provoke China into abandoning its aim to create a peaceful international environment, to make essential economic construction possible. The BAC aim is to try to get China to abandon its long-term national policy, and go into an expansionist reaction, which would “justify” their war plans. Japan was lured into such disastrous expansionism earlier this century; but it is not likely that such a strategy would now work with China.

Already in November 1996, *EIR* founder Lyndon LaRouche warned that the operations of the British-allied forces in the United States and Japan, risked war in the Pacific.

However, whether Helms and crew will succeed in their aims, is a real question. As one Chinese observer has commented, East Asia is not the Balkans; there is a limit to how far the nations of the region will be willing to commit economic and political suicide at the behest of outside geopolitical interests. A remarkable commentary by former Japanese Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone published on Aug. 21 reflects awareness of the orchestrated nature of the situation in northeast Asia, as well as the vital dangers it presents (see box).

Stern warnings

The operations led by the Helms-Bush mob have provoked some violently worded attacks from China, on what is being taken as “U.S. policy.” On Aug. 20, China’s largest-circulation weekly magazine, *Global News Digest*, published an article which caused shocks in the international arena. In response to Lee Teng-hui’s declaration, and expanding U.S.-Japanese military ties, the *Global News Digest* warns that the



British-allied geopolitical lunatics such as Sen. Jesse Helms and former President George Bush have launched a highly dangerous drive to destabilize and carve up China, using Taiwan as their tool. Bush is shown here during a 1990 meeting with Senator Helms (right). Also shown are (from left) former Sen. George Mitchell and then-Speaker of the House Tom Foley.

“Taiwan traitors to their heritage, will certainly meet with disaster,” and the “United States had better not interfere. To protect the interests of the nation and its people, the People’s Liberation Army would rather lose a thousand troops than one inch of territory.”

The article blames the current tensions with Taiwan squarely on U.S. “long-term interference into China’s internal affairs,” and on the blatant support for Taiwan “independence” in both the U.S. Congress and among Republican candidates for the Presidency. “Lee Teng-hui is being pumped up, like a drug addict taking stimulants, carrying out arrogant bragging and wild provocations,” the article states.

China would use military force only as the last crucial option, *Global News Digest* states, but warns that those who think that China does not have the military capability to launch an attack are “making a very big mistake.” Although the heart of China’s national policy is economic construction, and the U.S. is certainly the strongest military power in the world, China has never been afraid of war, the *Digest* warns (see *Documentation*).

While the angry *Global News Digest* article represents only one of the voices coming out of China, its relative prominence, and the number of similar statements in the Chinese press recently, indicate that the warning is extremely serious, and should be so taken in Washington. It is urgent that the situation be cooled down.

China has always maintained its right to, ultimately, resort to use of force if Taiwan declares independence, but has also made repeated efforts, over time, to develop peaceful and productive relations with Taiwan — in cooperation with many

political and economic leaders on the island. At the same time, Chinese analysts have been sufficiently impressed by the U.S. “show of force” of high-tech warfare from the 1991 Gulf War up to the NATO onslaught against Yugoslavia this spring, so as to be very cautious about challenging the United States. China’s nuclear forces — some 20 or so intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) — are much weaker than those of Britain or France, to say nothing of well over a thousand of America’s ICBMs. Most important, China regards good relations with the United States as of utmost strategic importance.

To understand the violent reactions, and challenges to the world’s military superpower, it is necessary to look beyond the Taiwan Strait, to recent developments in East Asia and the world more broadly.

No ‘Taiwan crisis’

China’s greatest concern is the perceived move toward a strategic “pincer” operation by the West, consisting of NATO expansion from Europe into the Caucasus and then Central Asia, and the transformation of the U.S. military alliances with Japan and South Korea into NATO-style aggressive forces.

The NATO bombing of the Chinese Embassy in Belgrade on May 7 crystallized these fears. China had consistently opposed the Anglo-American assault against Iraq, and the war against Yugoslavia. On April 27, the Chinese military’s *Liberation Daily* had called NATO’s expansion into Central Asia a matter of “great concern” to military observers. “Continual penetration by foreign forces is aiding the growth of

centrifugal and separatist trends” in Central Asia, *Liberation Daily* wrote. “The Russian military [has] voiced its worry about CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States] collective security, because NATO units have long ago penetrated to Russia’s border region, and through NATO’s ‘Partnership for Peace’ program, the variety and number of maneuvers in which NATO units participate on CIS territory are increasing every year. . . . How should the CIS members concerned, especially Russia, deal with this? This is a question of great concern to military observers.”

On May 17, *Peoples’ Daily* said of the NATO war: “in essence [it] is a new form of colonialism,” and likened it to

the invasion of China by the Eight-Power Allied Forces 100 years ago. China’s ultimate concern is an attempted repeat of that invasion.

Geopolitics started wars

Most inflammatory, in Chinese perception, is the open intent among some American circles, to make *Japan* the Asian bulwark of an explicitly anti-China military alliance. This concern has a long history.

