

Provocateurs aim at carving up China

by Mary Burdman

On July 9, Taiwan's President Lee Teng-hui gave an exclusive interview to the German radio service Deutsche Welle, at his office in Taipei, in which he made the absurd, but dangerously provocative claim that there exist "state-to-state" relations between China and Taiwan.

Lee Teng-hui's assertion is all the more absurd, because he said that the model for his "special state-to-state ties" was the former relations between the defunct German Democratic Republic (East Germany) and the German Federal Republic. (Germany, of course, was peacefully reunited in 1993!) With delusions of grandeur, Lee apparently wants to imagine Taiwan as the "West Germany" of the relationship; but, given his efforts to try to keep China divided, he should take warning from the demise of the G.D.R.'s Egon Krenz.

Despite the fact that the world's nations, with only a tiny handful of exceptions, recognize only one nation of China, and recognize the People's Republic of China as its legitimate government, Lee told Deutsche Welle that, "since [Taiwan's] constitutional reform in 1991, we have designated cross-strait ties as nation-to-nation, or at least as special state-to-state ties, rather than internal ties within 'one China' between a legitimate government and a rebellion group, or between central and local governments."

It is no accident that Lee is making these statements now, a full eight years after these changes allegedly were made.

British geopolitics

The present moment is a critical one. The world financial system is lurching toward the abyss; one central goal of the "British-American-Commonwealth" (BAC) forces, which remain the most powerful in this collapsing system, is to attempt to "surround" and isolate China, and to sabotage any

potential strategic relationship between the United States and China. To this end, NATO deliberately bombed the Chinese Embassy in Belgrade on May 8, and the U.S. Congressional "Cox Committee" released its loony, but vicious, report claiming that China had stolen what the committee alleged were U.S. military technologies (see "Backlash Grows Against Gore's Cox Report Hoax," *EIR*, June 11, 1999).

The BAC strategy against China was explicitly laid out by Gerald Segal, of London's International Institute of Strategic Studies, in a March 1994 paper entitled "China Changes Shape: Regionalism and Foreign Policy," blatantly promoting "opening and dividing China."

"The outside world has no interest in the formal breakup of China," Segal wrote. "But . . . it may be that the only way to ensure that China does not become more dangerous as it grows richer and stronger, is to ensure that in practice, if not in law, there is more than one China to deal with." Echoing the British imperialistic "divide and conquer" policies from the past 250 years, Segal's report laid out a perspective to involve not only the then-Crown Colony of Hong Kong, but also Taiwan and Japan in the process.

Segal called on governments and international business to open their own direct ties with China's provinces and cities, in an effort to undermine the central government, using economic means. The next step, Segal went so far as to propose, would be to try to put international security issues on the agenda with China's regions. His proposals have not met with success.

A key channel in carrying out these operations against China, is the "Taiwan Lobby" in Washington, which was characterized by a Reagan-era Washington insider, as comparable only to the Zionist Lobby for its nastiness, clout, and

the money it throws around. Offices such as that of Sen. Jesse Helms (R-N.C.) are bastions of this “spook” operation. The “Taiwan Lobby,” and its hosts, are trying not only to undermine President Clinton’s determined effort to establish a strategic relationship with China, but also to destroy the legacy of both Presidents Richard Nixon and Ronald Reagan, in establishing, and expanding, a cooperative U.S.-Chinese relationship.

The situation in Taiwan

Lee’s words should not be seen as representing any consensus within Taiwan. He is, first, a lame-duck President whose term will end after the March 2000 elections. There is a hot political situation inside Taiwan. Former provincial Governor James Soong (Taiwan had always had a provincial government, until it was abolished by the Lee Teng-hui forces in 1997) has split from the ruling Kuomintang (KMT) party to stand as an independent candidate for President, and is opposing the KMT candidate, Lee’s Vice President Lien Chan. Soong is committed to establishing closer relations with the People’s Republic.

The economic situation is also contentious. A few years ago, Lee’s government had declared that Taiwan businessmen, who are the fourth-largest investors in the mainland, would not be allowed to invest in infrastructure projects there—a declaration which provoked big protest demonstrations. There is no question that China-Taiwan trade (conducted via Hong Kong), which is vital for the island’s economy, has been hit as hard as all other trade within Asia; Lee’s provocations could only hurt Taiwan’s economy even more.

