

there is no telling what direction semi-independent republics in Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, Kyrgyzia, and Uzbekistan might move vis-à-vis China. If there is any truth in the story of military help from Kyrgyz across the border for their fellow tribesmen in Xinjiang, this thought will be all the stronger. . . . A few Uighurs have heard of the Joint Committee for the Manchu, Mongol, East Turkmen, and Tibetan Peoples and are particularly anxious to obtain by whatever means possible the Committee's publication *One Voice*. They have some links with Isa Alptekin, leader of the Turkestan Liberation Movement. . . . It is noteworthy that Alptekin's son Erkin Alptekin took an active part in the International Convention on Tibet in London from 6 to 8 July [1990].

"The conjunction of revived minority discontent on both national and religious grounds, of improved access across the frontier to fellow tribesmen, of major political change in neighboring countries, and of the sustained world reaction against genocide, colonialism, and apartheid, creates a situation in Central Asia in which radical change is just possible. . . . The present campaign to arouse world opinion on the subject of genocide, colonialism, and apartheid in China could be the lever which pries out from a Politburo due for change radical concessions in areas such as Xinjiang and Tibet."

The House of Lords and Foreign Office speak

Lord Avebury, chairman of the British Parliamentary Human Rights Group, is another controller of the separatists. In 1994, Lord Avebury sent an open letter to the British Foreign Office demanding that it "save the peoples of Eastern Turkestan," who were "faced with national extinction." In 1995, Lord Avebury told *EIR* that he was pessimistic that Britain could be successful in defending the Uighurs and Tibetans from Chinese efforts to exterminate them, simply through human rights campaigns, implying that he favored more aggressive London involvement in the destabilization of Xinjiang.

Lord Ennals, a former British Foreign Secretary, was, until his recent death, another top patron of the Uighur and Tibetan independence movements. He was also a leader of the UNPO. Martin Ennals, Lord Ennal's brother, controls Amnesty International, the British Foreign Office front which oversees international propaganda campaigns against China, over alleged suppression of the Uighurs and Tibetans.

American 'cousins' weigh in

Among the so-called "Americans" who have joined the Anglo-Dutch drumbeat to destabilize the "New Silk Road" through secessionist violence in Xinjiang, is one of Henry Kissinger's leading State Department protégés, Dr. Helmut Sonnenfeldt. In an interview with Voice of America on Feb. 14, the retired career State Department official, now with Kissinger at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, predicted that Xinjiang could become a "Chinese Chechnya."

Sonnenfeldt gloated, "I think the Chinese have tried to observe very closely what happened in Chechnya, in part because they may be conscious of the possibility that something of that sort might arise in their own domain." Sonnenfeldt cautioned that, should such an uprising gain steam, "it needs to be dealt with harshly and rapidly," or else China will be forced to grant the region autonomy—precisely the British strategic plan.

Elsie Walker is another leading propagandist devoted to "rousing world opinion" on Xinjiang. A cousin of former U.S. President Sir George Herbert Walker Bush, she heads the U.S.-based Asians for Democracy, which also mobilizes on behalf of the Tibetan cause. In October 1994, Uighur liberationist leader Erkin Alptekin addressed a conference in New York City of the "Allied Committee of the Peoples of Eastern Turkestan, Inner Mongolia, Tibet," organized by Walker's outfit.

In its official announcement of the conference, the Dalai Lama's so-called Tibetan government-in-exile declared: "This conference is being organized to let the international public know that in the uncertainty, instability, and even turmoil in China, that may result from the death of strongman Deng Xiaoping, the struggle to regain the freedom of these three peoples [Tibetans, Uighurs, and Mongols] from communist China domination will be pursued relentlessly." According to both Chinese and foreign news accounts, on the day of Deng Xiaoping's funeral, three bombings took place in Xinjiang.

The proposed map of a China broken into pieces, which the separatists distributed at the conference, leaves no doubt what their London masters are attempting.

British assets push 'China peril' to sink Clinton Asia policy

by Kathy Wolfe

If the daily U.S. press headlines such as "China Gifts Part of Espionage," which appeared recently on the front page of the *Washington Times*, remind you of Cold War "red scare" propaganda,¹ you're right. A British network of think-tanks and media manipulators, now, as then, is engaged in an all-out scare campaign, aimed this time at sabotaging the Clinton administration's diplomacy toward China and East Asia. They are also fueling a new round of "Clintongate" scandals

1. George Archibald, *Washington Times*, March 17, 1997, p. 1.

with lavish disinformation about Chinese spies “buying” access to the White House.