During the first half of this century, Japan and China were repeatedly pitted against each other in brutal wars, as Germany and Russia were repeatedly set up to destroy each other

Nakasone: North Korea needs China-style reform

The following is excerpted from a commentary by former Japanese Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone, which was published in the International Herald Tribune on Aug. 21.

“There is growing opinion in the United States and Japan in favor of shifting to a hard-line policy toward North Korea,” in reaction to Pyongyang’s “alleged nuclear arms program” and expected ballistic missile launch, wrote Nakasone. “This view is supported in the United States by, among others, Sen. Jesse Helms. . . . In Japan, some members of the LDP, the Liberal Party, and the Democratic Party are preparing a bill to suspend the considerable remittances to North Korea from Japan. These hard-liners criticize the weak negotiating stance of the free world. . . .

“While in the past I have maintained some degree of sympathy” for North Korean policy, “the situation cannot continue. It is time for the free world to make clear that it finally has an uncompromising collective determination to deal firmly with North Korea’s blackmail diplomacy.”

If Pyongyang launches its Taepodong-2 missile, the issue should go to the United Nations for further economic sanctions, Nakasone continued. “We are effectively back to where we started in 1994 when North Korea declared its intention to break away from the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.” Now, after the India-Pakistan tests, North Korea must end its nuclear program.

However, the international community must also show equal determination to help North Korea succeed “if it cooperates with the rest of the world and opens up.” Expressing sympathy for the condition of the North Korean population, Nakasone wrote, “In the long term, that plight can only be alleviated by giving Pyongyang a chance to abandon its seclusionist policy and join the international community.



Former Japanese Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone

“To that end, China, Japan, and the United States should agree to request jointly that North Korea adopt Deng Xiaoping-style economic reforms. If North Korea accepts and seeks collaboration with the international community, these three countries should then offer further cooperation.

“In the final analysis, it is up to the two Koreas themselves to resolve in a responsible manner the problems of the peninsula they share. The South Korean President, Kim Dae-jung, evinces a broad-minded and tolerant policy toward North Korea, even though it remains bent on achieving an equal economic and political standing with, if not superiority over, its rival.

“To move beyond this impasse, a North-South summit should be convened to reconfirm their 1991 North-South ‘non-nuclear declaration’ ” and discuss mutual inspections.

“North Korea may well demand the withdrawal of U.S. troops from the peninsula and the replacement of the armistice accord among itself, China, and UN forces, with a peace treaty. The achievement of such a treaty would pave the way for a process of unifying Korea as a vital member of the Asia-Pacific region.”

in Europe—the result of the geopolitical operations of the world’s greatest power, the British Empire. Already in the last decades of the 19th century, the Japan of Emperor Meiji had succumbed to British geopolitical policy. Japan, although economically far too weak to sustain a massive military buildup, was lured into the pursuit of “Great Power” status in alliance with the British Empire. From 1895 on, Japan launched wars against China, overran Korea, and finally, in 1941, launched strikes against the United States and the British colonies in Southeast Asia. Yet, in 1945, it was Japan, already militarily defeated and bombed to ruins, which became the victim of the first atomic bombings in history.

Postwar Japan adopted a “peace constitution,” committing the nation to a purely defensive military, a policy broadly supported today. This, in combination with its famous postwar industrial economic miracle, transformed Japan and its relations to the rest of Asia. However, recent developments, particularly the tendency toward a revival of Japan’s military role, are causing uneasiness in Asia. As the financial crisis in Japan worsens, efforts are being made to shift Japan from its peace constitution to a more active military role. This will not be so easily done, however, given what Japan suffered during the last war.

BAC maneuvers

The crux of the problem is the continuing shambles in American policy, and the urgency of eliminating BAC influence in Washington. Chinese spokesmen have made clear that they understand that the key question in the Taiwan issue is not Lee Teng-hui’s provocations, but what the United States will do.

What the BAC wants was stated in an editorial in the London *Daily Telegraph* published Aug. 19, titled “Beijing Goes Ballistic.” Ballistic missile defense is “in the news,” but “moves by the Americans and their allies to counter the ballistic threat from countries such as North Korea, Iraq, and Iran, are strongly opposed by the Russians and Chinese,” fumed the *Telegraph*. Moscow regards the revival of interest in missile defense with as much enthusiasm as it did President Reagan’s Strategic Defense Initiative of the 1980s. . . . Beijing sees the TMD debate among its neighbors and the Americans as designed to circumscribe its own superpower ambitions. . . .

“Washington needs to deal firmly with these objections,” the *Telegraph* dictated. “The Russians must be persuaded that the strategic threat has changed radically since the Cold War: Then, the West confronted the Soviet-dominated Warsaw Pact; today, it has to contend with rapid proliferation of weapons of mass destruction across Asia. The Chinese should be reminded that it is their neighbor, North Korea, which is propelling TMD development, and that their hysterical revanchism toward Taiwan is merely driving the island to try to board the bandwagon.

