

Taiwanese society, whether or not it wins elections.

Separatism has a long history inside Taiwan. However, apart from a small indigenous population, most of Taiwan's inhabitants are Chinese, who came from the mainland over many generations. The "newcomers" are the mainland Chinese who moved to Taiwan with the central government in 1949 when the Communists took over the mainland. A year before, in 1948, due to the misconduct of the appointed Chinese commissioner in Taiwan, the Communists orchestrated riots there, costing many Taiwanese lives. This planted the seed of the idea that Taiwan belongs to the "Taiwanese," and that mainland Chinese bring only problems. During the 1950s, Taiwanese avoided involvement in mainland Chinese affairs, and even shunned intermarriage with newcomers from the mainland. Later, due to careful handling by the government, a land reform system gave the Taiwanese far better economic interests, and regionalism was disarmed step by step. Currently, Taiwanese have more advantages than other mainland Chinese, because of their social background, and the average Taiwanese is better off financially than those who arrived from the mainland as refugees.

But for 40 years, only a few Taiwanese have been involved in the government service, which is why the DPP is demanding National Assembly elections and free presidential elections. They want to put more Taiwanese in policy-making circles to be able to control the central government.

At the Dec. 2 election, there are 16 important posts, including the mayor and the governor of Kao-hsiung. At present, the DPP holds six of these positions, in I-Lan, Kaohsiung, Tainan city, Hsinchu city, Cianghua city, and Chia-ye city. They intend to win another four positions in different cities and counties.

The DPP is also using more violent methods, essentially to undermine the social stability of the R.O.C. Intelligence sources report that many of the gangsters, also cropping up like bamboo shoots on Taiwan, are in the pay of DPP radicals, and armed from the growing weapons trade from the mainland. There are more than 1,000 "professional" goons throughout Taiwan, who are mobilized whenever the DPP needs to run a demonstration in Taipei city. The same familiar faces appear again and again in the front lines of the DPP demonstrations.

To prevent violence, it is essential that the government deal with these problems. If the DPP wins in the elections, it will push for an independent Taiwan. Even if they do not win, there is great danger of violence at the polls. If this occurs, there is no doubt that the U.S. observers will carry out a replay of their attacks on the elections in the Philippines and Panama, and will attempt to use the scandal against the KMT. The Communists are closely watching the situation, and Taiwan out of control is exactly what they want. If the R.O.C. does not guard its republic now, its citizens will be ashamed to face their ancestors, when they are gone.

South Korea opposes U.S. troop withdrawal

by Lydia Cherry

South Korean President Noh Tae Woo told a joint session of the U.S. House and Senate on Oct. 18 that tragic results would follow any reduction of U.S. troops from his country. "Any hint of weakening in the U.S. defense commitment or a precipitate lessening of the military presence might cause North Korea to misjudge the U.S. commitment to peace in the region," he said. "The results would be tragic. Thus far, security cooperation between our two countries remains strong and effective. Let us not disturb it until necessity dictates change. For this reason, I welcome and applaud the pledge of President Bush and the American government that U.S. ground troops will remain as long as the Korean people want and need them."

In an interview with a *New York Times* reporter timed to be published upon his arrival in the United States on Oct. 14, Noh had specified that "U.S. troops in Korea not only defend South Korea against a possible attack from North Korea. They are an important factor in the overall military balance of power in northeast Asia. There can be a slight modification as time goes by, but the general level of the American presence is not a subject for any possible change."

In reporting on both Noh's message to Congress and his talks with President Bush, the wire services and U.S. press report on a different slant that U.S. officials gave to the results of the talks. In Washington, the "decouplers," who advocate a U.S. military withdrawal, are gaining ground. "Mr. Noh went further [than had President Bush], suggesting the two leaders agreed that the number of U.S. troops in South Korea should remain steady at roughly 43,000," the *Washington Times* reported Oct. 18. "They agreed 'there should be no change in the current level of the Korean-U.S. combined defense capability,' Noh said. U.S. officials, however, refused to rule out future reductions in U.S. troops levels, and, in what could be interpreted as preparations for that eventuality, attempted to steer the issue away from precise numbers of troops."

The *Times* quoted an administration official suggesting that the United States could help South Korea defend itself at less cost, perhaps by changes in the U.S. military command

structure. But, said the official, "The threat from the North has not demonstrably eased. If anything, it's going in the other direction."

Richard Solomon, assistant secretary of state, was quoted by Reuters on Oct. 17 telling reporters that the size of the current U.S. contingent in South Korea could be significantly reduced from its 43,000 level. "We are not making the troop level, the number of troops, the measures of our security commitment," he said.