In the July 9 interview, Lee asserted that during 1991-92, Taiwan had amended its Constitution, so as to state that the “jurisdiction of the Constitution has been restricted to Taiwan, and recognized the P.R.C.’s legality in administering mainland China.” Reforms established the direct popular election of the President and Vice President. This, he claimed, means that “the legitimacy of the administration of state power can only be authorized by the Taiwan people and has absolutely nothing to do with the people on mainland China.” From this, Lee did a double flip, to claim that China-Taiwan relations are now “nation-to-nation” or “special state-to-state ties.”

Asked whether “declaring Taiwan independence seemingly is not actually feasible,” Lee leapt from the assertion that the Republic of China—which, before 1991, had claimed sovereignty not only over all of mainland China, but also over Mongolia—is still “an independent sovereign state,” to the claim that, “since our constitutional reform in 1991, we have designated cross-strait ties as special state-to-state ties. *Therefore, there is no need for us to declare Taiwan independence again.*”

Lee made clear what geopolitical cards he would want his “independent Taiwan” to play: “Taiwan’s importance lies in

two aspects: first, to safeguard democracy and human rights; and second, its important strategic position in the western Pacific Ocean.” In addition to pushing the “human rights” line—the Anglo-American establishment’s favorite excuse for starting wars these days—against China, Lee also asserted that “Taiwan’s geographical position allows it to control the sea routes in the western Pacific Ocean, which are very important to the United States, Japan, and Southeast Asian countries. Therefore, whether in cross-strait relations or regional stability, Taiwan is playing an important role.”

Asked what he would do in case of any “military actions” by China, Lee asserted that the United States would have to step in. “In the foreseeable future, the security cooperation between Taiwan and the U.S. will remain an important factor in maintaining stability in the Taiwan Strait,” he said.

Lee repeated the same formulations, including to Honduran Foreign Minister Roberto Flores Bermudez on July 13.

Lee is trying to stir up a lot more trouble than just ensuring U.S. interference in any tensions in the Taiwan Strait. On May 19, he published a book, *Taiwan’s Standpoint*, in which he calls for the destruction of the nation of China. Lee wrote in

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., in an article titled “Ring Around China: Britain Seeks War” (*EIR*, Nov. 21, 1996), warned of exactly the kind of scenario that Taiwan’s Lee Teng-hui is now serving. LaRouche wrote:

“The U.S.’s vital strategic interests are threatened by a coordinated series of destabilizations, ringing China, all coordinated by the British foreign service and its intelligence arms. These British-fired hot-spots include Britain’s ‘Pushtunistan’-oriented, Taliban operations into Afghanistan, Kashmir, and Pakistan itself. They include the British campaign to coordinate the overthrow of the present government of Myanmar (formerly Burma) on the usual, flimsy ‘human rights’ pretexts. It includes the attempt to induce Japan to perceive itself as taking political hegemony over the northern tier of China (and Mongolia), from the central government in Beijing. It includes the repeated efforts by London and their U.S. Republican Party assets, to destabilize the uneasy peace between the northern and southern portions of Korea. It includes the recent cranking up of ‘Radio Free Asia,’ by the same U.S. Republican assets. . . .

“Unless the U.S. government acts to warn the British, openly, that the U.S.A. will not tolerate the presently ongoing, geopolitical ringing of China, the U.S.A. will be at risk of losing all significant ability to deploy an effective foreign policy in defense of vital U.S. global interests.”

his book, that China should end what he called its “great-China chauvinism,” and that it should devolve into seven competing breakaway regions, among which he names Taiwan, Xinjiang, Tibet, Mongolia, and Manchuria.

Lee’s book was first written as a series of interviews with Katsuhiko Eguchi, vice president of the Japanese Peace and Happiness through Prosperity research institute, conducted in Taipei in September 1998. So far, the book has been published only in Chinese and Japanese—a spokesman of the Taipei representative office in Germany said that the book “is very popular in Japan”—but an English version, entitled *With the People Always in My Heart*, is planned.

Beijing Central People’s Radio reported on July 10 that Su Chi, chairman of Taiwan’s Mainland Affairs Council, defended Lee’s position, claiming that Lee had proposed this division on the basis of the “market mechanism.” Su Chi also claimed that China is “too big,” and that the concept of the “supremacy” of the nation has to be forfeited.