“In dealing with both countries, Bill Clinton has not put America’s case with sufficient force,” whined the *Telegraph*.

“As commander in chief of the world’s greatest democracy, he has a duty both to protect his country and to support those who share American beliefs in representative government and a market economy. That duty points toward rapid development of anti-missile systems and a stout defense of Taiwan against Chinese bullying.”

Embassy bombing destroyed good faith

In these circumstances, the failure so far of President Clinton to repair the grievous damage done to U.S.-China relations by the deliberate bombing of the Chinese Embassy in Belgrade, is undermining the good faith so essential to prevent conflict. At stake is not just the bombing itself, but the question, essential for all nations: Who is running the world’s greatest military power?

If the Clinton administration does not act to restore that good faith, which the President had taken many steps to establish, China will then act accordingly. This should be taken as the message of the recent statements from China.

Much has been done to attempt to restore relations, including the July 18 telephone conversation between President Clinton and Chinese President Jiang Zemin following Lee Teng-hui’s provocative statements. Both the United States and Japan immediately stated their full commitment to “one China.”

In his news conference in Washington on July 21, President Clinton went further than any previous U.S. President had, to state his support for China’s policy of “one China, two systems.” This was the policy under which Hong Kong was restored to China, and is the basis of Beijing’s proposals for eventual reunification with Taiwan. Clinton contradicted Jesse Helms’s bloviations that the “one China” policy was a “perplexing fabrication,” stating that he did not believe it was a perplexing fabrication. The two sides are not yet unified, but the Chinese usually take a long-term point of view, the President said. Mainland China has stated its understanding of the different system prevailing in Taiwan, and is ready to coordinate with it in various ways, as China has done in Hong Kong, and it may even go further, Clinton said. Clinton was the first U.S. President in office to visit Hong Kong.

Assistant Secretary of State for East Asia Stanley Roth and National Security Adviser Sandy Berger have both supported this policy. Roth stated recently that Taiwan should look toward an interim agreement with China, and State Department spokesman James Rubin announced that the Clinton administration wanted “substantive negotiations” between China and Taiwan.

In addition, the Taiwan *Commercial Times* reported in the second week of August that Beijing and Washington had had a quiet arrangement to promote the visit to Taiwan by Wang Daohan, chairman of China’s Association for Relations Across the Taiwan Strait (ARATS), proposed for October, and to “settle” the Taiwan issue in accordance with the Hong Kong formula. Washington had, through a special channel, indicated to Beijing that it supported the plan to hold political

negotiations with Taiwan, under which Wang Daohan would propose to Taiwan an "intermediate agreement" to encourage acceptance of the "Hong Kong formula," but with more liberal provisions. Washington had indicated it would pressure Taiwan to accept the mainland's peaceful reunification policy.

Then came Lee Teng-hui's sabotage operation. Clinton reacted by mentioning Hong Kong at his press conference. At the same time, Beijing has *not* cancelled, or even announced any official postponement of Wang Daohan's visit to Taiwan.

Yet, despite these efforts, profound problems remain. Washington has maintained its idiotic stance that the bombing was "accidental," and, other than the early dismissal of NATO commander Gen. Wesley Clark, the political heads responsible, which should roll, remain in place.

Since Clinton's telephone call with Jiang Zemin, Defense Secretary Cohen toured northeast Asia; the United States announced the sale of \$550 million worth of sophisticated weapons, including E-2T early warning aircraft, and F-16 jet parts and equipment, to Taiwan; the U.S.-Japanese TMD agreement was announced, and the United States, Japan, and South Korea have engaged in massive maneuvers in the Pacific; and a gaggle of reactionary U.S. Congressmen made a provocative trip to Taipei to avow their support for Lee's "two-state theory." As the Hong Kong newspaper *Ta Kung Pao* asked Aug. 5: "What on earth is the United States up to?"

Concerns over Japan

China's concerns over the role of Japan are rooted in both past history and in the military-strategic situation in the region today. On April 17, the Japanese House of Representatives passed legislation ratifying the new U.S.-Japan defense guidelines. According to the official statements of both the U.S. and Japanese governments, "one of the most important aims of the new guidelines is to establish a framework for effective responses to an armed attack against Japan, or to situations in areas surrounding Japan through bilateral cooperation" (emphasis added).

This highly ambiguous phrase, "situations in areas surrounding Japan," is the focus of great apprehension in China, as to the real scope and intent of the new guidelines. It is often forgotten, in this context, that Japan's military potential is more than large enough to be perceived as a very substantial military threat from the Chinese side, if that potential were to be placed behind an anti-China alliance.

Even under its peace constitution, Japan has the second-highest official defense budget in the world, after the United States, and considerably surpassing Russia. Japan also has the second largest surface naval fleet in the world. Under its military alliance with the United States, Japan constitutes the overwhelming military power in the Asia-Pacific region. Japan's budget is now at least \$50 billion. The per-capita expenditure is very high: Japan has about 235,000 men in the Armed Forces, out of a population of about 126 million, but its Armed

Forces have an unusually high proportion of officers and equipment, and could be very rapidly expanded.

