

McCarthyite onslaught hits U.S.-China ties

by Mary Burdman

The efforts to generate a new “Cold War” by the “British-American-Commonwealth” faction, representing Wall Street and the City of London, is setting off a “new McCarthyism” hysteria inside the United States. The same methods used during that disastrous period of U.S. history, which was ushered in after Harry S Truman became President following the death of Franklin Roosevelt, are being applied now. Lies, gossip, and innuendo, are being used by the media and the “attack-dog” faction of the U.S. Congress, including Republicans Chris Cox (Calif.) in the House and Richard Shelby (Ala.) in the Senate, to try to frighten whomever in the U.S. population is gullible enough, into believing that China is America’s new “Cold War” enemy.

The McCarthy witch-hunts were used in postwar America, as a bludgeon to destroy America’s wartime alliances with both Russia (then the Soviet Union) and China, and, through brutality epitomized by the executions of alleged “Soviet spies” Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, to cow the population into accepting, if not believing, the “Iron Curtain” worldview of Britain’s Winston Churchill and Truman. Then, it was the notorious anti-Semitism of the Rosenberg case; now, “Yellow Peril” racism is being used to sabotage the genuine, substantial progress in relations between China and the United States, that has been achieved by Presidents Bill Clinton and Jiang Zemin during the past four years, and to frame up political figures, scientists, and everyone who has cooperated with China.

The British-American-Commonwealth (BAC) mob is using the same newspapers, hacks, and “spooks,” that they used to (unsuccessfully) try to impeach President Clinton, to generate a daily onslaught of hyper-sensational articles and books attacking China. The *Washington Times*, owned by Rev. Sun Myung Moon’s “neo-conservative” Unification Church, publishes several sensationalist articles *every day*; the onslaught from the establishment press, such as the *Washington Post* or *New York Times*, is not far behind, and getting more aggressive by the day.

Who’s afraid of ‘national economic security’?

The BAC faction, which is trying to start wars and confrontations as rapidly as possible, fears Chinese national security policy—because it is one of “common development” for peace. At the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation Forum (APEC) summit in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia last November,

after Vice President Al Gore brutally called for the overthrow of the government of Prime Minister Dr. Mahathir bin Mohamad and demanded obedience to the dictatorship of the “markets,” Jiang Zemin warned that globalization has “presented countries, especially for developing countries, a new subject to tackle: How to ensure national economic security. . . . If there is no economic security, then there is no real national security.”

What the BAC fears, were the United States to adopt the policies of Lyndon LaRouche’s New Bretton Woods proposal, in alliance with China and other Eurasian nations, Wall Street’s power over world affairs could be broken. For the past years, Lyndon and Helga LaRouche have been the strongest voices in U.S. policymaking, calling for a strategic alliance between China and the United States.

President Clinton’s policies fall far short of LaRouche’s New Bretton Woods alliance, but the President understands very well the strategic importance of improving Sino-U.S. relations, based on “engagement,” on political, military, and economic fronts. The Commerce Department under the late Ron Brown had promoted a sound policy of state-to-state collaboration to build infrastructure; and former Defense Secretary William Perry initiated the successful U.S.-China military exchanges, which the Pacific command has announced it wants to continue.

Indeed, this obsessive anti-China mob is distorting the history of U.S.-China relations over the past 25 years: It was Richard Nixon who opened relations to China in 1972, and Ronald Reagan made a six-day state visit to China in April-May 1984, during which he signed protocols on cooperation for peaceful use of nuclear energy, cooperation in the field of management of industrial science and technology, and on cooperation in the field of scientific and technological information.

Anti-China campaign launched in 1995

The anti-Clinton, anti-China campaign was launched in earnest in 1995, using the controversy over the visit of Taiwan’s President Lee Teng-hui—no friend of China-Taiwan cooperation—to the United States, and hysteria in the U.S. press over alleged Chinese “war” threats to Taiwan during the elections in March 1996. Wild allegations about Chinese espionage, human rights violations, and financial contributions to the Clinton election campaigns were a constant theme in the press for months afterwards, but the genuine success of the Jiang Zemin visit to the United States in late October 1997, and the Clinton return visit last year, stalled the onslaught.

At the same time, inside the United States, the BAC was so heavily involved in using its sordid sex scandals to try to force the President from office, that China was (relatively) neglected. But with the collapse of the impeachment operation, “Yellow Peril” again became the obsession.

The centerpiece of the current frenzy is the primitive propaganda piece *The Year of the Rat*, the U.S. “bestseller” which

tee” in the House of Representatives, which has been investigating alleged harm to U.S. security through U.S.-China trade with satellites and commercial rocket launches, issued its 700-page classified report, calling for draconian measures to cripple high-technology trade between the United States and China. Much of the classified report has already been leaked to the press.