The China-bashing drive also comes at a point when *EIR*'s Eurasian Land-Bridge *Special Report*, detailing Lyndon LaRouche's in-depth proposals for building economic development corridors all across the Eurasian continent, is circulating widely among policymakers in Washington and in capitals around the world. LaRouche has emphasized that the economic development of the Eurasian continent is the great economic challenge for the 21st century, and should be a pivotal feature of U.S. strategic policy. The Land-Bridge, LaRouche has written, holds the key to the revival of the heart of the United States' economy, the strategic machine tool design industry.

The architects of the new outbreak of China-bashing, an *EIR* investigation shows, are the likes of Baroness Caroline Cox of Queensbury and her Christian Solidarity International; the London International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS); the London Royal Institute of International Affairs (RIIA); the RIIA's New York branch, the Council on Foreign Relations; Sir Henry Kissinger, and sundry other lords and ladies.

“China-gate” is nothing but a barely veiled attack on President Clinton's policy of “engagement” with China, Harvard's Ezra Vogel, China adviser to the National Security Council during Clinton's first term, told *EIR* March 11. “The President, [former Secretary of Defense] Bill Perry, and [the late Secretary of Commerce] Ron Brown had a vision of a much wider friendship with China,” he said. “But there are a lot of people who would like to sandbag the President's China policy.”

Let's you and him fight

Widely publicized books such as *The Coming Conflict with China*, by Richard Bernstein of the *New York Times* and Ross Munro of the *Toronto Globe and Mail*, have one purpose: to dupe naive Americans into siding with the British Crown, in its drive to destabilize China, break it up, and destabilize all of Asia.²

In the March issue of the New York Council on Foreign Relations' journal *Foreign Affairs*, Munro and Bernstein published a diatribe against China, summarizing their recent book. Since its publication, Munro has been a regular fixture on radio talk shows, in U.S. and British newspapers, on ABC News “Nightline,” touted by Ted Koppel as a “China expert,” and even quoted by senators in debate in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Munro's *Foreign Affairs* piece, however, shows that, once again, *EIR* Founding Editor Lyndon LaRouche was right. His *EIR* cover story of Nov. 22, 1996, “Ring Around China: Britain Seeks War,” featured a map showing the flash points

for war, through which the British have been attempting to surround China (see **Figure 1**). The March 1997 cover story of *Foreign Affairs*, titled “The China Threat,” featured a similar map, titled “China and Its Neighbors: Flash Points” (see **Figure 4**). It said that China, indeed, is ringed with threats of war—but with the British line that Chinese “expansionism” is to blame.

Bernstein and Munro charge that China is rushing to “build up a military with force projection capability to expand its presence” throughout the Pacific. “Samuel Huntington calls it ‘clash of civilizations’ and we call it ‘balance of power,’ ” they write, “but either way, China will be our strategic adversary.”

In a now-infamous *Foreign Affairs* article several years ago, Huntington had written that the West would be faced with a clash of civilizations, pitting “the West against the rest.” Huntington singled out China and the Islamic world as the West's greatest strategic adversaries in the 21st century. For Huntington, Munro, et al., the Eurasian land-mass is a zone of geopolitical conflict, to be kept in a state of permanent instability and war—to secure the continuing power of the sea-based British Empire, now cloaked under the name of British Commonwealth. This is a transparent regurgitation of London's geopolitical dogma, the same which brought about two world wars in this century.

The occurrence of nominally “North American” voices demanding a showdown with Beijing has been widely cheered in the British press. “Washington is in the early stages of a ‘yellow peril’ fever provoked by growing alarm about the strategic and military threat of a resurgent China,” gloated Ambrose Evans-Pritchard, one of the key self-confessed British intelligence operators involved in puffing up the White-water scandal against the U.S. Presidency, in the March 16 *London Sunday Telegraph*. “A new book selling briskly on Capitol Hill, *The Coming Conflict with China*, says Beijing is determined to ‘replace the United States as the pre-eminent power in Asia . . . and to extend its power into the South China and East China Seas so that it controls the region's essential sea lanes.’ ”

Hysteria against the Land-Bridge

Munro admitted to a journalist in a March 10 interview, that the new propaganda blitz against China was provoked by a judgment, made recently by the British elite. It now appears that the past few years' British efforts, publicly advertised by IISS, to break up China through British-intelligence-backed ethnic chaos, have not succeeded, and may not succeed in the foreseeable future. “Unfortunately,” he noted, “now, we need a strategy to deal with a more powerful China.”

