

NO/NON/NEE/NEIN!

To the Lifting of the EU Arms Embargo on China

The European Union (EU) is contemplating the lifting of its arms sale embargo to China after the annual EU/China summit meeting this coming December 8. The EU imposed its ban on selling arms to China after the 1989 Tiananmen Square Massacre. The 15-year-old embargo is a clear gesture of Europe's ongoing dissatisfaction with the pace of political reform in China and the Chinese government's continuing violation of human rights. It goes without saying that, for Taiwan, lifting the embargo will constitute a disastrous security threat.

Lifting the embargo would require unanimous agreement of the EU member states. Currently the pro-lifting camp counts France, Italy, Spain and Germany among its members. Most of the Nordic countries, however, and some of the East European countries are opposed. The EU's current president -the Netherlands- as of today, opposed lifting the ban.

FAPR vehemently objects to the EU plans to lift the arms embargo to China for various reasons.

First, such lift will alter the current fragile military balance across the Taiwan Strait and will rapidly tip the balance in China's favor. Graham Watson, British member of the European Parliament, argued in the International Herald Tribune in August 2004, "For Taiwan, the lifting of the EU-China arms ban could only send one signal. Taiwan lives with the daily intimidation of its democratic institutions by the People's Republic of China. The prospect of EU-made submarines and missiles being the tools of this intimidation should be out of the question."

The 2004 U.S. Defense Department's report on the military power of China already cautioned that the PRC's ambitious military modernization casts a cloud over Beijing's declared preference for resolving its differences with Taiwan through peaceful means. Richard Lawless, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, testified in a House International Relations Committee hearing last April that, "As the PRC accelerates its force modernization program, Taiwan remains isolated in the international community, especially in the area of security cooperation." It goes without saying that Taiwan's security will be seriously damaged should China be able to acquire advanced weapons from Europe.

second, such a lift will aggravate the already strained relationship between the U.S. and the EU and impact the

immediate U.S. security interests in the region. The Far Eastern Economic Review wrote last August that, "American officials are convinced that a lifting of the embargo could result in a Chinese People's Liberation Army equipped with advanced military systems from Europe. If U.S. forces and Asian allies are called on to intervene militarily in a crisis in the Taiwan Strait, their safety would obviously be imperiled to a greater extent." And, one day these arms may even be used against US armed forces if conflict in Taiwan Strait erupts.

And finally, since the original Tiananmen Square protesters are still in jail and China continues to imprison its citizens for their democratic aspirations, lifting the ban (which after all originates from the 1989 massacre) would be tantamount to saying to those in prison that Europe does not hesitate to arm the oppressor.

To fight this possible lifting of the EU ban on arms sales to China, FAPR worked with Reps. Steve Chabot (R-OH) and Sherrod Brown (D-OH) to craft House Concurrent Resolution 512. Thanks to all who lobbied their Members of Congress to co-sponsor this resolution.

108th Congress H.CON.RES.512

Expressing the sense of Congress regarding the European Union's plans to lift the embargo on arms sales to the People's Republic of China.

Whereas leaders of the European Union and the People's Republic of China will meet in December 2004 in the Hague, the Netherlands, to discuss lifting the European Union's embargo on arms sales to the People's Republic of China;

Whereas the European Union initiated a ban on arms sales to the People's Republic of China after the 1989 Tiananmen Square massacre

Whereas the ban has remained in force due to China's continued violation of human rights;

Whereas the ban displays the European Union's ongoing dissatisfaction with the pace of political reform in China and the continued repression of dissent by China's authoritarian government;

Whereas 14 years after the 1989 pro-democracy demonstrations in Tiananmen Square, many protesters still remain in prison and have not received a fair trial;

Whereas according to the annual human rights reports of the United States State Department of State and various international human rights organizations, the Government of the People's Republic of China continues to commit human rights abuse against its own people;

Whereas lifting the European Union embargo on arms sales to the People's Republic of China will result in the increased procurement of arms by the People's Republic of China;

Whereas the United States shares defense technology with the European Union in order to enhance the interoperability between the two military powers;