U.S. back-channels to the North

The Seoul daily *Choson Ilbo* on Oct. 8 revealed apprehension about the possibility that the United States might agree to a deal regarding the Korean peninsula, with or without Seoul's consent. It notes that "former U.S. Assistant Secretary of State Gaston Sigur, adviser to an institute on China and Soviet affairs at George Washington University in the U.S., is reported to be leaving for North Korea on Oct. 20 for a week-long visit. Before Mr. Sigur, North Korea's Academy of Social Sciences invited Robert Scalapino, professor at University of California. . . . Long before him, Dr. [John W.] Lewis, director of an institute for strategic affairs at Stanford University went to North Korea and had long talks with Kim Il-sung."

The daily added that, of the recent visits, "we attach far greater importance to Mr. Sigur's scheduled visit," in that "his career as such can have a far more powerful impact even on the Bush administration. . . . We are concerned about the possibility that the United States, being less familiar with the North Korean authorities' way of thinking and way of behaving than we are, could fall victim to the fraud of the 'Kim-Il-sungists.' Even when the negotiations were under way for an Armistice Agreement, we objected to being a signatory to it, because we know very well that it would provide the communists with an opportunity to reorganize and strengthen themselves. As a result, the United States signed it alone. Of course, we believe that the United States would not repeat the same mistake."

Choson Ilbo reports on four rounds of contacts between "influential diplomats" of the U.S. and North Korea which took place in Beijing in the last year. "The fourth contact that took place on 15 May draws our special attention, because it occurred shortly after James Lilley, who previously served as U.S. ambassador to Korea, assumed office in Beijing. Reports after that told us many things: that North Korea would fly chartered planes to the United States; that North Korea would soon send students to the United States for advanced studies before the end of this year; that the United States would issue visas to North Korean student tourists, and that the two countries would go so far as to open direct phone lines."

Looking at the backgrounds of the U.S. emissaries who have visited the North Korean capital of Pyongyang, Seoul has reason to question whether its interests will be protected

in the back-channel negotiations they are carrying out. John Lewis from Stanford, for example, wrote a joint proposal for a "Yalta"-type arrangement with the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences Institute of the Far East, as early as June 1988. Robert Scalapino has a long history of close association with the Soviet Union. And another such unofficial State Department emissary, Adm. Eugene LaRoque, director of the Center for Defense Information, had this to say in a speech at the National Press Club on Oct. 18. "Korea is a net drain for us. Korea does not contribute anything that we need in the way of economic help. They have a favorable balance of trade for Korea of about \$10 billion a year. There are no raw materials that we need from Korea. There is nothing to benefit us from Korea. So that from a purely military point of view, you could not justify the maintenance of U.S. forces in Korea. . . . We ought to take our forces out, and they will be out; they will be out by the end of this century—at the latest."

In a conversation following his presentation, LaRoque told *EIR* that his visit to North Korea the summer before last was partially at the behest of the U.S. State Department.

Sharing the podium with LaRoque was another friend of the State Department, Pharis Harvey, director of the North American Coalition for Human Rights in Korea, who is also National Council of Churches' "Korea hand." Harvey insisted that the administration and Congress rebuff President Noh Tae Woo's "lobbying operation." "Unless it is a lobbying effort to prevent withdrawal of U.S. troops from Korea," there is "no serious reason for President Noh Tae Woo to visit Washington at this time." Harvey continued that "the U.S. is in the unique position of being able to offer what North Korea most wants, the reduction, and even the eventual phaseout of its military presence in Korea, and for which it appears ready to pay a considerable price. The key to genuine dialogue is in our hands."

Who is revving up trade war?

In light of the above, the question of *cui bono*—who benefits?—has to be asked about the sharp intensification of the U.S. trade war tactics against South Korea. Seoul on Oct. 13 witnessed a wild scene in which U.S. Ambassador to Korea Donald Gregg had to run for his life to flee students protesting U.S. agricultural dumping policies against the Republic of Korea. The students broke into the ambassador's residence to protest U.S. pressure on Korea to open markets to U.S. agricultural products; they set off explosives and caused serious damage.

Though this is the most dramatic case, similar incidents have abounded in which it is the U.S. side which directly creates the reasons for the anti-U.S. sentiment, which the "decouplers" on the U.S. side then use to boost their case for pulling U.S. troops out. In the words of Admiral LaRoque, "U.S. troops will ultimately leave South Korea; They should do so before popular opinion in South Korea turns against the United States to the point that we are run out on a rail."