Funeral for Lin Yi-hsiung’s mother and daughters

On 1 January 1985, streams of mourners from every part of Taiwan came to pay their last homage to Mr. Lin Yi-hsiung’s mother and his twin daughters in a funeral service at Gi-kong Church in Taipei. The church building used to be the home of Mr. Lin and his family. Five years ago, on February 28, 1980, Mr. Lin’s mother and twin-daughters were murdered there. Mr. Lin’s mother died of 13 knife wounds. The funeral stirred memories of their violent death and the still unsolved murder. Many people broke down and wept.

After the funeral service, the hearse followed by about 60 cars and buses left for Mr. Lin’s hometown, I-ian, on the east coast of Taiwan, where the three deceased were laid to rest.

Lin Yi-hsiung and his family
to rest. The murder continues to be a painful chapter in the history of the Taiwanese people’s strive for democracy and freedom.

Mr. Lin’s mother and twin-daughters Liang-chun and T’ing-chun (age 7) were knifed to death after Mr. Lin -- who was in prison at that time -- had indicated to his visiting wife that he had been tortured. A third daughter, Ah-chun, age 9, survived multiple stab-wounds. Two days earlier Mr. Lin had been warned by his Taiwan Garrison Command interrogators not to tell his family about the “treatment” he had received during 42 days of interrogation, or else “unfavorable” things could happen to his relatives (see the New York Times, March 26, 1980).

In April 1980 Mr. Lin -- along with seven other prominent native Taiwanese opposition leaders -- was sentenced to twelve years imprisonment on “sedition” charges. On 15 August 1984 he became the first one of the “Kaohsiung Eight” to be released. Until recently Mr. Lin had refused to arrange for the funeral of his deceased mother and daughters in protest against the fact that the Kuomintang authorities have yet to apprehend those responsible for the murder and bring them to trial. The three bodies were embalmed and kept in a funeral home in Taipei.

After his release Mr. Lin and his wife made the decision to focus their attention on the upbringing of their one remaining daughter, and on the work of his wife (who was elected to the Legislative Yuan in December 1983). They decided to go ahead with the funeral, although the Taiwan authorities have yet to publicly admit the role of security officials in the murder. Until now, February 1985, the authorities maintain that the murderers “cannot be found.”

Taiwan Communiqué comment: The Taiwan authorities would do well to clear the air now and prosecute those responsible for the murder of Lin Yi-hsiung’s family. If the authorities in Taipei do not come forward and bring the perpetrators of this terrorist act to trial, this blot will continue to damage their image in the international community, and particularly in the United States and Europe.

It is also essential that the United States government does its utmost to convince the Taiwan authorities to prosecute those security officials who were directly or indirectly responsible for the murder of Mr. Lin’s mother and daughters. The United States certainly has the leverage to do this. The Reagan administration should have the political courage to counter terrorism wherever it occurs.
The murder of Henry Liu

In *Taiwan Communiqué* no. 17 (November 8, 1984) we reprinted some quotes from a *Washington Post* article by Mr. Jay Matthews regarding the murder of Mr. Henry Liu, a prominent Chinese-American journalist, on October 15, 1984 in the Daly City suburb of San Francisco. Since then a number of important developments have taken place, which we summarize here:

1. On November 12, 1984, the Taiwan authorities started a large-scale campaign against organized crime. One of the first persons to be picked up was Mr. Chen Chi-li, the son of a well-known judge in the Kuomintang’s judicial system. Mr. Chen, a Chinese mainlander, reportedly headed Taiwan’s largest underworld gang, the “Bamboo Union.” Through the end of January 1985 more than 1,000 persons had been arrested in this “Operation Clean Sweep.”

   .... the Reagan Administration has long known about the extensive activities of Taiwan government secret police and intelligence agencies in the United States, but has failed to act against them.

   *Taiwan Communiqué*

2. On November 28, 1984 United States authorities in San Francisco announced the arrest of a Mr. Yu (28) in the murder-case and stated that murder warrants would be issued for the arrest of Chen Chi-li, and two of his assistants, Wu Tun, and Tung Kueisen. Mr. Yu reportedly drove the getaway car. Chen Chi-li and his wife visited the United States between the end of September and the second half of October, ostensibly to promote their magazine, Mei Hua Pao Tao, a strongly pro-KMT publication. When they returned to Taiwan, on October 21, they were met by the deputy-head of the Military Intelligence Bureau of the Ministry of Defense, Colonel Chen Hu-men, and made use of the VIP room at Chiang Kai-shek airport.