Whereas lifting the embargo will render it impossible to guarantee that the military technology that the United States shares with Europe will not be passed on to the People's Republic of China;

Whereas the Taiwan Strait is one of the flashpoints in the world and a conflict in the region will involve United States forces;

Whereas the military balance between Taiwan and the People's Republic of China continues to shift in favor of the People's Republic of China, as documented in recent reports from the Pentagon and in the June 2004 report by the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that –

(1) the President should seek a commitment from the leaders of the European Union that the European Union will not lift its embargo on arms sales to the People's Republic of China; and

(2) the 2005 annual report by the Department of Defense on the military power of People's Republic of China required by section 1202 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (10 U.S.C. 113 note) should include –

(A) an analysis of the effect on the United States interests in the Asia-Pacific region if the European Union lifts of its embargo on arms sales to the People's Republic of China; and

(B) a review of the steps taken by the United States to address such action by the European Union

Unfortunately, the House agenda was too full for this resolution to make it to the floor for a vote. Given the difficulties in the current lame duck session of Congress, it seems clear that the resolution will not be passed.

Next to this resolution, Representatives sent a letter to the Prime Minister of The Netherlands urging him to do what he can to make sure the ban stays.

- The Hon. Jan Peter Balkenende
Prime Minister
Ministerie van Algemene Zaken
Kabinet van de Minister President
Postbus 20001
2500EA, The Hague
THE NETHERLANDS

Dear Mr. Balkenende:

On 8 December, the EU will hold a summit meeting with China. One of the major topics of discussion will be whether the EU will lift its arms embargo on China.

We understand that German Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder and French President Jacques Chirac are in favor of lifting the embargo, imposed in 1989 after the crackdown on China's democracy movement at Tiananmen Square.

We believe that Europe should take the positions of other democracies into account. The views of the U.S., Japan, and democratic nations that surround China -- such as Taiwan and South Korea -- should weigh heavily in the balance between pro and con. They clearly do not favor lifting the embargo.

We oppose such a lift for the following reasons:

First, a lift will alter the current fragile military balance across the Taiwan Strait and will rapidly tip the balance in China's favor. It goes without saying that Taiwan's security will be seriously damaged should China be able to acquire advanced weapons from Europe.

Second, a lift would aggravate the relationship between the U.S. and the EU and impact the immediate U.S. security interests in the region. Also, the Far Eastern Economic Review wrote last August that, "American officials are convinced that a lifting of the embargo could result in a Chinese People's Liberation Army equipped with advanced military systems from Europe."

And finally: the original Tiananmen Square protesters are still in jail. Lifting the ban (which after all originates from the 1989 massacre) would be tantamount to saying to those in prison that Europe does not hesitate to arm the oppressor.

We urge you to use your good offices to work with your European Union colleagues to make sure that the EU arms embargo on China remains.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely yours,

- Steve Chabot	Sherrod Brown
- Tom Lantos	Tim Ryan
- Mark Souder	Pete Sessions
- Tom Tancredo	Vito Fossella
- Earl Blumenauer	Steve King
- John Shimkus	John Hostettler
- Gene Green	Lane Evans
- Howard Berman	Brad Sherman
- John Culberson	Ron Lewis
- Shelley Berkley	Gil Gutknecht
- Dave Camp	Peter King
- Hilda Solis	Thaddeus McCotter

The International Herald Tribune and the Washington Times printed our letter re. this important issue on October 30, 2004.

- **International Herald Tribune
Saturday, October 30, 2004**

"Arming China"

The editorial "Courting China" (Oct. 19) highlights President Jacques Chirac's effort to lift the longstanding European Union arms embargo against China.

The French president seems to forget that the ban on exporting arms to China was instituted in response to international outrage over the 1989 massacre of unarmed students and civilians in Tiananmen Square.

Fifteen years later, Chirac intends to supply the same army with highly advanced weaponry in direct contradiction to stated EU principles of respect for human rights and democracy.

Besides domestic repression, another function of the Chinese government is to intimidate Taiwan. If the EU repeals its embargo, it will also enhance the formidable threat Beijing already poses to Taiwan.