At least since the collapse of the Soviet Union, certain circles in Japan have been promoting the breakup of China. In 1991, some Japanese analysts put out the view that, after the disintegration of the Soviet Union, China would be next. A year later, a Tokyo “scholar” even called for dividing China into ten states.

Lee himself grew up in Taiwan under the Japanese occupation, and was educated in pre-war Japan. He maintains very close relations to right-wing circles in Japan.

During the first half of this century, maintaining such an aggressive policy toward China led Japan to disaster in 1945. From the time when Japan abandoned the “American System” principles of the Meiji Restoration, to strive for “Great Power” status, it launched one aggressive war after another against China: the 1895 Sino-Japanese war, after which Japan first took over Taiwan; the use of the brutal Treaty of Versailles at the end of World War I, to first seize German concessions in China, and then put forward the notorious “21 demands” that the Republic of China surrender its economic and political sovereignty; followed by Japan’s bloody 15-year invasion of China, in which some 30 million Chinese people died.

Since 1972, Tokyo has recognized the People’s Republic, and has become the largest foreign investor, and one of the China’s biggest trading partners. Mainstream policy in Japan is in full support of a “one China” policy, as Prime Minister Keizo Obuchi assured the Chinese government during his visit to Beijing on July 8-11. He emphasized that Japan is committed to peaceful construction and its defense-only policy, and called for peaceful resolution of the Taiwan issue by the Chinese, through dialogue.

Obuchi did *not* unequivocally assure Beijing that the new “defense guidelines” for the U.S.-Japanese alliance, which allow joint U.S.-Japanese military deployments in ambiguously defined “emergency . . . situations in areas surrounding Japan,” do not include Taiwan. However, Japan has no laws

specifying relations with Taiwan, which the United States does.

Clinton calls Jiang Zemin

On July 18, U.S. President Clinton called Chinese President Jiang Zemin on the telephone, to “reiterate our strong commitment to the ‘one China’ policy.” Clinton told Jiang, “I want to assure you that the policy will not change; you should have full confidence in the statements I have made to you in our previous meetings.”

Jiang stressed that China remains committed to the peaceful reunification of China, and the policy of “one country, two systems.” In February 1995, Jiang made a speech offering Taiwan the option of maintaining not only its own government and economy, but also its own military, as a future part of the Chinese nation.

In his hour-long discussion with Clinton, Jiang reiterated the long-standing policy of China, that it reserves the right to use force—if necessary. “We will never sit idle if some people engage in ‘Taiwan’s independence,’ and foreign forces interfere in China’s reunification,” he said.

Jiang quoted to Clinton, what Dr. Sun Yat-sen, the founder of republican China, had said on the question of a unified China: “China is a unified country, which has been imprinted on the consciousness of Chinese history. And it is exactly this, which has kept Chinese civilization intact despite the many forces of destruction facing it.”

The great Dr. Sun was the founder of the KMT, of which Lee Teng-hui is the current leader. Sun Yat-sen remained committed, his entire political life, to full cooperation between the KMT and the Communist Party of China.

Jiang also warned Clinton that the anti-China forces remain rampant in the United States. Since then, Clinton has cancelled a planned trip by Pentagon representatives to Taiwan to discuss air defense, and has announced that he is considering a cut-off of arms sales, in order to pressure Lee Teng-hui to back off.

Helms and other dinosaurs

The anti-China mob set off the current tensions between China and the United States by publicly flaunting Lee Teng-hui during his supposedly “personal” visit to the United States in 1995; their every action since then, has been aimed at destroying the Chinese-American relations which President Clinton has been trying to foster.

The latest provocation is the so-called “Taiwan Security Enhancement Act,” which was introduced into the Senate in March—just as NATO was launching its assault on Yugoslavia. This bill, which calls for extending direct U.S. military intervention in the Taiwan Strait by including Taiwan in the proposed (but yet to be successfully developed) “Theater Missile Defense” system, was introduced in the Senate by Helms and Robert Torricelli (D-N.J.), and is co-sponsored by Frank Murkowski (R-Ak.), the key sponsor of Lee in 1995; Trent

Lott (R-Miss.); and others. A House version was introduced by Majority Whip Tom DeLay (R-Tex.) in May; the 32 co-sponsors include House International Relations Committee Chairman Benjamin Gilman (R-N.Y.) and Dana Rohrabacher (R-Calif.).