3. On November 30, 1984, the Government Information Office in Taiwan suddenly announced that the Taiwan government would “maintain close contacts” with the United States regarding the murder case. Up until that time, the Taiwan authorities had maintained a studied silence on the matter, but had banned or confiscated all opposition publications which had reported on the case. The GIO also announced that Mr. Chen had been arrested on November 12th, and that Wu Tun had been apprehended on the 26th of that month.
4. The New York Times, in its December 5, 1984 issue, published an article by Mr. Fox Butterfield, who quoted the lawyer for the family of Henry Liu as saying that the killing had been “ordered and planned by powerful figures in Taiwan.” The lawyer mentioned in particular that Chen Chi-li had links to the son of President Chiang Ching-kuo, Mr. Chiang Hsiao-wu.

5. On January 16, 1985 it was announced in Taipei that three officials of the Military Intelligence Bureau of the Ministry of Defense, including the deputy-head, Colonel Chen Hu-men, had been arrested. Colonel Chen was reported to have met Chen Chi-li several times before his visit to the United States.

Mr. Liu’s murder is thus only the latest step in a long series of acts of intimidation and harassment against the Taiwanese and Chinese communities in the United States and elsewhere.

6. On January 25, 1985 the International Herald Tribune reported that a Taiwan government official had stated that U.S. investigators would not be allowed to talk with the arrested military intelligence officials, and that there was “almost zero chance” that Chen Chi-li and Wu Tun would be turned over to U.S. authorities for trial. Close observers of developments in Taiwan recognize in this move the first step of the familiar Kuomintang pattern of cover-up in an effort to hide the facts.

7. The January 28, 1985 issue of Newsweek reported that initially Taiwan’s Nationalist government had refused to investigate American suspicions that Nationalist Chinese agents were involved in Liu’s murder, but that the Taipei government had changed its mind after being told that the FBI possessed a tape recording in which Chen Chi-li purportedly implicated several high intelligence officials, including the chief of the Military Intelligence Bureau of the Ministry of Defense, Vice-Admiral Wang Hsi-ling.

The developments in the second half of January had immediate repercussions on the relations between Taiwan and the United States: U.S. State Department spokesman Alan Romberg called the involvement of the Taiwan intelligence organization in the Liu murder “a very serious matter.” Representative Tom Lantos, a California Democrat, called for House of Representatives hearings to determine whether the Liu murder is part of a “consistent pattern of acts of intimidation and harassment against individuals in the U. S.” If this is found to be the case, Congress could cut off U.S. weapon sales to Taiwan under a 1982 amendment to the U.S. Arms Export Control Act. This
amendment was passed after another murder in Taiwan, which remains “unsolved” to this day: the July 1981 death of Taiwanese-American professor Chen Wen-cheng, after a lengthy interrogation by the Taiwan Garrison Command in Taipei.

Taiwan Communiqué comment: The Taiwan authorities are now portraying the murder to be an “individual act” of the security agents and underworld figures involved. This is an absurd notion and we hope that the US government, the US Congress, and the foreign press are not so gullible as to believe this. While high government officials such as President Chiang Ching-kuo and Prime Minister Yu Kuo-hwa were in all probability not involved in the planning of the murder, all high government officials were certainly aware of the fact that during the past thirty years the security agencies have been able to act without restraint and with impunity. Indeed, the Taiwan authorities and the Kuomintang Party have consistently encouraged the secret police agencies to act against “dissidents,” and have never brought any security agents to court for their involvement in terrorist acts such as the murder of Lin Yi-hsiung’s family or the death of professor Chen Wen-cheng.

It must also be stated that the Reagan Administration has long known about the extensive activities of Taiwan government secret police and intelligence agencies in the United States, but has failed to act against them. These spying activities were mostly directed against the Taiwanese-American community and were coordinated through the offices of the Coordination Council for North American Affairs (CCNAA), the unofficial “Embassy” of Taiwan in the United States (see also “The Kuomintang’s spying in the USA”, in _Taiwan Communiqué no. 10, January 8, 1983). Mr. Liu’s murder is thus only the latest step in a long series of acts of intimidation and harassment against the Taiwanese and Chinese communities in the United States and elsewhere.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Old legislators (almost) never die

On January 3, 1985 the Independence Evening News, the only relatively objective daily newspaper in Taiwan (the others are closely controlled by the ruling Kuomintang), published an overview of the size and age-composition of the National Assembly, Legislative Yuan, and Control Yuan. The statistics were supplied by the secretariats of the three bodies. Their overview is as follows:
** 631 of these persons are “selected alternate delegates”, meaning that they themselves were not elected on the mainland, but that they have been appointed by the Kuomintang authorities to succeed members who have died since 1947.

