
Asia

Deng speech flaunts totalitarian regime's commitment to genocide

by Linda de Hoyos

As if the world required it, the June 9 speech of China's leader Deng Xiaoping has made manifestly clear the totalitarian character of the "unified" Communist leadership now ruling the People's Republic of China. "The storm had to come, sooner or later," stated Deng, opening his apologia for the mass murder in Beijing June 3-5. "This proceeded inevitably from the international climate and China's own, subsumed climate. . . . It was only a matter of time and of extent. We were lucky that it happens now, above all because now, still, a great number of old comrades are still living. They have already survived many storms, and know the causes and consequences of the developments."

The students, Deng claimed, were aiming to "overthrow the Chinese Communist Party," "create a Western-oriented bourgeois republic," and accomplish "the abolition of the socialist order."

The peasant army, Deng hailed as the "wall of steel for the party. . . . They have proven they are the defenders of socialism," and then fulminated: "We have seen the cruelty of the enemy, and we will not forgive."

Amid his diatribes against "bourgeois liberalization," Deng also denounced the American Constitution as any model for China, stating: "We must insist on the National People's Congress, and not on the introduction of the American system of the separation of the three powers."

With these pronouncements, Deng summoned up the spirit that made him the top hatchet man for Mao Zedong's bloody purges of 1957, and the Grand Inquisitor against the "Hundred Flowers"—Mao's brief respite for the intelligentsia.

Underlining the Orwellian nightmare character of the communist regime was the interview broadcast by NBC's Tom Brokaw from Beijing with State Council spokesman Yuan Mu, who declared with a straight face: "The Liberation Army advanced to Tiananmen to enforce martial law and maintain order in the capital. When it cleared up Tiananmen Square, no casualties occurred. Not a single person was killed nor was anyone crushed by military vehicles of the Liberation Army. . . . There was no such thing as killing people."

Despite the importance of Deng's June 9 speech, it has been published only in an unauthorized translation in the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* June 23. While Washington sputters about the intelligence failure that "lost China"

LaRouche's observations

The following statement was issued on June 22 by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. in response to the People's Republic of China government's continuing lies about the massacre in Tiananmen Square on June 4, and the subsequent arrests and executions of student pro-democracy leaders:

"The government of the People's Republic of China is continuing to lie in denying the massacre that was seen by television viewers around the world. In point of fact, more than 4,000 people were killed in the June 3 action in Tiananmen Square alone. The actions of the 27th Army are known worldwide. The present Communist regime in Beijing has lost its Mandate from Heaven. They are attempting to pretend that they have not lost the Mandate from Heaven despite the fact that the whole world knows this to be the case.

"If there are any patriots still remaining in the current regime in Beijing, they should recognize that it is impossible to save the Communist regime, now that the Mandate from Heaven has been lost. It is time now to save China from a collapse into catastrophe beyond imagination. China must be saved; not the Communist regime in Beijing. Perhaps it is time to listen to the people who were speaking from Tiananmen Square. Perhaps they have now inherited the Mandate from Heaven."

(see article page 61), the U.S. and relevant news media are suppressing the evidence of the nature of the P.R.C. regime, in deference to the "important relationship" the United States believes it has with China.

According to intelligence sources, that special relationship involves Chinese assistance to U.S. intelligence operations, including the Chinese arming of the Afghan mujahideen; the Chinese selling of arms to Khomeini's Iran; the Chinese arming of the Contras in Central America; and Chinese intelligence operations in Africa, particularly in Zaire.

Stampede on the Hill

However, the American population is evidently not satisfied with the equivocation coming from the Bush administration.

On June 20, 15 congressmen from Capitol Hill visited the P.R.C. embassy to protest the Tiananmen massacre. House Majority Leader Richard Gephardt (D-Mo.), who led the contingent, reported that any attacks on students in the P.R.C. were purely an "internal affair." The congressmen demanded the enactment of H.R. 2613 against the mainland regime, which would deny China most-favored nation treatment for its trade, and withdraw the benefits of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation.

The increasing pressure on the Bush administration to take stronger action against the Communist leadership, resulted in a stampede against Secretary of State James Baker on June 20. Under questioning from insistent senators, Baker, in testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, did an about-face and claimed that he had urged the White House to suspend all political contact with the P.R.C., at the level of assistant secretary and above. This includes cancelling a planned trip to Beijing by Commerce Secretary Robert Mosbacher on July 10. Baker also said that the U.S. would do "what we can to postpone consideration of loan applications in international financial institutions, at least for the time being."

However, a day later, and Baker had dropped such "militant demeanor." Baker urged congressmen to mute their criticism of U.S. policy toward China. He defended the Bush policy and the "special relationship" with the Chinese leaders Bush admits he can't even reach on the telephone. "We've seen examples in the past where we have not spoken with one voice in foreign policy," intoned Baker.

The source of this appeasement policy, however, is not the White House, but Henry Kissinger. Appraising U.S. policy, the *Financial Times* June 23, that "There is a desire to express moral outrage and stand up for democratic values. . . . On the other, there is a careful calculation of America's strategic interests—the *realpolitik* school of Mr. Henry Kissinger and his many disciples. . . . Bush and his advisers, especially Secretary of State James Baker, a chip off the old Kissinger *realpolitik* block, do not want to sacrifice the gains of the 1970s and 1980s."

Soviet master stroke in the Persian Gulf

by Thierry Lalevée

Iranian Speaker of the Parliament Hashemi Rafsanjani's visit to Moscow on June 20 comes at a critical time for both the Soviet and Iranian leaders. Though the trip had been planned for months, it has the same impact as when Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze landed in Teheran last February and pulled off an unscheduled meeting with Ruhollah Khomeini: It confirms the worst fears about Iran's striking a decisive relationship with the Soviet Union, which will dramatically change the balance of power in the entire Fertile Crescent region.

Right off the bat, it gives Moscow a close to unchallengeable position in a region extending from the Mediterranean Sea to the Indian Ocean, consolidating its southern flank and marshalling to its advantage the so-called "Green Belt" of Islamic fundamentalism advocated by the Carter and Reagan administrations. With Syria as a reliable and totally dependent ally, Afghanistan as a tightly controlled satrapy, Iraq as a state still bound to a mutual defense treaty, and India maintaining an ambiguous foreign policy, the new Soviet relationship with Iran highlights the danger looming over both Turkey and Pakistan.

Iran and the Soviet Union each have their own imperial visions, religious and political for the first, political and military for the second, so the newly established relationship is needed for both. For Hashemi Rafsanjani, the aim is a spectacular consolidation of his personal ambitions at home. His arrival was timed with the announcement that the Aug. 18 presidential elections in Iran will actually be held on July 18, ensuring that no other candidate could successfully challenge his planned election. The very fact that he could travel to Moscow in the midst of the official mourning period for Ruhollah Khomeini underscores his power. In other times, this would have been heralded as a "very positive indication" by those fools in the West, starting in Washington, who considered him as the most "pragmatic" and "pro-Western" of the mad mullahs. The fact that this was underlined by a trip to *Moscow*, has provoked dismay and deflated illusions.

What Rafsanjani gets

As far as Rafsanjani is concerned, the deal is good. He can expect the Soviets to influence their own friends within Iran not to challenge his position, and why should they, if indeed, Rafsanjani, the "pragmatist," the "moderate," just joined their radical ranks? He proved it while in Moscow by repeating the death sentence against novelist Salman Rush-