This bill is an attempt to expand the scope of the existing "Taiwan Relations Act," which already legislates a U.S. "connection with" Taiwan. This includes the United States "maintaining the capacity to resist any form of coercion" against Taiwan—already most unusual, considering that Taiwan is *not* recognized by the United States as a sovereign nation. Not finding this language sufficient, the new proposed bill repeatedly asserts how "separate" Taiwan is from China, and emphasizes the "free market" principles of Taiwan's economy and its "multiparty democracy." The "Security Enhancement Act" states that the limited military links between the United States and Taiwan "could prove detrimental in the event of future aggression against Taiwan."

It calls for selling Taiwan tactical missile defense (TMD) equipment, ground- and naval-based missile defense systems, and other advanced equipment, and establishing "secure direct communications between the U.S. Pacific military command and the Taiwan military command."

Such provisions are, for obvious reasons, clearly perceived in China and elsewhere in the Asia-Pacific, as the eastern counterpart to the "NATO expansion" operation in the West.

Helms turned up at Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings on China-Taiwan relations on July 21, to bluster that "Taiwan deserves to be free," and attempted to compare this subversion of China with the American Revolution against the British Empire.

Another witness at the hearings, Steve Yates of the Heritage Foundation, confirmed that global "NATO expansion," in one form or another, is very much on the agenda. Yates stated that Lee had raised the issue of "state-to-state" relations now, to take advantage of the Kosovo intervention, in which the United States intervened, to create an autonomous situation.

Senator Torricelli at least appeared to recognize the grave dangers in this situation, and stated that, although he had co-sponsored the Taiwan Security Enhancement Act, he was very dismayed by Lee's statements.

Despite these efforts, the provocateurs have not succeeded in creating a crisis on the scale of March 1996, when the United States sent an aircraft carrier into the Taiwan Strait after a world media hype about Chinese military maneuvers. (China was, actually, totally calm internally during this period.)

And, despite media hype this time, spokesmen in Taipei have repeatedly asserted that nothing has been going on. "There is no sign that Chinese communist troops are preparing for large-scale war games," Defense Ministry spokesman Maj. Gen. Kung Fan-ding said on July 13. The next day,

Taipei Air Force headquarters denied media rumors about mainland Chinese fighter jets flying over the middle of the Taiwan Strait. In order to quash further rumors, the office reminded the press, that the upcoming months have always been the peak period for the People's Liberation Army to hold its war games, and that upcoming military activities would likely be in preparation for celebrations of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the P.R.C. on Oct. 1.

Peace efforts

Lee's interview was also clearly timed as an effort to counter the very successful Symposium on the Peaceful Reunification of China, which was sponsored by the Taiwan-based Strait Peaceful Reunification Association in Hong Kong on July 10-11.

Wang Daohan, chairman of mainland China's Association for Relations Across the Taiwan Strait (ARATS), has been invited to visit Taiwan during October. On July 9, Taiwan's Strait Exchange Foundation (SEF) had sent a letter inviting ARATS Vice Chairman and Secretary General Zhang Jincheng to Taiwan in late August or early September to finalize the itinerary of Wang Daohan's planned visit.

Almost 200 analysts, scholars, and public figures, from China, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Macau, and foreign countries, participated in the Hong Kong symposium for an in-depth discussion of the peaceful reunification of China.

The conference issued a joint communiqué calling on both sides of the Taiwan Strait, to hold political negotiations as soon as possible to end the state of hostility, under the principle of "one China." The communiqué acknowledged that, due to special historical circumstances, the Taiwan people's rights and desire to be masters of their own destiny should be respected, and said that a special arrangement acceptable to both sides must be found for Taiwan's political status under the "one China" principle, according to the official Chinese news agency Xinhua.

The communiqué urges Taiwan to open direct postal, commercial, and transport links at an early date, and to abandon the policy of restraining Taiwanese investment on the mainland. It also calls on the mainland to better protect the rights and interests of Taiwan investors.

Perhaps most important, it calls on both sides to jointly promote Chinese culture, as both sides share the same national ideology and the same language.

From Hong Kong, Tang Shubei, executive vice chairman of ARATS, warned on July 12 that Lee Teng-hui is "playing with fire." At the same time, Tang said, on the issue of peaceful reunification, "This symposium was the largest non-governmental symposium of the highest level ever held, and discussion was most profound. The event shows that defending the 'one-China' principle and standing for peaceful reunification and the opening of three direct links have become the common aspirations of compatriots on both sides of the Taiwan Strait."