As for the age composition, the Independence Evening News gave the following data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>National Assembly</th>
<th>Legislative Yuan</th>
<th>Control Yuan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. of members above 90</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 80 - 89</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 70 - 79</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total above 70</strong></td>
<td>781</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average age of members elected on the mainland</strong></td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average age of those elected in supplementary elections in Taiwan</strong></td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>52.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From this list it can be seen that within the next few years virtually all “oldies” will fade away from the scene. This fact presents a major dilemma for the Kuomintang authorities, because these old, mostly bedridden and partially senile “legislators” still represent the Kuomintang’s claim to sovereignty over mainland China.

The Kuomintang has -- for the time being -- suspended the appointment of new “selected alternate delegates”, who take the place of old legislators, who had passed away. However, it is not impossible for them to come up with a scheme whereby younger mainlanders living on Taiwan would be appointed “selected alternate delegates” representing provinces in mainland China, thus continuing the fiction that they are the government of China.

There are some interesting discrepancies between this list and data published earlier by the Taiwan authorities, particularly in the membership according to the Constitution and in the number of National Assembly members elected in 1947 on the mainland (see Taiwan Communiqué no. 14, January 8, 1984, page 8). The information presented in this list also differs with data published by the Congressional Research Service and by ourselves: this difference concerns the number of representatives elected on Taiwan, and can be traced to the fact that in our list we considered the persons selected through professional organizations (farmers, businessmen, teachers, etc.) and from overseas Chinese groups as being appointed and not as being elected. The reason for this approach is that the KMT tightly controls these organizations: the “election-procedure” followed by these groups can in no way be regarded an open election. The resulting picture is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Assembly</th>
<th>Legislative Yuan</th>
<th>Control Yuan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Life members”, remaining from 1947</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected on Taiwan of which tangwai:</td>
<td>49 (’80) (2)</td>
<td>52 (’83) (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed from overseas Chinese groups, and selected from professional groups</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total present membership</td>
<td>1031</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage elected by the people on Taiwan</td>
<td>4.75 %</td>
<td>14.9 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 955 "life members in the previous table, includes the 631 “selected alternate delegates.” Since January 1984 more than 100 of the “life members” of the National Assembly have died. This is an attrition rate of **two per week**.

If one would want to compute the overall “representativity” of these three bodies, one could divide the sum of the elected persons \((49 + 52 + 22 = 123)\) by the sum of the total membership \((1031 + 348 + 70 = 1449)\) which results in a “representativity percentage” of 8.5 percent.

The advanced age of the national legislators recently also caught the attention of the **Wall Street Journal**, which on January 2, 1985, discussed the issue in an article titled “New Taiwan leaders start to replace old guard.” The article, written by staff reporter Maria Shao, focused on one of the young generation of Kuomintang legislators, Mr. Eugene Chien, who was elected to a seat in the Legislative Yuan in December 1983. The article had this to say about the Kuomintang’s old guard:

“According to political pundits here, one only has to watch the local funeral parlors to see how Taiwan is changing: the island’s elderly rulers are dying off.

To outsiders, Taiwan is identified with stiff, old men clinging to the past. Indeed, 35 years after fleeing from the mainland for Taiwan, these aging mandarins still claim to be the legitimate rulers of all China. Officially, they still vow that one day they shall recover the mainland.

But a younger generation of political and business leaders gradually is emerging. Their identity is tied to Taiwan’s future instead of China’s past. This second generation has grown up here and is concerned mostly with Taiwan’s development.

Because of Taiwan’s economic success, this generation is far more prosperous, educated and flexible than the defeated, bitter Nationalist government warriors who fled here in 1949. To many of these younger citizens, China is a curious, distant entity, portrayed mistily through history books.

By the year 2000, the younger generation is expected to succeed its predecessors as leaders of the island. President Chiang Ching-kuo, son and successor of the late Nationalist hero and president, Chiang Kai-shek, is 74 years old and ailing. None of his children is likely to immediately succeed him. When he passes from the scene, Taiwan will have lost an important symbolic connection to China’s past. (....)
Nowhere is the contrast between old and new more evident than in the legislature, which was brought over from the mainland in 1949. Members elected in the late 1940’s to represent mainland provinces are guaranteed seats for life because replacements can’t be elected for constituencies now outside Nationalist control. Most lawmakers are in their 70’s and 80’s and many are frail. The Parliament is shrinking monthly as elderly representatives die off.”

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

The death penalty in Taiwan

During the past years we have repeatedly called the attention of our readers to the unpleasant conditions in Taiwan’s prisons, but we have not yet focused on the frequent use of the death penalty in Taiwan. Martial law apparently has the effect of making a human life rather cheap in the eyes of the authorities. The information we have available to us shows that it is possible to be sentenced to death for the theft of a relatively small amount of US$ 4,000. The case of Mr. Chang Ming-ch’uan (see Taiwan Communiqué no. 13, pp. 12-13 and issue no. 16, pp. 15) also shows that the police authorities are often very eager to “show results”, and frequently torture suspects in order to produce evidence.

