

## **NEWT GINGRICH AT “COMMITTEE ON THE PRESENT DANGER: CHINA” EVENT**

### **FRANK GAFFNEY:**

You all know, of course, Newt Gingrich. He has come to address this because this existential threat to freedom is, I know, on top of his mind. And he has been doing, through both his sort of public ministries on FOX and in many other outlets and, of course, through his contacts with the President of the United States and other leaders of our country, his level best to raise awareness of this problem of the present danger with China, the Chinese communist party. And I'm absolutely thrilled that he has been able to find a very few minutes to join us to talk about some of those concerns here today. Speaker Gingrich, I know you've got a hard stop right about the top of the hour, so we're going to ask you to come shoot and scoot, as they say. Welcome [APPLAUSE]

### **NEWT GINGRICH:**

Well, let me just say, first of all, I'm delighted to be here and I'm delighted to have Frank's continuing leadership on national security issues. And I think this is a very important initiative in that direction. I'm just going to say three or four quick things and then maybe take a couple of questions. And let me start by saying that I think that the first – the first thing I want to say, emphasize, is that Xi Jinping is the chairman of the military commission, the secretary-general of the communist party and the president of the People's Republic of China. And if you remember that, it's in that order. The military commission gives him control of the people's liberation army, which is explicitly a wing of the party. Not the government. The role of secretary-general gives him eighty-nine million members by contrast to Trump got sixty-three million votes. So he has a cadre across the whole country of eighty-nine million people. And the number one duty of the Chinese system is the preservation of the party. And anybody that doesn't understand that completely misunderstands what's going on. And third, as long as you remember that he has the military and the party, he's also the president of the country. Now, all of our Western media and our diplomats tend to think of him as president, which puts him in the context of a Western traditional system, which he's not. And so, that's just my first observation. My second observation is, that everybody who really wants to understand this – and I, frankly, got this from Kissinger's book on China and I've since been following it up and I really believe it's true, everybody who would really like to understand this, should learn how to play go. The difference between go and chess is so radical. And go is so much more reflective of Chinese styles of warfare and so much reflects the period of the warring states and the period before that, that it's really worth your looking at. And it's worth your – after you get in the rhythm of go, going back and re-reading Sun Tzu and realizing how dramatically different it is from Clausewitz. The Western world, with chess, basically has an offensive system of taking pieces and our military, for example, tends to think very heavily in kinetic terms of fighting battles and winning wars. What go teaches you and what Sun Tzu and much of the writing of the ancient period teaches you, is that victory is actually the goal. And as Sun Tzu says, the greatest of all generals win bloodless victories. Fighting's not the goal. Victory is. So, if you apply the pattern of go and if you apply the principles of Sun Tzu, there are three case studies right now and we're losing all three, which are very useful models to look at. And my newsletter, which will come out tomorrow, suggests that the insanity of the American news media is a major part of our current problem. Because you can look at their coverage of things that are utterly silly and then look at the absence of their coverage of things that may be life and death. So, I'll just give you three examples of grand, strategic effort that make perfect sense under the Chinese model. The first is the South China Sea, which begins in the 1930s when the Kuomintang [PH] issues the nine dash line, which, in essence, sets the precedent for claiming that virtually all of the South China Sea is Chinese territory, which would thereby eviscerate the whole concept of the international law of the sea because it's now arguing this is not – this is not international sea anymore. This is a Chinese sea. Now, they follow up on that – and this is a long Chinese tradition, there's a lot of parallel between the Kuomintang and the Chinese communists. They were both trained by the Soviets. The [UNCLEAR] University for Chiang Kai Shek was literally staffed originally by the Soviets. They