On Feb. 23, the U.S. government refused to grant a license to the Hughes Space and Communications company, to sell commercial communications satellites to Chinese companies—a serious loss to the U.S. company. Reportedly, the Pentagon, the State Department, and intelligence services objected to the sale, while the Commerce Department favored it.

The action was strongly condemned by China, but the Chinese leadership has kept a restrained attitude toward the anti-China frenzy. In a mid-February interview in Beijing with Norman Pearlstein, editor-in-chief of Time Inc., Jiang Zemin said: “The Chinese are very smart. On our own, we developed the atomic and hydrogen bombs. If you refuse to sell us satellites and other new high-tech products, we may be able to develop them by ourselves. Then we will not have to purchase yours.” Pearlstein wrote that Jiang, while professing close relations with President Clinton, expressed “frustration with the squabbling over China policy in Washington.”

On Feb. 25, the Senate voted 99-0 calling on President Clinton to sponsor a resolution condemning China for “human rights abuses” at the annual UN human rights conference in Geneva this month. Last year, Clinton refused to sponsor such a resolution.

At the same time, the Pentagon has prepared a report on the alleged Chinese military build-up across the Taiwan Strait. Chinese military expenditure, of course, is only a fraction of that of the world’s two biggest military spenders, the United States and Japan (the latter, despite its “peace constitution,” maintains, among many other military capabilities, the world’s second-largest navy).

China has reacted strongly to the insane, incompetent plans of Defense Secretary William Cohen to build (if he can) and deploy a Theater Missile Defense (TMD) system with Japan, and possibly Taiwan. China views this scheme as a threat to the overall stability of the Asia-Pacific region, and totally unjustified by the military situation. Deploying TMD systems in Taiwan, would be seen by Beijing as an unacceptable strategic provocation against its national interests. Foreign Minister Tang Jianxuan said at a press conference on March 7 that development of the TMD system for Japan will “exert a negative impact on the global and regional strategic balance and stability into the next century. So China is very much concerned about it.”

It should be noted, that Cohen’s incompetent National Missile Defense system (NMD) for the United States, would aim at China’s minuscule strategic nuclear force, of 17 ICBMs.

U.S. human rights violations

The frenzy worsened as Secretary of State Madeleine Albright departed for a visit to China on March 1, when the State Department issued its annual “Human Rights” report—attacking “human rights violations” in 190 nations—except, of course, the United States. This report was nastier to China than in previous years.

Just before Albright’s trip, she had met with President Clinton in San Francisco, where he gave a speech, reiterating his policy toward China: “I do not believe we can hope to bring change to China if we isolate China from the forces of change. Of course, we have our differences, and we must press them. But we can do that, and expand our cooperation, through principled and purposeful engagement with China, its government, and its people.”

Albright did not follow Clinton’s lead, and launched her usual “human rights” diatribe in Beijing, just as she had at the Chinese Embassy reception in Washington in January, marking the 20th anniversary of U.S.-China ties. But the Chinese government was prepared for her. During her visit, the *People’s Daily* published a long, well-researched article documenting, accurately and in devastating detail, the economic, racial, imprisonment, crime, and other conditions in the United States, which violate the rights of its citizens.

Speaking at a press conference prior to their meeting, Foreign Minister Tang warned about the “handful of anti-China elements within the United States,” who seemed intent on “going all out to interfere with and obstruct the normal development of U.S.-China relations. . . . Their acts have run totally against the trend of historical development . . . nor do they serve the aspiration and interests of the general public in the United States.” Albright countered that “everyone was ‘united’ around their concern for human rights.”

State Department spokesman James Rubin later described the talks as “forceful, tough, and there wasn’t a lot of agreement.”

The new Rosenberg case

After Albright’s return, things got hotter, with new charges of Chinese “military espionage” emerging daily from the U.S. Congress and media. On March 6 and 7, the *New York Times* published two articles, elaborating a Feb. 17 *Washington Post* story alleging that the Chinese gained access to information on how to produce smaller warheads so that it could MIRV its missiles, through alleged spies employed at Los Alamos National Laboratory during the 1980s. (MIRV stands for Multiple Independent Reentry Vehicles.) One of the authors, Jeff Gerth, had written an article in April 1998, claiming that China got U.S. military technology through commercial satellite launches, which led to the formation of the “Cox Committee.”