From the beginning of 1982 until the present time, a total of at least 102 individuals were sentenced to death. One of these persons reportedly escaped, one person’s death sentence was changed to life imprisonment, and one -- Mr. Chang Ming-ch’uan -- was released. However, since January 1982 at least 32 people were actually executed. These are, however, still very preliminary figures. The actual number of executions may be considerably higher, particularly since trials in military court are carried out in secret, and the Taiwan authorities do not publish statistics on the death penalties meted out by military courts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sentenced in District Court</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentenced in Military Court</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 ?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executed</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The matter has attracted the attention of the London-based human rights organization Amnesty International, which has expressed its concern about the frequent imposition of the death penalty in Taiwan, and about reports of ill-treatment of suspects during interrogation.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
Prison report

1. Lin Hung-hsuan still in solitary confinement. In issue no. 17 Taiwan Communiqué we reported on the transfer of Mr. Lin Hung-hsuan to the isolated Green Island prison. At this time Mr. Lin is still being held in solitary confinement, although he has received several visits from his relatives since then. However, the authorities do not allow Mr. Lin to meet his relatives in person, but he must talk to them by telephone, separated from them by a glass window.

During one such visit by a brother, Mr. Lin said that since his transfer to Green Island on November 7, 1985, he had been kept in small cell (2 by 3 meters), and that he had not been allowed to go outside for exercise. He had also not received any clean clothing, and had been wearing the same black prison shirt, trousers and sweater. Furthermore, his personal belongings -- which he had with him in his cell in An K’ang prison near Taipei -- had been taken away from him. He only had in his possession a small bible (which was only given back to him after repeated requests), a small dictionary, and a meditation book.

Mr. Lin also complained about the fact that he had not been allowed to write or receive letters, and that during the whole first month he had been allowed to take a hot bath only once. The rest of the time he had only access to cold water. Ever since he was transferred to Green Island, Mr. Lin has been suffering from a severe cold.

A further example of the degrading way in which the Taiwan authorities treat their political prisoners was given on January 2, 1985, when Mr. Lin’s brother from the United States, Dr. Adie Lin, came to visit him on Green Island. Dr. Lin is a prominent member of the native Taiwanese community in the United States, where he serves as the President of the Taiwanese Human Rights and Culture Association (THRCA) in the Los Angeles area.

He visited Taiwan with a group of nine leading Taiwanese from the United States, and had received a permit from the Ministry of National Defense to visit his brother in prison. However, when Dr. Lin arrived on Green Island, accompanied by Lin
Hung-hsuan’s wife and by Legislative Yuan-member Hsu Jung-shu, the prison officials told them that they could only talk to Lin Hung-hsuan by telephone, separated by glass. During such a conversation Mr. Lin would be flanked by two guards, while the visitors would also have a guard standing by on their side, ready to cut the conversation whenever “unappropriate” topics such as mistreatment would come up.

The visitors refused to go ahead with the “meeting” under those restrictive circumstances, and spent most of the day trying to convince the prison officials to allow them to go ahead with a meeting. The latter were clearly under the instruction not to let a “person-to-person” visit happen, and at the end of the day the visitors left the prison without having seen Lin Hung-hsuan.

2. Former “Kaohsiung” prisoner re-arrested. On December 26, 1984 at 6:00 p.m., Mr. Wu Cheng-ming was arrested at his home in Hsin Yin of Kaohsiung County by four plaincloth policemen. The arrest warrant stated that he was being charged with sedition. Mr. Wu is a former political prisoner, who spent three years in prison in connection with the Kaohsiung Incident of December 1979. He was released on November 17, 1982.

Mr. Wu’s wife, Wang Mei-li, said on January 3, 1985 in an interview with Progress magazine that the authorities had not allowed her to be in contact with her husband since he was taken away by the police. Mrs. Wu contested the sedition charge because the police did not find any gun or contraband in their house. She said that her husband has been a law abiding citizen, and was incredulous that her husband had been arrested again.

The police said that Mr. Wu was arrested because his name was included in the “Clean Sweep” arrest campaign. The Taiwan authorities started the campaign on November 12, 1984 and so far more than one thousand people have been arrested. Mr. Wu’s arrest
was handled as a military case, and he has thus been refused a visit by his lawyer. Opposition legislator Mrs. Hsu Jung-shu’s inquiries to the Ministry of Defense about Mr. Wu’s arrest went unanswered.

