

Paper for the conference : The Impact of "Tiananmen Square,"
on March 28, 1990, Brigham Young University.

The Peking Massacre and Japan

Dr. Mineo NAKAJIMA

Professor of International Relations

and

Director of the Institute of Foreign Affairs

TOKYO UNIVERSITY OF FOREIGN STUDIES

The Peking Massacre and Japan

Mineo NAKAJIMA

1. The Response of Japan

After the Peking Massacre, China seems to regain stability superficially, but inside the country the tragedy have rather expanded and deepened even greatly. If the bloody accident was the shocking opening of the tragedy, the reign of terror which is practiced forcibly in China today is its second act. In these circumstances the incident have called forth various reactions and created stirs in many countries in the world.

The response of Japan which has the closest relationships with China, above all, drew attention from the whole world, yet we cannot help admitting that the Japanese Government and the diplomatic authorities have responded to the incident quite negatively and vaguely from first to last. From the beginning, when the democratization demonstration occurred, the Government of our country and the diplomatic authorities underestimated the movement. When the mourning demonstration for Hu Yaobang took place, though this was right after the premiers' talk between Li Peng and Takeshita which had been held under the name of Sino-Japanese friendship or if anything, because of that, the Japanese Government did not see the substance of the situation in an attempt to keep the diplomatic relations with Chinese authorities as they had stood.

Even after the massacre on July 4, its reaction was very slow and the spokesman of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs only expressed anxiety the next day at length.

Prime Minister Uno spoke on July 6 in his earlier days in office that on account of our experience of war with China, we could not take the same line as other western countries did.

Upon the attitudes of the Japanese Government and the diplomatic authorities, I myself often made critical comments in newspapers and on television and so did public opinion, Mr. Shun Ishihara; the representative of *Keizai Doyu Kai* (Economic Friendship Committee), and others. Finally they changed their attitudes toward China a bit but were too late for the fair.

If Sino-Japanese relationship was really important, the Japanese Government and the diplomatic authorities should have made the greatest diplomatic effort in order to avoid a situation that may tear apart the friendship between the two nations. After the tragedy of China on July 7, three days later of its occurrence, the Japanese Government conveyed the notion of concern to Yang Hsin-ya, Chinese Ambassador to Japan, at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. As you see, Japan has been continuously reacted too slowly. Therefore the world saw Japan alongside the most rigid autocratic socialist nations such as North Korea, East Germany, and Romania which affirmed the attitudes of the Chinese authorities.

Moreover, according with the reactions of the government, a Japanese businessman in Peking appeared on the advertising

television of Chinese authorities as early as on July 12, saying that the policy of reform and liberation would not change. The news that Japanese companies went back to China hurriedly while the persons concerned of business from other countries went back home all together spread all over the world.

Because of these reactions mentioned above, the image that now Japan is an uncivilized country just as "oriental despotic" China which is an economic animal quite insensitive to the principles such as human rights and democracy prevailed around the world.

2. The Inertia of the "Low-postured Diplomacy toward China"

Since Japan has very close relations with China, it is a mistake just to sit and watch the tragedy. Most of the Japanese are mad at the reckless attempts of the Chinese authorities. Wherefore, as the biggest economic partner which has the direct influence toward China, Japan should have made the greatest diplomatic efforts to prevent the bloody affair.

It is by no means the interference of Chinese domestic affairs by Japan. The Japanese Government should strictly refrain from supporting reformist Zhao Ziyang or expressing favor toward the assertions of democratization of the students but should have insisted at any cost that bloodshed must be avoided, because it had just promised the friendship between Japan and China with Li Peng

government. We should have made clear diplomatically that the logic that the nation which governs nearly a fifth of the world population can do anything against its nation because it is a matter of domestic affairs cannot be accepted from the standpoint that holds human rights and democracy in high regards.

