

Ray Cline woos the Chinese students

by Leo Scanlon

In the weeks following the student insurrection in China, the entire policy apparatus of Washington, including President Bush himself, has admitted to being caught “flat-footed” by the events. Under these circumstances, the announcement on June 7 of the formation of a brand-new Washington-based organization linked directly to Chinese partisans, should have contributed to an improvement in the analytical climate. But a close look at the ideology and pedigree of this new International Committee in Solidarity with Chinese Democracy indicates that it was created merely to fill the vacuum in policy thinking with more of the same old balance-of-power nostrums.

The new organization’s debut was a press conference held under the auspices of the Global Strategy Council and was presided over by Ray Cline, who is chairman of the Council, and former Deputy Director of Intelligence of the CIA. Principal speaker for the Committee was Feng Sheng-Ping, a student from Fudan University, now studying at Princeton, who is a member of the Standing Committee of the Chinese Alliance for Democracy, an organization of Chinese students in the United States. Feng is an editor of a new publication, *China and Pacific Rim Letter*, published by Cline and the Global Strategy Council.

Cline, opening the press conference, was careful to preserve his credentials as a “friend of Taiwan” by reading and endorsing the policy position of the government of the Republic of China, and even went so far as to praise the government of the R.O.C. for its successful record of economic development.

Feng, for his part, scored the vacillation and hypocrisy of the Bush administration’s policy toward the opposition leaders in China, and emphasized that the U.S. establishment has made a cowardly commitment to tolerate, and even support, the stability of the Deng regime. But Feng was careful to avoid any discussion of the ideas of Dr. Sun Yat-sen which have made the R.O.C.’s success possible, and downplayed the influence these ideas have on the mainland today.

Feng’s view is not a simple hostility to the R.O.C.’s ruling Kuomintang party; he accepts the Communist Party as the legitimate institution ruling the mainland, and counts himself among those who look to the present upsurge on the mainland to result in, first, multi-candidate elections within

the Communist Party, then multi-party elections, and finally “democracy” in the country as a whole. Such schematic views of revolutionary events are popular among the American academic circles in which Feng travels. As for the fate of Taiwan’s government, Feng had scant support indeed: “If it is a government, legitimate government, that’s only because the opponents of that government are not strong enough to get rid of it and put another government in.”

At a reception later, a less diplomatic colleague of Feng told a reporter that the model of development of Taiwan is not to be emulated, since “there was economic development, and industry under Hitler as well,” and went on to equate the nationalist Kuomintang regime with the Nazi government. Academic hostility to the nationalist government, and slanders of Chiang Kai-shek, are the stock-in-trade of the liberals who engineered the Communist victory in the 1940s, and are equally common among many who call themselves “friends of Taiwan” in the United States.

‘World federalists’ behind the scenes

If the bizarre concept that “democracy” can evolve out of a Communist regime, sounds similar to the administration propaganda extolling the virtues of Gorbachov today—and of the butcher Deng himself just a few months ago—that is because it comes from the same source.

Feng and his committee are backed by an obscure organization known as the Association to Unite the Democracies, which represents the views of a core of “federalists” within the State Department and intelligence community. Energized by the ideas of Clarence Streit and his 1939 book *Union Now*, the AUD believes that the NATO military alliance must become an actual government which can subordinate the sovereign nations of the alliance to a federalized, “democratic” system. In their view, Communism is a form of government which can be considered a precursor to democracy, and can be “evolved” into a democratic system.

The AUD asserts that the “Northern Democracies” (read: “white Europeans”) can attract and stabilize the Communist regimes as they reform themselves along the austerity guidelines laid down by the International Monetary Fund. More than one observer has commented that the alliance of Communist regimes with the genocidal policies of the IMF is “a marriage made in hell.”

The AUD may be obscure, but it is not insignificant. Its board of directors includes Walter Judd and George Olmstead of the Global Strategy Council.

An American representative of the organization boasted that they intend to use the membership base of the China Spring movement, of which he spoke in disparaging terms, and expand from there to build the new committee. Thus “vetted” by Ray Cline and his friends, they plan to represent themselves as the “official, reliable” spokesmen on Chinese developments to the government, the media, and the intelligence community.