Mr. Wu has been working as a taxi driver since his release. Despite police warnings not to get involved with the opposition’s political activities, he volunteered to work for Mrs. Kao Li Li-chen, the wife of Presbyterian Church General-Secretary Kao Chun-ming, who was a candidate in the December 1983 elections. On the day of his arrest, at noontime he promised in a telephone conversation to go to Taipei to help with the funeral of Lin Yi-hsiung’s family (see story on page 1). He also recently promised Mr. Chen Shui-pien that he would assist Mr. Chen’s in the upcoming (December 1985) election campaign if Mr. Chen decides to run for the office of Tainan County magistrate.

Opposition politicians fear that Taiwan authorities are utilizing the “Clean Sweep” campaign as an opportunity to arrest some opposition people.

3. Long-term political prisoners released. On December 16, 1984 the Taiwan authorities released two persons who have been imprisoned since the early fifties. Messrs. Lin Shu-yang, age 59, and Li Chin-mu, age 57, both spent more than thirty years in Green Island prison, off the Southeast coast of Taiwan.

Mr. Li Chin-mu’s wife said in a recent interview that she has been waiting for the past 34 years for her husband to come home. She remembered that it was in 1950, a year after they were married, when he disappeared. Their new-born daughter was then barely a year old. She was not able to find out what happened to him until three years later when a letter from him revealed his whereabouts: he had been arrested and sentenced to life imprisonment.

On December 16, 1984, her dream finally came true. On that day Mr. Li and another political prisoner, Lin Shu-yang, were released after having spent 34 years behind the bars of the Green Island prison. Mr. Lin, who was never married, returned to the home of his brother in Taipei. Mr. Li returned to the Kaohsiung home of his daughter and son-in-law. Both men are in poor health.

The release of Messrs. Li and Lin, and earlier releases of nine longterm prisoners in 1983 and another eleven long-term prisoners in January 1984 -- most of whom spent more than 30 years in the Green Island prison -- are steps in the right direction.
Nevertheless, it must be pointed out that political liberation still takes a painfully slow pace in Taiwan. Hundreds of political prisoners are still languishing in prison. At least 75 are held in the Green Island prison, the most isolated and dreaded prison in Taiwan.

Mr. Li and Mr. Lin, arrested in 1950, were victims of Kuomintang political purges against the native Taiwanese population, following the “February 28” incident of 1947 -- when the troops of Chiang Kai-shek massacred about 12,000 to 20,000 Taiwanese after protests against police brutality turned into island-wide demonstrations. For several years after that, the Kuomintang engaged in large-scale arrest campaigns. Many people disappeared, never to be heard of again. Many of them were sentenced to death and executed. Mr. Li and Mr. Lin, at the age of 23 and 25 respectively, were lucky enough to receive life imprisonment, and were banished to Green Island for the next 34 years.

Mrs. Lin Chin-mu recalled that during the past 34 years, she worked as a factory worker in the daytime and washed clothes for other people at night in order to save enough money so that once in a while she and her daughter could make the trip to Green Island. It was one day’s journey from Kaohsiung to Taitung by bus. From there they must cross the 20 miles wide water by boat to reach Green island. Such a trip cost her NT$10,000 (US$250), but she got to see her husband only for 30 minutes.

4. Time to close down Taiwan’s Gulag Archipelago. Green Island, located off the southeast coast of Taiwan, is a remote island, which houses a prison camp and two cemeteries. It is mainly used for political prisoners and for criminals sentenced to life or long-term imprisonment. Once a prisoner is sent there, he is subject to the whims of prison guards, and is often forgotten by the outside world. The long distance makes the trip there very expensive, which often prevents the families from visiting their imprisoned husbands, fathers or brothers.

Before air transport provided a link between the island and Taitung, the closest city on Taiwan, families of prisoners had to endure an hour’s boat ride on choppy water to reach the island.

Although the air link has made the island more accessible to the outside world, a trip to the island is still a financial burden. The families must first travel by train or by bus to Taitung, and then board the small airplane, which carries them to the island. The flight takes 15 minutes, the cost is NT$900 (US$23). Sometimes the flight is cancelled due to bad weather conditions. Sometimes they cannot get on board because the plane
is full. The worst can still happen -- they are not allowed to see their loved ones after they have reached the prison compound, because he is being denied family visits as punishment for alleged “wrong-doing.”

For years, the families of political prisoners have urged the Taiwan authorities to close down the Green Island prison on humanitarian grounds. The prison is notorious in Taiwan for inhumane treatment of prisoners. Former political prisoners have reported pervasive use of torture by prison guards. The prison, due to its geographical isolation lacks adequate medical facilities. The closest hospital is the military hospital in Taitung. Only when a prisoner is seriously ill, is he taken to the hospital in Taitung. Many have died on the way. In March 1984, Huang Hua, a writer serving a 10 year prison term, was denied permission to attend his mother’s funeral in his hometown Keelung, located at the northern-most point of Taiwan. The authorities gave as reason that Mr. Huang “would not be able to make the trip within one day.”