A European Union that exports arms to China would find itself in opposition to the United States, which supplies defensive weaponry to Taiwan. Lifting the embargo would add strain to the already battered trans-Atlantic alliance.

The European Union must now define itself politically as either a continued force for the advancement of human rights and preservation of stability, or as merely a trading association that seeks profit at every opportunity, without regard to human cost.

Ming-chi Wu, Washington
President, FAPA

WASHINGTON TIMES
October 30, 2004
Letters to editor

On the EU, China and Taiwan

The letter from Chinese Embassy spokesman Sun

Weide ("China and the arms embargo," Oct. 16) in support of the French-led attempt to repeal the European Union arms embargo against China completely misrepresents why, when and how the embargo was instituted.

Mr. Sun, for instance, argues that the embargo dates from the Cold War. But it was adopted because of the human rights tragedy that took place on Tiananmen Square, June 4, 1989. It had nothing to do with the Cold War.

His claim that there are no grounds for linking the EU embargo to human rights is false as well. He argues that the extent to which China adheres to human rights has never been higher. Still, Tiananmen demonstrators are in jail today, and advocacy of the cause they espoused remains a criminal offense.

The press counselor then states that the Chinese government follows peaceful foreign and defense policies. If this is the case, why does the Communist government need to import arms? What pressing threat justifies China's interest in satellite technology that would facilitate that nation's use of joint direct attack munitions -style guided bombs?

He then identifies Taiwan as the paramount danger to East Asian security. Is he serious? Is the stance that a

small democratic country such as Taiwan can threaten the second greatest power in the world really credible?

The legitimacy of the communist government is the only thing Taiwan can threaten. The Tiananmen massacre demonstrated that Beijing treats such threats with the utmost brutality. The European Union, therefore, would do irreparable harm to its own stated humanitarian principles and the standard of human rights around the world if it lifts the embargo.

What it comes down to, is that the European Union must choose whether it wants to remain a force for the advancement of human rights and preservation of stability or merely become a trading association that seeks profit at every opportunity, without regard to human cost.

MING-CHI WU
President, Formosan Association
for Public Affairs
Washington

Powell Misspeaks?

On October 25, 2004 in a CNN interview, Secretary of State Colin Powell stated, "We have made it very clear to the authorities in Taiwan, to President Chen Shui-bian, that we do not support independence for Taiwan. Our One-China Policy, resting on the Three Comuniquees and the Taiwan Relations Act, has served all of the parties quite well for a long period of time, and we would not support anything that would change that approach. We want to see both sides not take unilateral action that would prejudice an eventual outcome, a reunification that all parties are seeking."

That same day, a reporter from Phoenix TV asked Powell, "Recently the Chinese a touch bit nervous. Taiwan keep on saying that "we don't need to declare independence because we are already independent country with sovereignty because there are already some twenty six countries that recognize us, so many countries." What does this mean to you?"

Powell replied, "Well, they can make these sorts of statements but our policy is clear. There is only one China. Taiwan is not independent. It does not enjoy sovereignty as a nation, and that remains our policy, our firm policy."

Secretary Powell quickly retracted the "reunification" statement, stating on CNBC that "peaceful resolution" was the US position. State Department spokesman Adam Ereli emphasized this in a briefing.

Ereli was asked on October 25, "When you say the United States does not want to prejudge the outcome of any outcome between the two sides of the Taiwan Straits, and when the Secretary uses words like reunification, is there a contradiction here? Why does the Secretary use such word as reunification?"

Ereli, clearly prepared, answered, "I don't think you should read that any prejudging or hinting or departure from our longstanding position. That, as I said, the policy has not changed. One element of our policy has been to favor a peaceful resolution of the Cross-Straits issue through dialogue and through a resolution that is acceptable to both sides.

"There are a whole wealth of possibilities there. We are not prejudging those possibilities. We are simply emphasizing that it has to be done through dialogue, and I think the Secretary is very outspoken and very emphatic about encouraging an intensification of that dialogue. And that's where we think the focus should be."