The attitude of present Japan was seen at the protest when shots were fired in the block of embassy in Peking and in the reactions which seemed to take notice only of the protection of the Japanese in China. That we have an unhappy history, that is, the Sino-Japanese War and should refrain from intervening in the domestic politics and that we just sit and watch the situation in which many of the people are shivering in front of the guns and many victims are displayed are different matters. Our country which has closer relations with China than any other western countries should have shown clearer attitudes before the massacre. There was little possibilities that the hard-liners (Deng Xiaoping, Li Peng, and Yang Shang-kun) listened to the comments of a friendly nation, yet things looked quite different, concerning diplomatic position of Japan and Japan's reactions against the Chinese mass, if Japan have had made those comments clearly.

In spite of the need of those actions, Japan continuously maintained a peace-at-any-price principle on the extended line of old "low-postured diplomacy toward China."

It is no exaggeration to say that the substance of the Sino-Japanese relationship which tends to bypass the heart of many

Japanese people and create an atmosphere of pseudo-friendly relationship between men in power was questioned.

Surely whether our country should apply sanctions against China like the U. S. and the Western European countries must be considered with deliberation and, for the moment, we should watch out carefully how far the oppression of the reign of terror goes in order to make right decisions. Yet the Third Yen-denominated Loan (1990-95) which was newly concluded between bloody Li Peng government and Recruit contaminated ex-Prime Minister Takeshita in the summer of 1988 that sums up to 810 billion yen should have been stopped as early as possible because the money of Japanese nation must not be offered to the bloody Chinese authorities.

On the other hand, any kind of spritual and material aids to the wounded and those oppressed by the military and police authorities should have been presented. In fact, when the incident happened, persons around myself spoke to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs or the Red Cross Society of Japan to send urgent medical aids somehow, but the Japanese Government authorities turned their back on those activities coldly.

If our country is a nation dedicated to liberty and democracy, we should unite together over the difference of political systems and country borders against the fundamental challenge to those values. If Japan trys to be friendly only with the side of Chinese national authorities lacking these visions, it means that Japan may be let down by both the Chinese mass and the world.¹

Our country retained the "low-postured diplomacy toward China" or "apologetic diplomacy toward China" when China almost intervened in the domestic politics such as the textbook issues, the Yasukuni Shrine question, and the Ko Ka Ryo (Kuang Hua Dormitory) problem.² Moreover, concerning the establishment of new offices of the press and financial institutions in Taiwan, Japan take notice only of the authorities of mainland China. This time again, the overawed attitude of Japan toward China was revealed.

During these period, the Japanese Government was busy with electing new prime minister after Takeshita and there was no time left for the diplomacy toward China. Still the reactions of the Japanese diplomatic authorities are to be condemned. It is too near-sighted just to establish a headquarters for protecting the Japanese in China without any diplomatic visions.

3. No principles in the Assistance toward China

The Yen-denominated loan has already amounted to about 800 billion yen by the year of 1989. Including the third loan for 1990 and after, which adds 810 billion yen more, it sums up to 1,610 billion yen. If there will be the fourth or fifth yen loans in the future, the total may be equivalent to the reparations for war losses which China asks for.

It is debatable to what extent these loans are effectively used in China. Official assistance including ODA should be used much more, for example, for the hosting of the foreign students, especially for the ones who come to Japan at the governmental expenditure (accepted by the Ministry of Education), which is really rare up to the present. These ways of giving official assistance to China will sure be able to meet the requests of the Japanese people.

Besides, if Japan continues to give loans blindly to China, they may exceed the ability of Chinese government to repay the foreign debts, and cause the default on an obligation. Yen loan has the rate of interest of 2,5-3,5% a year. Increasing of the accumulation in China's foreign debts, which is estimated to be about 46-47 billion U.S. dollars, may cause China's economic bankruptcy.

However, from the Chinese side, especially from the authorities having Deng Xiaoping behind them, we can get the feeling that they

are trying only to get assistance from the west without even taking the slightest notice of how the foreign countries think about and deal with China.

If this is China's real intention, Japanese government must carefully reconsider continuing of the economic assistance to China. China often brings up the past history of Sino-Japanese war in order to get the economic assistance from Japan. And this kind of idea is already a perversion. The Sino-Japanese war was the cost in wartime, and besides, Japan has already got the penalty of the defeat. On top of that, we shouldn't be indebted to the government which massacred the people with an army during peacetime.