Recently some officials in Taiwan have made proposals to open up Green island as a holiday resort. The island is picturesque, and its white sandy beaches, unpolluted air and water could be a major attraction to tourists who want to spend a weekend away from the bustle and hustle of Taipei. Perhaps the Taiwan authorities can polish up their tarnished image by closing down Taiwan’s Gulag Archipelago?

Freedom of the press?

1. Executives of opposition press sentenced. In the first two weeks of January’ 1985, the executives of two prominent Taiwanese opposition magazines, Progress Time and Neo-Formosa Weekly, were sentenced to imprisonment on “libel” charges. To close observers of political developments in Taiwan it is apparent that this is yet another attempt by the authorities in Taipei to silence the opposition press.

On January 3, 1985 the Taipei District Court sentenced three executives of Progress Time magazine to eight months imprisonment on “libel” charges brought by former Kaohsiung mayor Wang Yu-yun. Mr. Wang is an ardent supporter of the ruling Kuomintang, and is generally known to have close connections with organized crime in Kaohsiung. In February 1984 the magazine published information about mayor Wang’s connections. The persons sentenced are:
-- Mr. TSAI Jen-chien, publisher of Progress Time;
-- Mr. CHEN Yu-hsin, the magazine’s editor.
— Ms. YANG Tsu-chun, director of the magazine, and an opposition candidate in the December 1983 elections for the Legislative Yuan; Ms. Yang is the wife of Mr. Lin Cheng-chieh, an outspoken opposition-member of the Taipei City Council;

.... it is apparent that this is yet another attempt by the authorities in Taipei to silence the opposition press.

A few days later, on 12 January 1985, the Taipei District Court sentenced three executives of another prominent opposition magazine, Neo-Formosa Weekly, to one year imprisonment and payment of NT$ 2 million compensation (approx. U.S. $ 50,000,--) to the plaintiff. The sentences stem from charges filed by the strongly pro-KMT dean of the College of Philosophy of Tunghai University, Mr. Feng Hu-hsiang. In a broad-ranging article about the University in its June 19, 1984 issue, the magazine reported that Mr. Feng had translated foreign publications and had presented these translations as his own academic work. After a written protest from Mr. Feng, the magazine substantiated its allegations in its June 27, 1984 issue. The persons sentenced were:

-- Mr. HUANG Tien-fu, publisher of Neo-Formosa Weekly. Mr. Huang is a former member of the Legislative Yuan, and younger brother of Mr. Huang Hsin-chieh, the dean of the imprisoned opposition leaders;
-- Mr. LI Yi-yang, editor of the magazine;
— Mr. CHEN Shui-pien, director of the magazine. Mr. Chen is a prominent lawyer, and an opposition-member of the Taipei City Council.

As of the date of this writing, the abovementioned persons have not been taken into custody yet, but this will occur soon if no strong expressions of concern from abroad are forthcoming.

The two magazines have borne the brunt of the Taiwan government’s press censorship during the past year: a record 25 out of the 26 issues published by Neo-Formosa Weekly and its successor-publications were banned or confiscated. At least 24 out of 49 issues published by Progress Time and its successors were banned or confiscated during 1984. The authorities apparently hope that the law suits against the executives of these magazines will silence the magazines permanently.
We request our readers to express their concern about these sentences to the Taiwan authorities as soon as possible. If expressions of concern from Europe and the United States do not reach the Taiwan authorities within the next few days, these opposition persons will certainly be imprisoned. We request you to send telexes or telegrams to:

Mr. CHANG King-yu, Director
Government Information Office
3, Chung-hsiao East Road, Section 1
Taipei, TAIWAN 11,
Taipei, TAIWAN

Mr. James SOONG, Director
Cultural Affairs Department
Kuomintang Party
Chungshan South Road
Taipei, TAIWAN

Mr. Frederick CHIEN
Coordination Council for North American Affairs
5161 River Road, N. W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20016 U. S. A.

2. Kuomintang authorities continue clamp down. As we already indicated in issue no. 17 of our Taiwan Communiqué, we recently received a considerable amount of additional information regarding press censorship in Taiwan. With this information we have now updated our statistical overview and come to the conclusion that the number of confiscations and bannings have risen much faster than we believed to be the case until now. Below you find our compilation.

We acknowledge the fact that during the past year the Taiwan authorities have allowed the opposition magazines to increase their publication-frequency: at the end of 1983 and the beginning of 1984 several monthly magazines started to come out on a weekly basis. In mid-1983 we counted one weekly and six monthly tangwai publications, which together issued a total of approximately 10 publications per month. Now there are five weekly, one bi-monthly and three monthly magazines which consider themselves tangwai publications. These publications put out a total of approximately 25 issues per month, which means an increase in the overall publication-frequency by a factor of 211.

