

## An Interesting account

They called for equal conversation, and the government brought them into the People's Hall to talk face-to-face, yet the student leader showed neither respect nor strategy in the negotiation. As a matter of fact, even the objective of the demonstration became fuzzy: restore Hu Yaobang's status at the start, hang corrupt officials as things progressed, "democracy now" at the end - a rare, good exercise in public consultation which both sides were cooperative at the start, quickly descended into a nightmarish angry rant that pointed at inevitable bloodshed. Furthermore, it was disheartening to learn that the demonstrators were not so peaceful - molotovs were thrown, police officers beaten, one soldier was even beaten to death (along with several others and military vehicles destroyed by fire) and hanged on Fuchengmen Bridge lamp post... As far as I know, these mob acts of violence preceded any violence on the government side which as a matter of fact, exercised restraint. Later during the crackdown and curfew, the government intentionally displayed the dead bodies of soldiers at public places to raise alert among fresh troops being deployed. One of those my father personally witnessed for several days on the way to his work was an APC driver, whose charred skeletons were put right in front of the China Telecom Building on Chang An Avenue... Violence comes in full circles, and June 4th was no exception.

Overall, I would still dare to say that June 4th did more good than harm from a historical perspective. Different from prior political disasters like the anti-rightist campaign and Cultural Revolution, June 4th was the first time when Chinese citizen (the masses) was pitted directly against the state machine - a brand new experience for China, and China learns. The people learned about the bottom line of the government and how far the ruling elites are willing to go, while the government learned the bottom line of the people and what they are capable of. If you track Chinese politics during the 90s and well into the 00s, you can see a underlying mutual respect and careful dealing between the Chinese government and people, which makes China so much more complex as a dictatorship.

Nation building, after all...

## Another interesting account

Amidst the chaos in the morning of June 4 the four men decided that they had to take responsibility for the students in the square.<sup>[5]</sup> Although Zhou Duo had volunteered to go out to seek the cooperation of the soldiers, he realised that Hou Dejian was the only person that the soldiers might know of.<sup>[6]</sup> Together, Hou and the others met with a [political commissar](#) and said, "We volunteer to take all the students out of the square and ask the [PLA](#) not to open fire. Please give us enough time to organise an evacuation."<sup>[6]</sup> After the government accepted Hou's request, Hou and Zhou Duo rushed to the monument to announce that the command post had agreed to the evacuation of the square.<sup>[7]</sup> The crowd of students was initially reluctant to leave the square. However, with the help of Feng Congde, Hou Dejian and the student leaders were able to usher the students away.<sup>[8]</sup> Additionally, Hou was disappointed to hear about the PLA opening fire on the crowds in other areas.

## Life as a dissident

After the 1989 events at Tiananmen, Hou Dejian disappeared from the public eye to avoid the crackdown on so called "counterrevolutionaries" who had participated in the protest. While rumors swirled of his whereabouts, Hou spent 72 days under the protection of the Australian embassy.<sup>[9]</sup> Following his emergence out of hiding, Hou gave an interview to media discussing his role in the evacuation of the square. He stated: "During the whole withdrawal process I didn't see a single student, either citizen or soldier killed in the square. Nor did I see any armored personnel carriers rolling over people."<sup>[10]</sup> One of the first activists who appeared to be taking the governments side,<sup>[10]</sup> Hou was aware that his interview would cause outrage among the people of China, and he was correct.<sup>[11]</sup> Although the news release was clearly "slanted" in order to illustrate that no one had been killed in the clearing of the square<sup>[12]</sup> he questioned the people who thought he was lying about his story. Hou asked: "are we going to use lies to attack an enemy who lies? Aren't facts powerful enough? To tell lies against our enemy's lies only satisfies our need to vent our anger, but it's a dangerous thing to do."

## Why do people deny the Tiananmen Square Massacre and what proof do they have?

Firstly, I want to point out many flaws in this **Massacre** narrative pushed by the ( western ) media.

If you happen to know any combat veteran infantryman, he will tell you that it is almost impossible to get close to the enemy's tanks or armored vehicles column without being mowed down. Even if you have an anti-tank RPG, getting into the position to use it would be a big problem. In a flat terrain with no cover? It is not even possible. Tanks and armored vehicles are looking after each other from being boarded, in other words, if you try to get close to one tank or climb on it, you'd get shot into pieces by other tanks. It's called Back Scratching.



Look at this wrecked tank/ armored vehicle picture. If the PLA were given a weapon-free fire at will command to shoot at the protester, how the heck the unarmed civilians could wreck those armored vehicles? It should be dead bodies all over the place instead of dead tanks/ armored vehicles.