At one time, during the Duan Qirui power which was one of the Northern Warlords, the Japanese government gave a large amount of loan, the notorious Nishihara loan (1917-18), the total of which was 145 million yen in those days. It helped the military clique to increase the troops and strengthen the armed forces under the pretext of helping the development of the nation.

The assistance policy with no principles of today's Japanese government is obviously helping the despotic military regime in China. Deng Xiaoping's understanding comes down to that of the ancient emperors of China, which takes it for granted that surrounding countries should always come to China with some tribute, and in the case of Japan, with a tribute called economic assistance.

It sure will make negative images if Japan is to be understood, by other nations, as a country full of economic animals cooperating

with China and dying to form not the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere but the economic bloc of yen, forgetting any principle of liberty or democracy. The criticisms by the students and intellectuals were limited against the Chinese authorities in the last demonstration. However, we must not forget that there was a slogan criticizing Japan harshly by saying, "Don't let Japan buy up the Hainan Island!"

With these situations at the present, the tide of the world is now going through the stages of great changes and reorganizations, as we can see in the address in which prime minister Kohl and Gorbachev announced the end of the cold war. As compared with China, the Soviet Union of today is gaining high approval of the west. Taking into account the drastic changes in Eastern Europe, the relationship between the western countries and the Soviet Union will naturally be closer.

As the Soviet Union had taken steps to the reconciliation with China, with intention of expanding the closer relationships in Eastern Pacific regions, the incident must have come as a great shock for him.

If Japan will keep a self-contradictory relationship with China, as we have seen, in cooperation with it's retrogressive government, it may conversely raise the Soviet's suspicion toward Japan, and that will be a major obstacle in making a closer relationship with him, having the territorial dispute concerning small islands located off the eastern coast of Japan's largest northern island,

Hokkaido.

These kinds of attitudes of the Japanese government may ruin the relationships with the Soviet Union, the west, and the most important of all, the relationship with the United States. Originally, the United States, having the strong tension with the Soviet Union, had adopted the policy of helping China to become the superpower against the Soviet Union, with people like Henry Kissinger at the head. And they gave only rave approval on the modernization of China. Now that things have come to this pass, it seems to be off the point for Kissinger, who also was taken aback by the incident, to say that the United States should not isolate China. We must realize that the so-called "China Card" of Kissinger is not useful any more on account of the reconciliation between China and the Soviet Union. However, I'm pretty sure that the people of the United States, who had long been under the delusion of China, were widely opened their eyes by this tragedy happened in China.

For the time being, I believe that we should protect the foreign students in Japan and, for example, extend their visas. And we should also hospitably give protection to the Chinese political refugees who wants to stay in Japan.

Actually, it gave us a great shock when we heard the news last summer that a great number of Chinese refugees, including so-called camouflaged refugees, who had decided to flee from China when they had learned the news of Peking Massacre, had been cast ashore on the Japanese coast. The problem of refugees is not same with the

case of the political refugees. However, we must be aware that the easygoing way of forming the friendly relationship with China may, in the future, bring about the Chinese refugees coming to Japan on a massive scale.

Anyway, Japan, as a nation having great responsibility to the today's world, should express her opinion clearly than ever before.

4. Cost of our history

The historical tide surging in Soviet society is indeed amazing. Since this current has increasingly gathered momentum there seems to be no stopping it now that it has begun to flow in one direction. It has been commonly believed that, as the Soviet Union is a superstate unlike flexible Eastern bloc nations, she might not be able to proceed further with Perestroika for the time being. On February 7, 1990, however, the General Assembly of the Enlarged Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party, having engaged in a heated, insiders' debate, adopted, by a comfortable majority, a proposal for political reform. This could pave the way for a multi-party system which includes a president as the head of state. This new platform of the Soviet Communist Party might include the abolition of Article 6 of the Soviet Constitution. And then Mr. Gorbachev has just become the first President in the Soviet Union on March 15, 1990.

Thus, the Soviets have begun to end the revolutionary regime under the Communist Party's dictatorship and tread a path toward the future de-Communization/de-Socialization of Russia for the first time in seventy-two years since the October Revolution in 1917.