However, our statistics show that the number of censorship actions by the authorities has risen more than twice as fast as the overall publication frequency of the magazines. The present count for 1984 is 177 individual censorship actions by the authorities (7 issues censored, 90 banned, 61 confiscated and 19 licenses suspended). In 1983 we counted a total of 34 actions (2 censored, 10 banned, 16 confiscated and 6 suspended). The absolute number of censorship actions thus increased by a factor of more than five.
We also emphasize that in July / August 1984 the police started an extensive campaign to confiscate banned magazines at distribution points and at newsstands. It has thus become much more difficult to distinguish the “banned” from the “confiscated” category. Many newsstand owners have recently been warned by the police not to sell banned magazines. If they do, they will be fined NT$ 4,800. If they have been fined three times they will lose their newsstand-license.

In a number of cities in central and southern Taiwan there are some local publications which might be considered *tangwai*, but we have not been able to collect data on their publication frequency or on censorship against these publications. There are also several national magazines which consider themselves “neutral”, and which are banned or confiscated from time to time. We did not receive information on censorship of these publications either.

The most important *tangwai* magazines to be banned, confiscated or suspended during 1984 were:

**a. CARE Magazine** -- a monthly magazine published by human rights-leader and National Assembly-member Mrs. Yao Chou Ching-yu -- was confiscated three times during 1984 for publishing information about prison conditions and about the May-1984 hunger strike by imprisoned opposition leaders. Mrs. Yao’s husband, human rights lawyer Yao Chia-wen, has been imprisoned since December 1979.

**b. Senh-Kin weekly** magazine, and its successors Taiwan Nien-tai, Taiwan Forum, and Taiwan Tide -- published by Legislative Yuan member Mrs. Hsu Jung-shu -- were banned or confiscated twenty-four (24) times and suspended three times during 1984, because they contained articles about the lack of democracy in Taiwan and about Taiwan’s increasing international isolation. In the beginning of 1985 the publication license of Taiwan-Tide was suspended once again.

**c. Current Monthly** magazine, and its successors The Eighties Semi-monthly and The Asian Semi-monthly -- published by veteran opposition-leader Mr. K’ang Ning-hsiang -- were banned or confiscated at least eleven times during 1984. Current was once confiscated for a spoof on President Reagan, titled “Is President Reagan spreading propaganda for the Chinese communists?”, while The Eighties was suspended for a year because it printed an article about PRC athletes participating in the Los Angeles Olympics.
d. **Progressive Forum** magazine and its successors Progressive Time, Progressive World, Progress and Look Forward -published by Taipei City Council-member Lin Cheng-chieh -- was banned or confiscated at least twenty-four (24) times during 1984, and received a total of four suspension orders. The magazines published articles about the May 1984 hunger strike by opposition leaders, about nepotism in the ruling Kuomintang-party and about Taiwan’s increasing international isolation.

e. **Neo-Formosa Weekly** and its successors Northwest Rain and Political Monitor -- published by Mr. Huang T’ien-fu a younger brother of the dean of the imprisoned opposition leaders, Legislative Yuan-member Huang Hsin-chieh) -- was the target of the largest number of bannings and confiscations. From the middle of June through the end of December 1984 Neo-Formosa Weekly was banned or confiscated a record twenty-six times. Particularly when issues contained articles criticizing former president Chiang Kai-shek, the confiscations were unusually thorough. On 31 August 1984 all 14,000 copies of Neo-Formosa Weekly no. 9 were confiscated, and even the printing shop’s printing plates were impounded.

**Neo-Formosa Weekly** was succeeded by **Northwest Rain**, which appeared on 10 September 1984. The cover story of issue No. 1 reported how relatives of KMT high officials -- a number of names were listed – were able to use their political connections for business deals. The article stated that they monopolize government contracts and often siphon public funds into their own pockets.

Issue No. 2 carried an illustrated story about a temple in Keelung in which two statues of Chiang Kai-shek and Sun Yat-sen were worshipped as deities. This issue never made it into the hands of subscribers: agents from the Taiwan Garrison Command confiscated the full circulation (10,000 copies) at the printing office. They raided the printing shop four times, and even searched the neighboring houses for copies which might have been smuggled out. Issue No. 3 criticized the Minister of Economic Affairs, Hsu Li-teh and was subsequently banned. Issue No. 4 was also confiscated at the printing shop. In the beginning of October 1984 **Northwest Rain**’s publishing license was suspended for the period of one year, and in the beginning of November 1984 Mr. Huang Tien-fu reverted back to the title of his old magazine, **Political Monitor**, which had been suspended for one year in November 1983.