both believed in a Leninist model of centralized party hierarchy. And so, in a lot of ways, beyond fighting a civil war, they were actually the same – the same gang fighting a civil war because they wanted power. But they were not nearly as different as our news coverage would have had you believe. In that setting, the Chinese came in and said, you know, we’re going to build a few islands, but they’re all peaceful. Oh, and they put airfields on them, but they’ll be peaceful. Oh, and we might put a port there, but it will be peaceful. Oh, well, we have to put in some anti-aircraft systems, because we don’t trust you. But they’re peaceful anti-aircraft system. And we may bring the occasional ship in to prove that we can take care of ourselves, but that’s because of you. After all, you should be over in San Diego or somewhere, but you insist on being over here. And so, what they’ve done is they’ve gradually begun to establish facts, all of which are invidious to our interests. Second example, the entire bridge and road initiative. As many of you know, my wife is the – currently the ambassador of the Vatican. So, we get to live in Rome and it’s a brutal assignment, but as a citizen [LAUGHTER] I’m prepared to help, I’m trying to be supportive of Callista in serving the country. But recently, Xi Jinping came to Italy and signed a contract to run Genoa, which is the largest port in Italy and a contract to run Trieste, which is the port which opens up the space to go to Austria and southern Germany. Now, in the Cold War, if the Soviets had opened up two ports in Italy, we would have all understood this is catastrophic. Now, you can’t even get it covered because we have some guy in Chicago who pays people to beat him up so he can claim that it’s an anti-Trump event and I, we – in the article I have due out tomorrow, the number of minutes the news media devoted to this insanity was unbelievable. But it fits the infantile nature of the current news media. So, people don’t even realize in this country that what you’re watching is a gradual rolling offensive of enormous sophistication. They also, by the way, have a contract to run the port of Piraeus in Greece. So, they’re – and the reason Trieste matters is it takes one week off of delivering Chinese freight to south Germany. So, you’re watching a revolution in strategic economic capabilities and a revolution in geographic locational power. And all of it’s being done while we sleepwalk. The third example, which I have been deeply involved in, is 5G and Huawei. We are literally crazy in dealing with this. 5G matters because as – Samsung has a great sign that says, 5G, fifth generation, is to 4G as a computer is to a typewriter. Takes six to seven minutes to download a movie in 4G. It takes three seconds in 5G. It is the key to rural America getting broadband. It makes possible everything from autonomous vehicles to distant surgery. It will be central to the battlefield of the future. Our companies are so out of sync – I mean, take AT&T which is currently lying about this whole thing. And the reason they’re lying is simple. They took eighty-five billion dollars and they bought Time-Warner. For eighty-five billion dollars, they could have leapfrogged Huawei and we’d be the dominant internet country in the world. But now that they’ve – and now that they’re the most indebted American corporation. They can’t afford to go to 5G. And they’re desperate that nobody else go to 5G. And I’ve been on – for the last four months, I’ve been in a knockdown, drag-out fight in the White House and in the Defense Department, to go to 5G in America, you have to have an amount of capability from the Defense Department. There’s no other place that has enough. And we have bureaucrats in the Defense Department who, for the last four months, have dug their heels in. And so, what you get is, the domestic companies will tell you, well, we’re not doing too badly here. Well, first of all, we blocked Huawei from being here. But they missed the whole point. Huawei is now in sixty or seventy countries. Now, how are you going to operate worldwide if virtually every country in the world has a Chinese internet system? And we are truly totally out of sync with the reality. So, I came here, I have a very simple model. We are, right now, if you draw the comparison with the Cold War, we are right now in the period just before Kennan wrote the Long Telegram. We haven’t had a wake-up call. We don’t understand what the problem is. We don’t understand what the scale of the response is going to have to be. And we are losing. And anybody who tells you we are not losing is simply misinformed. And this is an enormous problem. This is going to be a long-term struggle between a civilization that believes in liberty and a civilization that believes in authoritarianism with Chinese characteristics. These are civilizational fights, these aren’t countries. And we currently have no political basis for thinking through and understanding what we’re doing. So, that’s what I’m up to. That’s why I wanted to go out of the way and come by for a little bit. [APPLAUSE]

**FRANK GAFFNEY:**

Thank you, Newt.

**NEWT GINGRICH:**

I can give you ten minutes.

**FRANK GAFFNEY:**

Can you take some questions?

**NEWT GINGRICH:**

I can take some for ten minutes.

**FRANK GAFFNEY:**

Mr. Speaker, thank you for that extraordinary wake-up call and the willingness to take some questions. Dr. Peter Vincent Pry? Member of the committee of the present danger of China. Let me get a mike to you, Peter, please. Right here, next to you. Next to you. There you go.

**PETER PRY:**

Well, I don't have a question, Speaker Gingrich, but I wanted to congratulate you for on 26<sup>th</sup> March President Trump signing the executive order to protect our nation from electromagnetic pulse. You know, this is a personal victory [APPLAUSE] your vision and leadership while there was all, at most, no one speaking about this, you were the one, one of the few political leaders who brought this to national attention, including being the first person at the presidential debate, when you were running for president, to raise this issue for which the *New York Times*, you know, tried to, you know, in headlines tried to mock you an all the rest, but your vision and courage finally made this happen. So, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for listening to the scientists and strategists who for twenty years have been trying to make this happen. It wouldn't have happened without you. Thank you, sir.

**NEWT GINGRICH:**

Thank you. [APPLAUSE]

**FRANK GAFFNEY:**

Do you want to respond?

**NEWT GINGRICH:**

No. I said thank you. What else can – [LAUGHTER] When a guy's that positive, don't, you know, don't mess it up.

**FRANK GAFFNEY:**

Don't get in the way. [LAUGHTER]

**PETER HUESSY:**

Mr. Speaker, Peter Huessy from the Air Force Association. Roger Robinson, former chairman, as you know, of the Congressional China Commission, says there's seven hundred Chinese companies listed on the New York Stock Exchange. Very few of them have done the due diligence required to say who owns you, who owns your stock, what are you up to? There is an SEC office, you know this, meant to say, hey, you don't get listed unless you do this. Would you please help? Get these – cause they're raising the cash to use to modernize their militaries.

**NEWT GINGRICH:**

I talked to Roger yesterday afternoon, yes.

**FRANK GAFFNEY:**

Super.

**NEWT GINGRICH:**

And that, by the way, is one of the seventy or eighty or ninety things we need to be doing. But it's a good example.

**FRANK GAFFNEY:**

Chris Hall. Also a member of the committee on the present danger of China.