There was, however, no retraction of Powell's flat statement that "our policy is clear. There is only one China." Ereli did reinforce the fact that the US position on Taiwan's sovereignty had not changed. "As far as Taiwanese sovereignty goes, again, there was – I don't think there was any new ground broken on that. The words the Secretary used accurately reflect our longstanding policy on Taiwan status," he stated.

In light of our concerns about any possible shift in US policy toward Taiwan, we moved into action on several fronts. First, we sent a letter directly to Secretary Powell:

Colin L. Powell October 28, 2004
U.S. Secretary of State
U.S. Department of State
2201 C Street NW
Washington, DC 20520

Dear Mr. Secretary:

The Taiwanese-American community appreciates your ongoing, constructive and peaceful diplomatic engagements in East Asia. We feel, however, that statements you made in Beijing on October 25 regarding Taiwan were inaccurate.

First, you stated that "There is only one China. Taiwan is not independent. It does not enjoy sovereignty as a nation." Clearly, sovereignty resides in the people of Taiwan. Taiwan's sovereignty and de facto independence is incontestable reality.

Second, on October 27 you clarified that the essence of U.S. policy is "peaceful resolution" and not "peaceful reunification." Stating that reunification is a legitimate focus of policy concedes that Taiwan was once organically within Chinese control; this is not the case. Taiwan has never

been part of the PRC. Briefly, from 1887 until 1895, China extended administrative control over Taiwan.

The United States must further expound upon the differences between U.S. acknowledgment of Beijing's unrealistic claim that Taiwan is part of China and your words last Monday that could lead observers to believe that you favor eventual reunification, whatever the wish and will of the Taiwanese people. U.S. acknowledgment of Beijing's claim over Taiwan does not mean that the PRC actually governs Taiwan. As a matter of fact, the treaties of Shimonoseki (1895) and San Francisco (1951) successively removed Taiwan away from Chinese sovereignty.

While the United States may not have diplomatic relations with Taiwan, we treat Taiwan as an independent country, as Section 4(b)(1) of the 1979 Taiwan Relations Act clearly stipulates. Additionally, in his "Six Assurances" to Taiwan of July 14, 1982, President Reagan promised that the United States "had not changed its long-standing position on the matter of sovereignty over Taiwan."

A reaffirmation on your part of these crucial policy statements would be appropriate.

The goal of the United States, as the first democracy in the modern world, should be to oppose foreign advances contrary to a people's will and protect peoples who tread a similar path. Ultimately only the people of Taiwan have the right to determine Taiwan's future.

We look forward to your clarification of these points, and again thank you for your work on behalf on peace in East Asia.

Sincerely,

Ming-chi Wu, Ph.D.

President, FAPA

In co-sponsorship with other Taiwanese American organizations (See: below), we also placed a full-page ad in the October 29th issue of *The Washington Times*. In bold headlines, the ad stated, "Mr. Secretary, You Are Wrong!" The text is viewable on our web site: <http://www.fapa.org>

Formosan Association for Public Affairs
Formosan Association for Public Relations
Formosan Association for Human Rights
North America Taiwanese Medical Association
North American Taiwanese Professors' Association
North American Taiwanese Women's Association
Center for Taiwan International Relations
Taiwanese American Citizen League
Taiwanese Association of America –USA

Taiwanese American Science and Technology
Association
Taiwanese Collegian
World Taiwanese Congress
World United Formosans for Independence-USA
Dr. Wang Kang-Lu Memorial Foundation
Formosa Foundation

Bush's Second Term Foreign Policy

With Condoleezza Rice named as the new Secretary of State and Stephen Hadley taking over as National Security Advisor, President Bush has tightened his grip on the foreign policy apparatus for his second term. What exactly that means for the direction of his foreign policy is very much under debate at this time.

What is clear is that Rice and Bush share an incredibly close relationship. As Mike Allen reports in *The Washington Post*, "Aides said Bush and Rice know each other so well they have conversations based on body language, with maybe four words exchanged. . . .

"Aides said Bush, seeking more discipline and harmony in his war cabinet, had discussed the job with her for weeks and perhaps months and never seriously considered anyone else."

Allen notes, "White House officials predicted that the deployment of Rice will tighten Bush's control over his national security apparatus and end the public sparring among members of his war cabinet. Powell, who saw himself as pragmatic, clashed repeatedly with Vice President Cheney and Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld on such matters as how to reach out to Europe and when to go to war with Iraq. . . .

