

Ms. Lally Weymouth
The Washington Post
1150 15 St., NW
Washington, DC 20071

8/12/93

Dear Ms. Weymouth,

Your today's "China Take-Out" reminds me of a bit of history that may interest you and that could be a good source if you know anyone who may develop an interest in the subject for an article ~~or~~ a thesis.

In the early 1930s there was a Senate investigation of the munitions industry. My ~~wife~~ ^{wife} was its assistant editor. I then worked for Pierre DuPont's morning paper, Delaware's only morning paper, the Wilmington Morning News.

It was for J.P. Morgan's appearance before that committee that Ivy ^{Lee} had a woman midget sit in his lap.

Pierre DuPont was also subpoenaed to testify. For the morning after's paper the managing editor, Charlie Gray, did not have to be told he needed a major distraction.

I was in the small newsroom throughout most of it.

Charley called the copy boy over, gave him a dollar, told him he had heard that school children were getting high on aspirin with cokes, and to go out and drink as many as he could.

Cokes then were a nickel and all drugstores had soda fountains.

When the copy boy, Don Hutchinson, returned, he told Charlie that if he had to drink another he'd quit. And that ~~was~~ during The Great Depression.

He did not have to quit. Charlie, not trusting anyone else to do it, started phoning all the quotables he could think of to get their reaction to this new vice of the young. He began with the governor, Clayton Douglas Buck, married to a DuPont. He got the mayor, perhaps more than one, the head of the board of education, the principal of Wilmington's only public high school and I no longer remember the others. And the paper had a large and very black banner across the top of the front page. *on This newest craze + danger to the young.*

Also on the front page was about a stick of story reporting that Pierre DuPont had appeared before that Senate committee and given ~~up~~ the knowledge he acquired in his business and some of the wisdom of his long life.

When we had no room for those hearings, of which my wife had all on those then-called "merchants of death," and when the United Mine Workers was a different union and the editor of its Journal was a friend, we gave them to him for the UMW library.

I was then the youngest on the paper, called "son" to distinguish from "boy."

Next youngest and a friend wound up handling DuPont's public relations.

Please do not take time to answer.

Best wishes,

Harold Weisberg
Harold Weisberg

8/12/93

Lally Weymouth

Chinese Take-Out

Supplying weapons to rogue states.

Nonproliferation has suffered the same fate as the middle-class tax cut. Although candidate Clinton promised to make the fight against nuclear and chemical weapons a top priority, the president appears—at least thus far—to be giving the issue short shrift.

In the proliferation arena, moreover, the administration finds itself trapped in a special dilemma regarding China. Most senior intelligence officials agree there is sufficient proof that China has shipped M-11 intermediate-range missiles to Pakistan, thereby violating an international arms control accord—the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR)—by which Beijing said it would abide. To explain the seriousness of the M-11 sale, it's necessary only to note that the missiles in question can carry nuclear warheads.

High-ranking Chinese and Pakistani officials have, to be sure, denied that the transfer of M-11s has taken place. But U.S. intelligence officials remain unassuaged.

Now the United States has spotted a Chinese ship on the high seas bound for Iran, carrying tons of chemical weaponry precursors—key ingredients for manufacturing mustard and nerve gases. At present the Yin He is in the vicinity of the Strait of Hormuz. And Washington has been negotiating with the Chinese government to ensure that the Yin He's cargo doesn't reach Iran. Beijing's response has been to deny that the ship is carrying the potentially deadly cargo.

This isn't the first time Iran has benefited from Chinese arms sales. China sold Iran key components for nuclear weapons development. Indeed, one well-informed U.S. offi-



BY LUCKOVICH

cial says that without help from China, Iran's nuclear program would be set back 10 years.

Why does China insist on helping a rogue state like Iran—a country that represents a direct threat to U.S. interests? Iran sponsors Hezbollah, which many experts consider the world's most professional terrorist organization. The question continues to plague official Washington.

Sens. Claiborne Pell (D-R.I.) and Jesse Helms (R-N.C.) have even sent Secretary of State Warren Christopher a classified letter—an unusual event in view of its bipartisan provenance—stating their concerns about six separate Chinese arms deals. The existence of this letter suggests that China's proliferation efforts may go well beyond what is now in the public domain.

As for China's motive: Greed appears to be the driving force behind Beijing's frenetic activity in this realm. Indeed, the proceeds from the arms sales line the pockets of the sons and daughters of the country's ruling elite: It is they who head the companies responsible for the pernicious but profitable transactions. These young people are not the only ones who stand to gain. Chinese generals also profit personally, according to a top U.S. official. Moreover, a large amount of money generated by the arms sales goes to the Chinese military for weapons modernization.

Alarmed by the increasingly flagrant pattern of Chinese arms violations, Secretary Christopher met Chinese Foreign Minister Qian Qichen in late July in Singapore to warn him that Chinese missile exports to Pakistan might bring on U.S. sanctions.

Shortly thereafter, Undersecretary of State for International Security Affairs Lynn Davis went to Beijing to discuss the increasingly tense situation with the Chinese leaders. The Chinese, however, refused even to discuss the M-11

sales in a serious way; Davis came away empty-handed.

As things stand, it's up to the Clinton administration to determine whether China actually transferred M-11 missiles or related technology to Pakistan. If the administration should reach an affirmative conclusion, it would automatically trigger congressionally mandated sanctions on the Chinese companies involved in the technology transfer.

Back in 1991, confronted with irrefutable proof that China had sold Pakistan missile technology that violated MTCR guidelines, the Bush administration rendered just such a verdict. It led immediately to U.S. sanctions on two Chinese companies and on one Pakistani government entity involved in the sale. The Bush administration was forced to act in accordance with a tough sanctions law on missile sales passed by Congress in October 1990 over administration objections.

Then, in March 1992, China agreed to abide by the MTCR guidelines; in response, Washington lifted the sanctions.

To date, the Clinton administration has maintained that the evidence is strong—but not conclusive enough to act against China. American business interests are pushing Clinton toward a softer line on China: Businessmen point

out that China will soon be a key market for U.S. exports.

In the end, Washington needs to define a simple and successful policy toward China. Today, the administration appears divided. On the one hand, it is busy chastising China for selling Pakistan advanced missiles and for shipping deadly chemical ingredients to Iran. On the other hand, it's getting ready to approve the sale of a supercomputer to China—a product Beijing has long sought. Although China claims it wants this computer for peaceful purposes, it's no secret in Washington that supercomputers are often used to target ballistic missiles and to verify—without testing—whether nuclear warheads will explode.

The Clinton administration would be wise to halt the sale of the supercomputer to China until Beijing stops selling ballistic missiles to Pakistan and shipping chemical precursors to rogue states like Iran.

Perhaps the best strategy for the administration would be to link next year's extension of most-favored-nation trade status for China to Chinese proliferation practices. Today the bill is linked—largely—to human rights violations. While it's impossible to impose American human rights standards on the Chinese, it may prove far easier to force some changes in China's proliferation practices via MFN.