Perestroika and Glasnost have exposed the contents of Pandora's box by bringing out into the open the contradictions and racial prejudice inherent in Soviet society. Worse still, the Soviet economy, the health of which is so indispensable for national survival, is not improving. It may safely be said that to rectify this situation which is becoming worse by the hour should be immediately addressed by President Gorbachev.

This does not mean, however, that President Gorbachev's political leadership is weakening. As I have often stated, his political foundation is very solid. It must also be seen that Gorbachev's leadership is being further consolidated because there seems to be no capable man who could possibly succeed him. The conservatives, headed by the Politburo member Yegor Ligachev, lack political power strong enough to threaten Gorbachev's leadership. Although the radical reformists, led by the people's deputy Boris Yeltsin, are enjoying the popularity of the general public, they are politically premature. For some time observers at home and abroad have been promoting the theory that Gorbachev was in a crisis, but I look at this from a different angle. And I was able to verify the validity of my observations when I had a meeting with Soviet VIPs concerning this matter during my visit to the Soviet Union in November, 1989.

It seems to me that every kind of criticism and dissatisfaction is being leveled against Gorbachev because his leadership is extremely stable.

The state of Gorbachev's leadership came to light at the latest Central Committee's General Assembly. In my opinion, however, ever since the political turmoil in Eastern Europe last fall, President Gorbachev, who gave tacit consent to this development at that time, realized that the Soviet Union would eventually have to become "Eastern Europeanized" which would mean a switch over to political pluralism.

In this respect, Gorbachev triggered the softening of the Eastern bloc. From a different point of view he could be labeled a betrayer of Marxism/Leninism, a true revisionist. But, at the same time, he has become a historically significant figure because of his painful awareness that, unless the Soviet system is demolished with boldness and vigor, he could not render the label "betrayer" meaningless. Otherwise, the Soviet could have no bright future before them.

If the Sobiet Union proceeds with democratization along with the Eastern bloc nations, this will bring into clear relief the obstinate Chinese Communists who flatly reject such reform. In spite of the lifting of the martial law in early January of this year, Beijing has begun to practice an even harsher reign of terror, exercising more strict control over the people using the Red Army and the police. On the other hand, freedom-seeking students and

private citizens in China have gone underground and are still ever active. When the news reporting the tragic execution of Mr. Ceausescue and his wife of Romania (which had been China's best ally) came over the Voice of America (VOA) and NIK's shortwave broadcasting, these Chinese freedom fighters on campuses throughout China shouted for joy and set off firecrackers.

As we have seen, China is now challenging the historical tide. However, there is no question but that Beijing's high-handed attitude may eventually collapse from within.

If Japan gives her approval of Gorbachev's reform in Soviet society and applauds the democratization of the Eastern bloc, she cannot possibly, at the same time, approve of Beijing's retrogressive attitude. Nevertheless, while supporting the democratization process of Eastern Europe, the Japanese government and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs are showing sympathy toward Beijing. I must say these two attitudes are extremely self-contradictory. Even worse, unaware that this is a contradiction, the Japanese opposition parties have arbitrarily used the Eastern European problem and the massacre at Tiananmen Square in Beijing in their recent campaign of the Lower House election. In this respect, I must say that the Japanese people's wisdom and intelligence is being challenged for its validity.

The massacre at Tiananmen Square in Beijing has given us a chance to essentially reconsider human rights and democracy, revolution and communism, and also the problem of the state powers and the the

violence under the name of the state. If we put it this way, we probably can say that the bloody massacre at Tiananmen was the costly price for our history.⁴

5. Revolution Reconsidered

If you think about it, the Marxism that was born in Europe flowered in Russia — a region that was thought of as being on the fringes of Europe. Then, a quarter century later — in a development which would have surprised Marx himself — spread to the world of Asian stagnation and oriental absolutism of China. In addition, a quarter century later, socialist revolutions took place in the former South Seas colonies of the Indo-China peninsular — Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos. But today, the red thread of Marxist socialist revolution appears to have stretched to its limit. History seems to reversing itself, and the hands of the clock are now moving to the right instead of to the left. In fact, in the 21st century, Marxism may come to be thought of as one of the pure socialist ideals of the 19th century contained only in the textbooks.

I think we probably must deal with the notions that Marxism is fading away and that history is moving away from Marxism more sincerely and more honestly.