Asked by NBC’s host Tim Russert on “Meet the Press” on March 7, whether this theft was of greater significance than the damage allegedly done by the “Soviet spies,” the

Rosenbergs, Senate Intelligence Committee chairman Shelby, a Conservative Revolution relic, agreed.

This reference to the Rosenbergs, who were executed for allegedly passing nuclear secrets to the Soviet Union, unfortunately has relevance to the current situation. The Soviet Union, with its scientific tradition and capabilities, did not require stolen secrets to develop its nuclear arms capability. China, too, developed the atomic bomb in 1964 in a massive national effort, after being denied all technology by the U.S.S.R. and the United States, more rapidly than either other nuclear power had.

Senator Shelby fulminated about U.S. national security, and said that he is planning to hold closed-door hearings starting on March 17, where his first witness will be FBI Director Louis Freeh. According to the *New York Times*, the discovery of the alleged Chinese espionage came to light while Congress was investigating the role of foreign money in the 1996 Presidential campaign and as charges emerged that Beijing had secretly funneled money to the Democratic Party.

The same day, Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott (R-Miss.), a notorious racist, said that the Senate may consider holding the administration in contempt of Congress in an attempt to expose more “security violations” in relation to China. On March 11, Richard Lugar (R-Ind.), who sits on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, published his own diatribe claiming that the United States “may now be at significantly greater risk from a Chinese ballistic missile attack.”

Chinese Foreign Minister Tang Jianxuan dismissed the charges as baseless and “very irresponsible” during his Beijing news conference: “There are some people who want to stop the United States from exporting normal high-technology products to China. I think this will not be beneficial to the interests of the United States.”

The most recent operation has been the firing of the Chinese-born scientist Wen Ho Lee from Los Alamos National Laboratory. Unfortunately, Department of Energy Secretary Bill Richardson on March 8 recommended to the University of California, which operates the laboratory, that it fire Lee for “failing to properly inform the Laboratory and DOE about contact with people from a sensitive country; specific instances of failing to properly safeguard classified material; and *apparently* attempting to deceive the laboratory about security-related issues” (emphasis added).

However, even the FBI, which had been investigating Lee, has admitted that it has no proof of any wrongdoing, and therefore has no ground to arrest him. Gaffney again raised the specter of the McCarthy period, in a March 8 press release, claiming that Los Alamos has been a “security problem” since “Julius Rosenberg, half a century ago went shopping for atomic secrets for the Soviet Union.”

Sen. Bob Smith (R-N.H.), chairman of a Senate Armed Services subcommittee, has also joined the fray, calling for the firing of National Security Adviser Sandy Berger, a Clinton loyalist, over the “spy cases.”

Principals Committee readies ‘Final Solution’ in the Middle East

by Muriel Mirak-Weissbach

The Anglo-American aggression against Iraq is scheduled to escalate through this month, and, by the latest, in April, to culminate in a ground offensive by special forces, which will attempt to topple the government of Saddam Hussein. This is the plan, elaborated by Chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. Henry Hugh Shelton. Over the first two weeks of March, U.S. Defense Secretary William Cohen followed in Shelton’s footsteps on a tour of the region, to discuss the plan with the Arab Gulf governments, and Israel. His discussions with the Israelis, though not publicized, most certainly dealt with the other prong of the regional offensive: Israel’s planned attack against Lebanon and/or Syria.

The timing of both projected offensives, is determined by events outside the purely military context. The British, Shelton, and Cohen are eager to see through their reenactment of the Panama invasion before the April summit of NATO in Washington, during which they intend to present the “new NATO doctrine” tested against Iraq, as a *fait accompli*. Israel’s scheduling considerations are largely shaped by Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu’s calculation, that a campaign into Lebanon could enhance his electoral chances, if the hostilities can be brought to a successful conclusion well enough in advance of the May 17 vote in Israel.

There is no guarantee that either option will function according to prescription. If the insane Shelton plan is implemented, and special forces enter Iraq, all indications are that civil war will be the result. Failure in the putsch attempt would then put the deployment of tactical nuclear weapons on the table. This, like Israel’s aggression against Lebanon/Syria, will be vehemently opposed by Russia, China, and France. Thus, this two-front conflict constitutes a test case for the new NATO doctrine of Shelton et al., of utterly unforeseeable ultimate consequences.

Cohen readies the troops

For the first time on such a tour of the Persian Gulf and Middle East, the U.S. Defense Secretary openly discussed ground troop deployments. As noted in an Associated Press wire March 10, “The U.S. military is taking a series of low-profile military steps to improve its capability for ground combat in the Persian Gulf region—even as the high-profile air battle over northern and southern Iraq thunders on.” Cohen