In addition, Japan is protected by the U.S. nuclear shield, the U.S. Pacific fleet, and 100,000 U.S. soldiers stationed in the Pacific.

The 'North Korean threat'

Despite these capabilities, the Japanese annual Defense White Paper, released at the beginning of August, stated that Japan could launch a pre-emptive strike against another nation, if it had reason to believe it was at risk of being attacked. Defense Agency Deputy Director Gen. Nobumasa Ota cited North Korea as an issue. "Japan has never seen itself as being under military threat," he said. But, "militarily speaking, North Korea is attracting our utmost attention right now."

"It is easy to predict that the range of North Korean missiles is rapidly lengthening. This sort of missile development, along with the question of possible nuclear weapons development, is a source of great instability for both Asia and the entire world," the White Paper claimed. The White Paper also said that Japan "is closely monitoring" China's increasingly frequent naval operations.

However, if you make an actual comparison between the totally impoverished North Korea's military capabilities (taking even the "possibility," alleged by the United States and Japan, that North Korea has long-range missiles and is in some stage of developing nuclear weapons) and those of Japan, the observer is forced to put the so-called "North Korea threat" to Japan into perspective. The North Korean defense budget was estimated at about \$2.4 billion in 1997; there are about 1.05 million men in North Korea's Armed Forces, out of a population of about 24.5 million. Japan spends 80 times as much per member of the Armed Forces than North Korea. Unlike U.S. ally Japan, North Korea has no military allies; neither does China.

Chinese military spending is also dwarfed by that of Japan. China's annual military budget is only \$10 billion, equal to 3% of the U.S. military budget, less than that of Taiwan, South Korea, and India. During the Cold War, China's military expenditure was up to 20-30% of GDP, but in the course of the Deng Xiaoping reforms, it was reduced to 5.7%. Over the past 20 years, the figure has hovered around 1% of GDP. China's great advantage is its hard-won nuclear capability, but that, still, is far weaker than that of the United States, Russia, Britain, or France.

China successfully test-fired a new long-range surface-to-surface Dongfeng-31 missile on Aug. 2. This is an intercontinental strategic missile with a firing range of 8,000 kilometers, and it is capable of carrying a nuclear warhead. Prof. Wang Xinqing, system designer at the China Institute of Carrier Rocket Technology, announced in Beijing on Aug. 10, that this was the first test of the independently developed Dongfeng-31, and, at the same time, that China is actively preparing to launch a manned space flight and to carry out

systematic research on space shuttles, like those of the United States. The core of current Chinese rocket research is to develop a completely new series of carrier rockets, he said, such as the Long March 5.

Russian Foreign Ministry spokesman Vladimir Rakhmanin said on Aug. 3, that Russia did not consider this launch any threat to the region. "The test by China of a long-range missile can hardly be assessed as a considerable and new aspect in the policy of China or in the development of the situation in Asia and the Pacific rim," he said.

U.S.-Japan military policy review

Official U.S.-Japanese policy reviews began in 1995, and were reflected in the joint statements made by President Clinton and then-Japanese Prime Minister Ryutaro Hashimoto in Tokyo in April 1996. In June 1996, Japan and the United States reconstituted their Subcommittee for Defense Cooperation, to put forward the new guidelines.

These included "cooperation in situations in areas surrounding Japan that will have an important influence on Japan's peace and security." According to the Japan Self-Defense Agency, this concept "is not geographical, but situational." Although both the United States and Japan pledged to make such responses in a manner "consistent with basic principles of international law, . . . and relevant international agreements such as the Charter of the United Nations," the United States, at least, totally violated these principles during the recent assaults on Iraq and Yugoslavia.

The Japanese government has listed six categories of potential area "emergencies," including "looming military disputes" or "internal disorder."

In September 1998, U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, Defense Secretary Cohen, and their Japanese counterparts Masahiko Komura and Fukushiro Nukaga, met in New York to discuss the new defense guidelines. During this meeting, the launch of a satellite by North Korea, deemed a "missile launch" by the United States and Japan, was made the focal "security" issue, and the Japanese side stated they would seek early passage of the new defense guidelines. At the same time, both sides "emphasized the importance of Ballistic Missile Defense" cooperative research.

When Japanese Prime Minister Keizo Obuchi visited China July 8-10, he did assure the Chinese government that Japan is committed to never becoming a military superpower, and that the reference to U.S.-Japanese military collaboration in the event of "situations in areas surrounding Japan" is purely defensive. He refused, however, to specify that Taiwan would *not* be included under this clause.

Then, on Aug. 16, Japanese Foreign Minister Masahiko Komura and U.S. Ambassador to Japan Thomas Foley signed and exchanged diplomatic notes on an agreement for conducting joint technical research on the U.S. TMD, after the Japanese cabinet gave final approval.