"Republican officials acknowledged that the public is likely to learn even less about the inner workings of the war cabinet. They said the selection of Rice will also mean that fewer competing views will be available to a White House that brooks little dissent."

Writing in *The New York Times*, Elisabeth Bumiller says that "'mysteries remain about Condoleezza Rice, the national security adviser nominated to be secretary of state in a second term that some administration officials assert will be characterized more by diplomacy than confrontation.

"Is she as hawkish as those who urged Mr. Bush to invade Iraq? Or is she more moderate like the men who have been her mentors, Secretary of State Colin L. Powell and Brent Scowcroft, the national security adviser to Mr. Bush's father?"

"More important, is she an ally of Vice President Dick Cheney? Or a counterpoint?"

Also writing in the NYT, David Sanger and Steven Weisman state, "'Some saw the departure of Mr. Powell as the moment for conservatives under the influence of Vice President Dick Cheney to assume an even larger role.

"But some officials who know Ms. Rice well do not expect her to take a hard-line hawkish view when she goes to State. . . .

"According to officials who have heard accounts of the case Mr. Bush made to Ms. Rice, he argued that their strong personal ties would convince allies and hostile nations like Iran and North Korea that she was speaking directly for the president and could make deals in his name."

Analyzing Stephen Hadley's appointment, Paul Richter writes in *The Los Angeles Times* that Hadley "has risen to influence as the most low-key member of the powerful, hawkish group that has shaped U.S. foreign policy over the last four years. . . .

"Because of Hadley's strong ties to Rice and to Vice President Dick Cheney, another former boss, his selection appeared to signal that Bush was looking to further consolidate foreign policy decisions in the hands of his inner circle. . . .

"Like others in Bush's inner circle, Hadley has demonstrated his loyalty. His most highly publicized appearance during Bush's first term came when he effectively took the blame for the president's mistaken claim in the 2003 State of the Union address that Iraq had sought to purchase uranium in Africa."

It is of interest to note that before joining the Bush administration, Hadley was a lawyer at Shea & Gardner and a principal in the Scowcroft Group, a consulting firm.

The Scowcroft connection to both Rice and Hadley raises the important question of whether President

Bush's second term policy toward China will reflect the "realist" school of Kissinger and Scowcroft or move to a more neoconservative view of China.

Many commentators believe that continuity will be the name of the game in Bush's second term, particularly regarding China. Jim Mann, author of *Rise of the Vulcans* about the inner circle of foreign policy advisors to Bush – Dick Cheney, Donald Rumsfeld, Colin Powell, Paul Wolfowitz, Richard Armitage and Condoleezza Rice, as well as *About Face: A History of America's Curious Relationship with China, from Nixon to Clinton*, writing on the Foreign Policy web site and guessing re. Rice's appointment, notes, "But it's a mistake to leap from there to the judgment that the neoconservatives will have complete control of the second Bush administration. During the last four years, the neocons were the dominant influence on U.S. foreign policy when it came to Iraq (which was no small thing). The neocons did not control the Bush administration's first-term policy toward China or Russia, which conformed to the classic realist principles of former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger and former National Security Advisor Brent Scowcroft.

"And the impact of the Iraq war has served to reduce further the neocons' clout. The war they so strongly favored has lasted vastly longer than they predicted. It took more U.S. troops and cost much more money than they led the nation to believe. By early this year, even leading conservative Republicans, such as columnist George Will, were vehemently opposing the Iraq war and the larger goal of spreading democracy in the Middle East. That internal Republican opposition has been muted this fall during Bush's reelection campaign, but it is sure to resurface.

'I'm not suggesting that Bush's approach to the world will be utterly transformed during a second term. The vision the Vulcans carried into office four years ago—a view of foreign policy based above all on overwhelming U.S. military power and a skepticism about accommodations with other countries—will not be abandoned.

'But I also don't think Bush's reelection means that United States is gearing up for some new military invasion. There are limits. Iraq has proved that fact, even to the Bush administration. And a sense of limits may turn out to be one of the defining characteristics of Bush's second term.'