It is the very economic development of China which is a threat to the United States, Munro insisted. “This is not a communist threat,” he said. “This is no threat of Maoism. Under Mao, paradoxically, China was weak, it had no economy,” he said, virtually bragging about the fact that British

2. Richard Bernstein and Ross H. Munro, *The Coming Conflict with China* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1997).

“socialist” ideologues such as Lord Bertrand Russell imposed Chairman Mao Zedong upon the Chinese people to keep them backward.³

“The problem now is precisely that China is growing *stronger economically*,” he said. “China may look more benign now than under Mao, but it is exactly this economic development which will put actual power behind Beijing’s expansionary desires.”

“Just look at the map!” he fulminated. “China looms over everything. If it were an empty space, that would be one thing—but it ain’t.”

Munro goes into a Rumpelstiltskin fit over China’s Eurasian Land-Bridge policy. His *Foreign Affairs* article hit at “China’s close military cooperation with the former Soviet Union,” and its increased “technological and political help to the Islamic countries of Central Asia,” which put China “at the center of an informal network of states which have goals and philosophies inimical to those of the United States.”

In his recent interview, Munro singled out “something which is of the highest strategic importance: Chinese strategic thinkers talk often about the ‘New Silk Road’—quote, unquote. It relates to rail lines, highways, and petroleum pipelines, leading from Xinjiang, into Central Asia and even into Europe. . . .

“But also it’s not too far, if you look at the map, from the Persian Gulf,” he continued, in the March 10 interview. “China itself is not too far removed from the Gulf, when you look at western Xinjiang. Given China’s increasing ties with Iran, I wait for the day when an Iran-China consortium will propose a whole New Silk Road set of links between the two countries. . . .

“It will be comparable in the next century, to what the Panama Canal was in the last century,” Munro said. “It will change the whole strategic picture in that region, make China a real presence well to the west of its territory, just as the Panama Canal allowed the U.S. to spread its influence south.”

Munro also predicted that “there will be a war” between the United States and China at some point, “most likely over Taiwan, where China’s desire to invade, grows with her growing military strength.” His greatest concern is to prevent any alliance, such as that envisioned by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, between China and the United States, and recently mooted by President Clinton in an interview with the *London Observer’s* Martin Walker (see p. 66), in which he specifically invoked FDR’s wartime alliance. “China’s eagerness to improve the Sino-American mood represents a tactical gesture” of deception, Munro wrote in *Foreign Affairs*.

With friends like Kissinger . . .

All this recent media China-bashing served as the perfect pretext for the Royal Institute of International Affairs’ (Chat-

ham House’s) self-described agent-of-influence, Sir Henry A. Kissinger, to publicly “defend” the Chinese-American relationship. For years, British agent Kissinger has posed as the only real “friend of China,” and the man with whom Beijing has to deal in the United States. Bernstein and Munro fueled this hoax, by building up Kissinger in their book as the head of a mythical “New China Lobby,” a subject to which they devoted an entire chapter. Kissinger Associates and other U.S. firms which lobby for trade with China were accused by Munro and Bernstein of being paid Beijing lobbyists.

Kissinger, in a March 12 speech in Manila, played his role as “friend of Beijing” to the hilt, urging that the United States foster “a cooperative but realistic relationship with China, willing to give them a real stake in the international system and welcoming their participation.” Yet, at the height of his “China Card” policy, Kissinger made plain his real British geopolitical views, regarding the need to keep China weak. “Once China becomes strong enough to stand alone, it might discard us,” Kissinger wrote in 1979. “A little later, it might turn against us.”⁴

4. Henry Kissinger, *The White House Years* (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1979), p. 1,091.

British put ‘American’ face on China-bashing

by Kathy Wolfe

Following a major strategic conference by the London International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS) on the danger of a Russia-China Partnership, on March 6-7 in San Francisco, Britain’s Baroness Caroline Cox and her Christian Solidarity International (CSI) have begun what they call a “grassroots mobilization” across the United States, to manipulate the average American against China. The CSI effort is nothing more than a British intelligence dirty tricks campaign to sabotage the Clinton administration’s policy toward China and East Asia.

Within days of the San Francisco IISS seminar, an anti-Chinese rally was held in Long Beach, California, protesting the investment of a Chinese shipping company in a facility there. Simultaneously, bills were introduced into the U.S. Congress, condemning China in language which has not been heard in Washington since the Bush administration’s jingoist Persian Gulf War propaganda against Iraq.

This so-called “popular movement” is being foisted upon U.S. citizens not only by British spooks, but even by the silver

3. Michael O. Billington, “The British Role in the Creation of Maoism,” *EIR*, Sept. 11, 1992, p. 48.