Lee Teng-hui hurried to follow suit. On Aug. 18, he an-

nounced his support for the TMD project. "Setting up a TMD system would cope with the current situation and be in the nation's interest. Every effort [for developing TMD] deserves praise," said Lee at a meeting of the ruling KMT party in Taipei. Also, Taiwan Defense Minister Tang Fei said in an interview with the U.S. *Defense News* magazine, that Taiwan needs a U.S.-developed missile defense system. Tang said that Taiwan, in addition to developing its own missile defense system, is very interested in purchasing the U.S.-made Patriot III modified missile defense system and Aegis radar system. On Aug. 19, State Department spokesman James Rubin stated that the United States does "not preclude the possible sale of theater missile defense systems to Taiwan in the future."

What could happen in the Taiwan Strait?

Beijing has made it clear, that it will not repeat the large-scale military maneuvers it carried out near Taiwan during the Taiwan elections in 1996. Lee Teng-hui's statements have *fundamentally changed* the situation. A threshold has been crossed; mere threats from the mainland will not have the effect they had in the past.

In 1996, the United States did send two aircraft carrier battle groups close to the Taiwan Strait, but there were also efforts to cool the situation down. Subsequently, President Clinton put forward his policy of "engagement" with China in 1996, and then made his very clear statement of support for Beijing's "three no's," during his visit to Shanghai in 1998, going further than any previous U.S. President had toward agreement with China on this critical issue. The "three no's" are: no declaration of independence by Taiwan; no statements declaring "One China, One Taiwan"; and no membership for Taiwan in international organizations of sovereign nations.

This time, despite hysterical exaggerations in the Western press, military activity in the immediate region of Taiwan has been kept at a low level, which Taipei has repeatedly confirmed. But, mainland spokesmen have made clear that military preparedness is high. While the government has deliberately publicized and spread the news of China's military deployments and firm stance in the mass media, at the same time, Beijing has made clear that the door for cross-strait communication remains open. On Aug. 15, Tang Shubei, executive vice chairman of ARATS, said that Beijing has not given up the policy of "peaceful reunification," and would decide how to act on Taiwan, depending upon who is elected next year. The currently leading candidate for the Taiwan Presidency for the March 2000 elections, James Soong, favors better and closer ties with China. However, despite Taiwanese efforts to play down the military threat, Chinese military leaders are asserting that China has the capability to attack Taiwan.

This would result in a protracted and bloody confrontation, a disaster for all China.

On Aug. 2, the Hong Kong *Ta Kung Pao* published inter-



Taiwan's President Lee Teng-hui's provocative statements about "state-to-state relations" between China and Taiwan, are the political equivalent of terrorist bomb attacks.

views with experts at the Strategic Research Department under the Academy of Military Sciences of the Chinese People's Liberation Army. *Ta Kung Pao* stated that the 1996 Chinese exercise had been a warning; it will not be repeated. Chinese military strategy holds that "there are no constant rules to follow, just like water, which has no permanent form." This time, if the Taiwan authorities go too far, military exercises will not answer the situation. If Taipei goes further, and announces the "revision of the Constitution" to permit "Taiwan independence," then China would have to attack Taiwan, the analysts indicated. "China regards sovereignty and territory as most sacrosanct and more important than anything else," the military analysts stated.

The mainland is basing this policy also on its insights into the Taiwanese military, the analysts said. Although it is expensively equipped, its forces have had no combat experience since the KMT retreated to the island in 1949. Even more important, a cross-strait war would be protracted, which would devastate the Taiwan economy. Taiwan's economic relations with the mainland—Taiwan has a \$90 billion surplus in cross-strait trade—were critical to its survival of the Asian financial crisis. Taiwan is totally dependent upon trade for energy and raw materials, and a blockade would have an immediate effect.

The real question remains, what Washington will do. This group of strategists estimated that the United States would not risk its own strategic interests, for the sake of one group in Taiwan. And, they stated, while China lags far behind the U.S. in military technology and armaments, the gap is no greater than when China fought the United States in Korea in the 1950s. The United States did not defeat China in Korea, nor did it defeat Vietnam, they noted.

Analysts have also noted the U.S. vulnerability to the "serious bubble" of its "virtual economy."

Yan Zhao, senior researcher of the Academy of Military Sciences, stated in an interview published by the Hong Kong *Wen Wei Po* on Aug. 12, that U.S. military capabilities in Taiwan would be weakened by the great distance over the Pacific, which would undermine their ability to withstand a war of attrition. In addition, there would certainly be domestic political fights over whether the United States should actually commit itself to war over Taiwan.

Given the serious weaknesses NATO has already demonstrated, in the ineffectiveness of its grandiose war against Yugoslavia, these criticisms of U.S. capabilities show insight.

Massive maneuvers

Unprecedented military maneuvers have been conducted in the northeastern Pacific during August.