Some conservatives are pressing Bush to move to a tougher agenda with China, however. Tom Donnelly, resident fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, noted at an AEI Nov. 9th seminar on Foreign Policy in the Bush Second Term, "I can claim one thing for interpreting the election, it would be that Americans decided that Iraq and Afghanistan were part of one single war, the global war on terror, so-called, the war to transform the Middle East. You pick your term of art. But if you look at the exit polling, for whatever that data is worth, it's pretty clear that those Americans who thought that these were two separate wars voted for John Kerry and those who thought that it was part of one larger war voted for the President.

To me, this suggests that Americans have come to accept, for better or for worse, the role that we play in the post-Cold War world. This is really a 15-year process since the fall of the Berlin Wall that we have been sucked into or dragged into, kicking and screaming, but I think with the election of George Bush we have accepted that we have certain responsibilities in the world, and that the goals set forth in the Bush doctrine--and I stress that they are goals, strategic goals, rather than a how-to strategy per se--essentially define what most Americans want their government to do in the world.

So the question for a second Bush administration is to try to put some meat on these bones, to translate this expression of goals and beliefs into an actual strategy, again, kind of a how-to approach to the world, clearly centered on the greater Middle East--another term of art that we've adapted to our vocabulary--but global in scope. And I would suggest that one of the biggest challenges for the Bush administration is to try to integrate its China policy into its larger--into the Bush doctrine, not simply to eliminate the China exception in East Asia, but as we see most clearly in the case of Sudan, China has become a global actor and particularly a Middle East actor. So the possibility not simply of confronting rogue regional regimes or terrorists based in the Middle East, but actually a great power confrontation it seems to me is rising pretty substantially."

Donnelly returned to the issue in the question and answer session. He was asked by Miles Pomper from the publication "Arms Control Today," "Tom, I have a question for you on China, which actually has got surprisingly little mention on this panel. As Nick and other people alluded to, China is obviously an

important player in the North Korea issue. They're becoming an increasingly important player on the Iran issue. How does the administration balance that versus the question of Taiwan? Do they basically give in somewhat on the Taiwan issue to get concessions from China on Iran and North Korea?

Donnelly answered, "I don't know how the administration will react. Reading the administration in the first four years, you can play it either way. Again, this is an administration that came to offer with a view of China as a potential strategic competitor. Lately, their attitude has been, after pushing through an arms package for Taiwan, to sit on that.

So I honestly don't know the answer to that. I would not recommend that we--you know, President Bush says he doesn't like negotiating with himself, so negotiating with ourselves over China is even dumber than negotiating with Democrats over Social Security or tax reform. So I would--I honestly don't know what they will do. It's a question that they must face, and the danger is that they will make concessions or be pushed to make concessions.

What we've seen is the return of the sort of Panda-hugger crowd that's endemic to both parties, is now a more dominant force in the Bush administration than it was in the first few years for a variety of complex reasons. The Bush administration needs to think through a coherent global strategy for China. And I have no idea how they will do that."

Stay tuned on this debate of such great importance to Taiwan. Was, in fact, the "panda-hugger crowd" a dominant force on China policy and do the Rice/Hadley appointments signal a shift? Or is, as many commentators believe, President Bush calling the shots on China/Taiwan issues and following very much in his father's footsteps? We shall see and we will fight any turning back on US support for Taiwan and its 23 million citizens.

.....

STC and CTC Updates

After the November 2 general elections, the STC lost Senators Zell Miller (D-GA) (who retired), Senator Tom Daschle (D-SD) (who got defeated).

The CTC lost Peter Deutsch (D-FL), Joe Hoeffel (D-PA), Chris Bell (D-TX) who lost primaries. Reps.

Johnny Isakson (R-GA) and Richard Burr (R-NC) became Senators. Denise Majette (D-GA) lost her Senate race. Reps. Scott McInnis (R-CA) and Nick Lampson (D-TX), Nick Smith (R-MI), Ed Schrock (R-VA) retired.

The CTC starts the 109th Congress with 136 members; the STC with 17.