It will stand as one of the ironies of history that the 200th

anniversary of the French Revolution was in a sense "commemorated" with the bloody massacre in China in 1989.

In China, one of the founders of the Communist Party, Li Da Zhao, wrote an essay in 1918 entitled "The Victory of Bolshevism," comparing the Russian Revolution with the French Revolution. In his essay he wrote that the French Revolution in 1789 did not merely express a change in the French public mind, but in reality expressed a universal change in the intellect of 19th century mankind. In addition, the Russian Revolution in 1917 was not merely a sign of a change in the public mind in Russia, but a sign of universal change in the psychology of mankind in the 20th century. While Bolshevism was a term invented by the Russians, its spirit was shared in the hearts of all mankind in the 20th century.⁵

However, I wonder if the realities of present day China can be said to be part of the traditions which stemmed from the Russian Revolution, which in turn grew from the French Revolution and Marxism and was moved forward by the Bolsheviks. I also wonder in fact whether these events have common elements with the spirit of the peoples of the 20th century.

The French Revolution was carried out under the slogan of "liberty, equality, and fraternity" — or a unity of objectives and spirit. But under the leadership of Robespierre, the revolution became the Jacobian autocracy which then gave rise to the Reign of Terror. When we consider the chain of events progressing from the French Revolution to the Russian Revolution, then to the Chinese

Revolution, we detect the common theme of government by terror.

The actions of Deng Xiaoping seem to reflect what occurs when those in power use that power in the name of the people based on their own subjective value judgements. This leads to the unbridled use of power against those who are viewed as being outside of the framework of the people. This spirit of slaughter and terror was present as the dark side of the French Revolution, and other revolutions seem to have carried on this aspect. We see this also in Russia's transition from the period of revolution to the Great Cultural Revolution and to "Bloody Sunday" last year. When we also remember that the massacre in Cambodia occurred under the influence of this tradition of revolution, we can see what a high cost is involved in the creation of governments through Marxist revolution. Mankind in the 20th century has learned what a terrible price these revolutions involve.

If we could say that by paying this price the economy was freed to expand and develop and that the people became affluent, we might think that the sacrifice in blood was worth it. But in fact, despite the number of victims and the price paid, today's socialist economies have experienced severe stagnation following these revolutions, human rights have been oppressed, and the interests of the state have been placed above the interests of the people. When we confront these realities, I believe it is no exaggeration to say that the 20th century has already declared an end to Marxism.

Nevertheless the tragedy which occurred on the 40th anniversary

of the founding of today's Chinese state also took place on the 70th anniversary of the May 4 Movement and the 200th anniversary of the French Revolution. This event also occurred as the 20th century is drawing to a close. On this occasion, I think we need to seriously reconsider the fundamental nature and meaning of revolution. By learning that freedom and equality cannot be easily exchanged for some other system, mankind is perhaps being forced to reconsider a universal principle that was born from the French Revolution. At the same time, I am clearly aware of the fact that it also may be essential to fundamentally reconsider the meaning of such commonly used words as revolution and counterrevolution, establishment and antiestablishment, conservative and progressive.

Note

1. On this point, there were many serious discussions in the International Symposium of the Japan Committee on the Bicentennial of the French Revolution, October 20-21, 1989, Tokyo.
2. See Mineo NAKAJIMA, *Chugoku ni Jubaku sareru Nippon (Japan Under the Spell of China)* (Tokyo:Bungei Shunju, 1987).
3. On the Soviet Union - Japan relations and Sino-Japanese relations, See Mineo NAKAJIMA, *Chuso no Senryaku, Nippon no Sentaku (Chinese Strategy, Soviet Strategy : What Should Japan's Position Be?)* (Tokyo:PHP,1988).
4. For a more extended analysis of Tiananmen incident, author wrote a book ; Mineo NAKAJIMA, *Chugoku no Higeiki (The Tragedy of China : Where Will Deng Xiaoping Navigate China?)* (Tokyo:Kodansha,1989).
5. Li Da-zhao, "Bolshevism de Sheng li (The Victory of Bolshevism)" *Xin Qing nien* Nov. 5, No.5 (November 15, 1918)