The first week in August, for the first time in history, the South Korean Navy and the Japanese Maritime Self-Defense forces conducted joint naval maneuvers.

Then, on Aug. 16, the United States and South Korean military forces began their annual defense exercises, on a scale as never before. The 12-day war games, code-named "Ulji Focus Lens," combined 14,000 Americans from bases in Japan, South Korea, and Guam, with 56,000 South Korean soldiers. The nuclear-powered aircraft carrier *Constellation*, flagship of the Seventh Fleet, based in Yokosuka, Japan, arrived in the South Korean military port of Chinhae, carrying some 70 fighters, to command the exercises, accompanied by a battle group of 10 ships, including two cruisers, two destroyers, two submarines, a supply ship, and a Canadian ship. The largest computer simulation joint military exercise in the world was also to be carried out.

Russia has also taken notice. Radio Moscow reported on Aug. 3, that the United States was reinforcing its military forces stationed in East Asia. It reported that U.S. intelligence collection vessels, *Observation Island* and *Invincible*, entered the naval base in Sasebo, Japan, while F-15 fighters arrived at the U.S. Air Force base in Osan, South Korea. The electronic observation aircraft RC-135, which moved to the U.S. Air Force base in Misawa, Aomori Prefecture, Japan, is observing the regional situation. The aircraft carrier *Kitty Hawk* has also arrived. The question is, stated Radio Moscow, whom are they there to threaten? There is the possible missile test-launch of the Taepodong-2 by North Korea, and China's recent test of its long-range Dongfeng-31 missile. But, noted Radio Moscow, Japan also has programs to develop and launch missiles, including a program to launch four intelligence satellites within the next five years.

It was also remarked in Asia, that on Aug. 2, the United States carried out the second successful testing of the Theater High-Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) missile.

American naval commanders have helped stir up the situation by voicing their opinions. Rear Adm. Timothy LaFleur, commander of the *Constellation* battle group, said in Singapore on Aug. 10, that the ships, then under orders for the

Persian Gulf, might be dispatched to the Taiwan Strait in case of a military crisis. In 1996, he said, a U.S. carrier had moved rapidly from the Persian Gulf to the Taiwan Strait. The *Constellation* was in Singapore for training exercises with the Singapore navy, following the Japan and Korean exercises. Then, Rear Adm. Timothy Keating, commander of the *Kitty Hawk* group, stated in Pattaya, Thailand on Aug. 13, that "China will know if they attempt to undertake any kind of operation, whether it is Taiwan or anything, that they are going to have the U.S. Navy to deal with. We are there in numbers, we're trained, we're ready, and we're very powerful. . . . The Chinese . . . will have to consider it very, very carefully in any action they may make against, principally, Taiwan."

On Aug. 7, the U.S. Navy announced that the *Constellation* and *Kitty Hawk* battle groups had conducted exercises "near Malaysia," but regional press located the "passing exercise" in the South China Sea, near the Taiwan Strait. The Navy even released photos of the exercise.

Congressmen staging riots

The U.S. Congress is a hotbed of subversion against America's national "one-China" policy, established by both Republican and Democratic administrations. Leading the subversives is Jesse Helms, whose murky career includes deep involvement with the drug- and gun-running Contra operation, and links to the networks which set up the 1984 assassination of Indian Prime Minister Indira Gandhi. Congressman Benjamin Gilman (R) of New York, whose office is a stomping ground for the powerful, rich, and dirty Taiwan and Zionist lobbies, is Helms's co-respondent in the House. A mixture of Democrats and Republicans, Senators Robert Torricelli, Frank Murkowski, and Trent Lott, and Congressmen Dana Rohrabacher, Christopher Cox, John Shadegg, and Gerald Solomon also lead the lineup.

No fewer than three separate delegations of the U.S. Congress went to Taiwan during August. One was led by Gilman, who strongly supported Lee Teng-hui's wild proclamation. "We expressed our concern about Chinese 'saber-rattling' over President Lee's state-to-state remarks and its effect on the confidence and security-building in the region," said a statement released by Gilman. "As we leave Taiwan, we are calling upon the P.R.C. to renounce the use of force against Taiwan."

This was followed by a group of six Republican Congressmen, escorted by Heritage Foundation President Ed Fuelner, who had organized Lee Teng-hui's disruptive visit to Cornell University in 1995. Then, on Aug. 14, three members of the House Armed Services Committee, Lindsey Graham, Solomon Ortiz, and Jerry Weller arrived in Taiwan, to study "if the United States can do anything to meet Taiwan's military needs," accompanied by a military officer, Jim Walker.

On Aug. 12, the Pentagon had to issue a rebuttal of the absurd assertions being made by Senate Majority Leader

Trent Lott (R-Miss.) and an aide to Rep. Dana Rohrabacher (R-Calif.), that a Chinese company contracted to operate port facilities at either end of the Panama Canal represents a national security threat to the United States. Defense Department press spokesman Kenneth Bacon stated that the official view inside the Department of Defense is that China's top two priorities are economic and agricultural development for its population. Military modernization has been, since the time of Deng Xiaoping, the last of its priorities.