**CHRIS HALL:**

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's an honor to be able to speak with you again. I'm – my name is Christopher Hall, I'm with the *Epic Times*, writing a piece on this. I was wondering if you could address, at the same time that we are trying to wake up the country to the threat of communist China, we are – we have as a Democratic frontrunner a self-acclaimed socialist who spent the Cold War, apparently, singing the national anthem of the USSR in Moscow. And we have in Congress an open socialist who is advocating something that looks very much like the Great Leap Forward in China's history, which starved untold millions of people to death. Could you address any links that you see between the fight with China and the fight with that same ideology here in the United States?

**NEWT GINGRICH:**

Sure. I mean, my view [APPLAUSE] my view is that Ronald Reagan defeated communism in Moscow, but lost to it at Stanford. It's that simple. I mean, you have an academic left that pervades the whole system, you have reporters who grow out of the academic left who pervade the whole system. You had three generations now of teaching people lies. And so, you have the natural result. And the only long-term healthy answer to free society is you got to go beat them. You have to turn – I believe there's a chance that next year will resemble 1972 because these people verge on being crazy. And I think the average American is not crazy. They may at times be sort of passive and let people babble for a while, but in the end they have tendency not to vote for self-immolation. [LAUGHTER]

**FRANK GAFFNEY:**

Thank God. Rick Fisher?

**RICK FISHER:**

Rick Fisher with the International Assessment and Strategy Center. Thank you very much for your comments, Mr. Speaker. When the Chinese want to organize for victory, especially long-term victory, Taiwan, against the United States, for example, they organize something called a leading group that brings together all the stakeholders across their government, intelligence, military system and they all talk to each other and they go forward. Is there a lesson in that for the United States? Is it time for us to consider that we're not at all organized for this coming present conflict?

**NEWT GINGRICH:**

Sure. And I actually had coffee with about a dozen US senators this morning and that topic came up. Because neither the House nor the Senate is organized. I mean, if you take the example of Huawei and 5G, it probably covers seven or eight different major government agencies. It covers probably three or four Senate and House committees. So, there's no natural center of energy and center of knowledge to organize. And I think very much as we had to get organized in the 30s to stop un-American activities, which people tend to forget originally was an anti-Nazi committee, or as we had to get organized in terms of creating the CIA, Strategic Air Command, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, we're

going to go through the same cycle here. I think my only point as a historian is, we're in phase one where we have to have a big argument. This will be part of the 2020 election. Do you think China is a threat or not? Do you think the United States should, in fact, decide that it does not want a Chinese internet dominating the planet or not? And do you really want to have NATO partners, just as we have Chancellor Merkel selling out to Putin on natural gas, we now have the Italians selling out to Xi Jinping on running ports, at what point do we need to develop a more robust diplomacy and a more robust foreign policy that takes them head-on? One or two more questions.

**FRANK GAFFNEY:**

I think you're getting the cane. If you're willing to take one or two more, we've got one or two more to give you. Sasha Gong? Also a member of our committee.

**SASHA GONG:**

I'm a big fan of *Rendezvous with History*.

**NEWT GINGRICH:**

Oh, thank you.

**SASHA GONG:**

Here's what, you know, I wonder if you can talk to the White House. I came from China and I was a political prisoner there in the 70s. The main difference between the China threat now and the Soviet threat at that time was at that time the United States and the free world won the people in China, in the Eastern Bloc, in Soviet Union, won their minds and hearts. And I remember so vividly in the 1980s, the United States was an icon. Nowadays, what happens, that you saw China try – and try very hard and quite successful, to win the minds and heart of people in the free world. And just look at schools, how many people thought, how many professors thought China was the better country. So, what you think – what do you think the United States should do?

**NEWT GINGRICH:**

Well, I think, first of all, Diana West wrote a great book on *American Betrayal*. And if you go back and you look, remember, in the 30s, we had to defeat Nazi sympathizers. In the 40s and 50s, we had to defeat Soviet sympathizers. I mean, Reagan becomes an active anti-communist after a Screen Actors Guild meeting when he goes out and has a drink with a friend of his who's a genuine communist, who says, not only am I a Stalinist, but if we take over, we're either going to lock you up or kill you. And Reagan goes home that night and thinks, this guy is really sincere. [LAUGHTER] Okay? I mean, but that's how these things occur. So, we're going to have to go back through another run. I mean, I just have to remind everybody, if you think these are nice people, look at the Uighurs. I asked a Chinese leader to explain to me their million person concentration camps of Uighurs and he said, well, think of them better as schools with room and board. They're not really concentration camps. We're trying to help them learn Chinese. Now, a person who can say that with a straight face is a genuinely dangerous person. I am going to have to run. I'm getting yelled at over here. It's quiet yelling, but I can feel it. [LAUGHTER] Let me just say, I think, Frank, what you and your team are doing is vital. I think free societies have to educate themselves, have to think through the response, have to aggressively implement. I am tactically very, very worried. But strategically, having survived Wilhelm in Germany, Imperial Japan, Nazi Germany, and the Soviet Union, I'm reasonably confident that in the very long run, we will have a greater capacity to respond than will any totalitarian dictatorship, even one with a five thousand year history. Thank you all very, very much. [APPLAUSE]