Carrying forward Jesse Helms' neanderthal-style provocations, John Bolton, senior vice president of the American Enterprise Institute and a former official in the Bush administration, wrote an article in the *Weekly Standard*, calling for the United States to grant full diplomatic recognition to Taiwan, and to abandon the "one China" policy. In a recent issue of the *National Review*, Mark Lagon, of the New York Council on Foreign Relations' Project for a New American Century, also called for the United States to recognize Taiwan as an independent state, while building up cooperation with "real" regional partners like Japan, South Korea, the Philippines, and, perhaps, India. He called on the U.S. administration to stop criticizing Taiwan for being provocative.

Regional diplomacy

Diplomacy is, however, under way in the region, in an effort to counter the orchestrated tensions. Chinese President Jiang Zemin is visiting Thailand, Australia, and New Zealand, where he is scheduled to meet President Clinton on Sept. 14. This will be a critical meeting; Jiang Zemin explicitly attacked the "gunboat diplomacy" and "economic neo-colonialism pursued by some big powers," in his speech on Sept. 3 in Bangkok. The next day, he accused Lee Teng-hui of taking "a very dangerous step on the road to splitting the nation."

A Chinese delegation led by Maj. Gen. Luo Bin, director of the foreign affairs office of the Ministry of National Defense, met North Korea's Vice Marshal Kim Il-chol, vice chairman of the National Defense Commission of North Korea in Pyongyang on Aug. 8.

South Korean President Kim Dae-jung has also launched a drive to save his "sunshine policy" of peace with North Korea, sending South Korean ministers to Beijing, Tokyo, and Washington on Aug. 23. Seoul officials attached special significance to the first-ever meeting between Defense Minister Cho Sung-tae and his Chinese counterpart, Chi Haotian, on Aug. 23. South Korean Foreign Minister Hong Soon-young met his Japanese counterpart, Masahiko Komura, Aug. 23 in Tokyo. The same day, South Korea's Unification Minister Lim Dong-won left Seoul for a week-long visit to the United States, which included talks with former Defense Secretary William Perry, President Clinton's adviser on North Korea. The agenda of these visits, was to discuss what economic and diplomatic incentives Seoul and its allies could offer North Korea if it forgoes a missile test. Already on Aug. 19, the North Korean Foreign Ministry had announced: "As

regards the missile issue, we are always ready for negotiation if the hostile nations honestly ask for it out of an intention to alleviate our concern.”

China and the other nations of East Asia, most of which are still developing nations, urgently need a prolonged period in which peace and a productive economic policy prevail, in which to build their far too backward economies. The eruption of the world financial crisis in Asia has been a severe setback; conflicts or full-scale war would plunge the region into chaos. These nations have repeatedly called for the rational and just new world economic, political, and security order essential for economic construction; the British-American-Commonwealth grouping is determined to block that new order at all costs. Throwing the BAC’s minions, the Bush-Helms mob, out of Washington, is a matter of dire urgency for every nation in the Pacific.

Documentation

‘United States: You had better not interfere’

Here are excerpts from the Chinese weekly magazine Global News Digest of Aug. 20.

The treasonous administration of Taiwan will certainly meet with disaster. The anti-China gang is threatening interference. . . . United States: You had better not interfere. To protect the interests of the nation and its people, the People’s Liberation Army would rather lose a thousand troops than one inch of territory.

The “theory of two Chinas” is causing daggers to be drawn on both sides: the American anti-China, pro-Taiwan forces, and the Chinese people desiring the unification of the country. Disregarding the feelings of the peoples opposing foreign intervention, the United States is openly selling arms to Taiwan, conducting exercises with aircraft carriers, and using extortion and other despicable methods, to connive with Li Denghui [Lee Teng-hui] and the other Taiwan authorities’ actions to split the country. This can only lead to further worsening of China-U.S. relations, to increasing the arrogance of the Taiwan authorities’ “independence” ideology, and pushing the nervous situation across the straits toward the brink of war.

America’s Asian strategy sees Taiwan as its “unsinkable aircraft carrier,” and has for a long time allowed Taiwan’s wild ambitions. American influence on Taiwan, American long-term interference into China’s internal affairs, have been the fundamental cause of the Taiwan crisis. The emergence of the “two nation” theory has given the United States a new

pretext to encroach upon the Taiwan question.

As the U.S. Defense Department continues to sell Taiwan advanced weapons systems, the anti-China pro-Taiwan members of the U.S. Congress are active in visiting Taiwan, and openly supporting and engaging in the “two nation theory” discussion. . . . In the United States internal situation, right now candidates who are pushing for nomination in the coming Presidential elections, are exploiting the “two nations theory” in many articles. On Aug. 14, [Republican Presidential contender] Gov. George Bush, Jr. . . . played up his promise, that if he would be President he would defend Taiwan by military force. Bush Junior declared, that the United States should adopt a “tough and unwielding stance” in dealing with China as a strategic adversary and competitor. At the same time, the Republican Presidential candidates Forbes and Mrs. Dole have also broadcast threats, that they as President would “order the U.S. military to defend Taiwan.”

Some American military spokesmen also have made brazen threats of war against China. On Aug. 11, former U.S. Defense Department head of department for China relations Shiraf said, that the U.S. military Pacific Command, on the basis of the “Taiwan Relations Act,” has “prepared a war plan for intervention into the Taiwan conflict.” Speaking of the present situation, he said that if Beijing “intends to punish Taiwan,” the U.S. will consider military action. In recent days, two aircraft carriers of the U.S. Seventh Fleet, the *Kitty Hawk* and the *Constellation*, have been carrying out maneuvers in the South China Sea neighboring the Taiwan Straits. The U.S. State Department, concerned not to irritate China, has called for ending the exercises, but the U.S. Defense Department is nevertheless continuing them. . . .

Because of the support by U.S. anti-China, pro-Taiwan forces, Li Denghui is being pumped up, like a drug addict taking stimulants, carrying out arrogant bragging and wild provocations. . . .

The Chinese people love peace and would only choose military force as the last crucial option, but China will also not bow down to foreign intervention. If some Western countries think that “in order to safeguard its economic development, China would not dare to use military force against Taiwan,” or “China’s military, unlike the American military, does not have the option and capability to launch a military attack,” then those Western countries are making a very big mistake.

Indeed, China truly has made economic construction the core of its development strategy, and the United States is certainly the most powerful military power in the world. But history cannot forget, that China has never been afraid of war, and especially is not afraid to fight a big and bitter war. Since the founding of the new China, China has twice matched swords with the United States, once in the war of resistance against the United States in Korea, and once in the anti-United States war in Vietnam, and in both cases the seemingly invincible United States aggressors were defeated in the end.

Twice, in the Taiwan crises of 1954 and 1958, the United States supported the Guomindang and menaced China by a policy of going to the edge of war and applying nuclear blackmail. But this was also useless.

From a theoretical standpoint, military strength normally includes two aspects—hardware and software. From the standpoint of hardware, China's neutron bombs are more than enough to cope with aircraft carriers, and China's short-range missiles can carry them. From the software standpoint, the United States has even less superiority: First, they would be operating in a far distant location, the supply lines would be very long, and they could not withstand a war of attrition; second, they would be fighting a war without moral right and would not receive the support of the international community; third, popular sentiment in the United States would not be happy: Everybody knows that America's economic and strategic interest on the mainland is far greater than its interests in Taiwan.

Furthermore, China has geographic superiority; we have an enormous strategic maneuvering room. Launching a war against "Taiwan independence" would not give the international community much chance to criticize. Consequently, the United States should not only weigh its relative interests on the mainland and in Taiwan, but also seriously consider the consequences of coming into direct confrontation with China over the Taiwan crisis.

The Chinese government has always pursued a policy of peace concerning the Taiwan issue, but if the Taiwan authorities think they can rely on foreign "protection," and think that China only has the ability to make a "psychological war" or "a media war," then they are making a very big mistake. At the present moment, the fatherland on the mainland has already carried out all necessary preparations to launch a military attack on Taiwan. The troops, transfer of units, strategic exercises, logistical backup, and other aspects are all ready. On the southern coast of the mainland, war preparedness drills have frequently been carried out by "night surprise attack" air force units. "Ground-to-ground missile groups" have all carried out focussed attack exercises. The *Liberation Daily* has just published an editorial saying: "The People's Liberation Army always puts the interests of the nation and the people higher than its own life. Better lose a thousand troops than give up one inch of territory."

Against the "Taiwan independence" attempts to split the country and the intervention of anti-China forces internationally, the Chinese government reaffirms: Do not underestimate the determination, confidence, and ability of the Chinese people to defend their national sovereignty and national territory! If the United States makes the miscalculation, of continuing to interfere in the internal affairs of China, then they will burn their cat's-paw. As former U.S. National Security Adviser Dr. Kissinger warned, if the United States does not take a proper policy toward the Taiwan issue, then it could lead to war and the United States will pay a bitter price.

**Former Mexican President
José López Portillo:**

**'And it is now necessary
for the world to listen to
the wise words of
Lyndon LaRouche.'**



An EIR Video

The Eurasian Land-Bridge: Ally with China, Not London

EIR's hour-long video features speeches by Lyndon LaRouche and Helga Zepp-LaRouche, and by former Mexican President José López Portillo. Here, Mr. López Portillo is shown with Mrs. LaRouche (right) and Mexican political leader Marivilia Carrasco.

Order Today!

EIE-99-002 **\$25**

Call Toll-free **888-EIR-3258** (888-347-3258)