3. **A “content analysis” of banned articles.** Until recently we had only limited information about the contents of the articles which prompted the authorities to ban or confiscate opposition magazines. Our statistics of press censorship in Taiwan published in earlier issues of Taiwan Communiqué thus did not go much beyond the mere
numbers of magazines banned, confiscated, or suspended. It was therefore a pleasant surprise recently to receive a pro-Kuomintang magazine, which contained a detailed “content analysis” of banned articles in *tangwai* magazines. Below you find a summary of their analysis, which covers the period January through July 1984.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>No. of banned articles</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Taiwan’s isolated diplomatic status</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* “Historical secrets” (mainly pertaining to President Chiang and other high KMT officials)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* The future status of Taiwan</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Succession of Chiang Ching-kuo</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Suggesting the foundation of an opposition party</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Prison conditions and political prisoners</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Undemocratic structure of the central government</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Domestic issues (such as the 3 coalmine disasters)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* “Inside stories” of power struggle within the KMT</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* The question of birthplace (mainland vs. Taiwan)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>327</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It must be noted that these data pertain to the number of individual articles in the magazines. Our own compilation for the same period show a total of 69 issues of the magazines confiscated or banned. If our own data are complete, this would mean that each banned or confiscated issue contained on the average 4.74 banned articles. This seems, to be on the high side, which leads us to the conclusion that our own estimate of the number of magazines banned or confiscated in the period January through July 1984 is still on the low side.
4. Overview of press censorship in Taiwan.

Press-censorship statistics, according to information available to us on 15 January 1985:

**Quarterly statistics on press censorship in Taiwan 1982 – present**

Measures (in order of increasing severity):

a. **Censored**: an article (or parts thereof) was ordered deleted, changed or blackened out.

b. **Banned**: the magazine received an order prohibiting the sale and distribution of one issue of the magazine. Recently it has become more difficult to distinguish the “banned” category from the next one (“confiscated”), since the police has started an extensive campaign to confiscate the banned magazines at distribution points and at newsstands. Many newsstand-owners have recently been warned by police not to sell banned *tangwai* magazines. If they do, they will be fined NT$ 4,800 (approximately US$ 120,--). If they have been fined three times, they will loose their newsstand-license.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Censored</th>
<th>One issue of a magazine</th>
<th>Suspended</th>
<th>Total Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Banned</td>
<td>Confiscated</td>
<td>for one year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL 1982</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL 1983</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For 1984</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. **Confiscated**: one issue of the magazine was seized by the secret police at the printing shop; generally by agents of the Taiwan Garrison Command, occasionally by other police agencies.

d. **Suspended**: the magazine received an order prohibiting its publication -- generally for the period of one year. Suspensions are given after a weekly review, attended by representatives of the Taiwan Garrison Command (TGC), the Government Information Office (GIO), the Cultural Affairs Department of the KMT, and the Investigation Bureau of the Justice Ministry.
Articles and publications

VANDAAR: The Presbyterian Church in Taiwan.

In its September 1984 issue this joint publication (circulation 300,000+) of the missionary societies of the two major Protestant denominations in the Netherlands published an editorial and a lead-article about the Presbyterian Church in Taiwan. The editorial focused on the important role which is being played by the imprisoned -- and now released -- General Secretary, Reverend KAO Chun-ming, for the Presbyterian Church in Taiwan and for the Taiwanese people as a whole. The editorial described his deep faith, and printed a Dutch translation of Reverend Kao’s poem “God’s way”, which was written when he was in prison.

The lead-article described the turbulent history of Taiwan and the courageous position taken by the Presbyterian Church. It particularly focused on the public declarations regarding democracy, human rights, and the international legal status of Taiwan -- issued by the Church since 1971. The article also highlighted the repressive measures taken by the Kuomintang authorities against the Church.

Notes

1. Public Policy Research Association grounded. In February 1984 a number of tangwai members of the Legislative Yuan, National Assembly, Provincial Assembly and the Taipei City Council agreed it would be necessary for the tangwai to set up a “think tank” to do background research for them. In September 1984 they established an office in a building on Chi Nan Road, just around the corner from the Control Yuan and the Taipei City Council, hired some staff members and started functioning. The Public Policy Research Association (PPRA), as it was named, organized seminars and lectures, and collected information on a great variety of issues, such as pollution control, nuclear energy, international relations, etc.

However, on 21 November 1984 the Minister of Interior, Mr. Wu Pohsiung, stated that the PPRA “should disband itself” and that it should terminate all its activities, since it is an “illegal” organization. Mr. Wu based himself on a law governing the formation
of civilian organizations, which was promulgated in 1942, which says that within the same functional category, only one civilian organization is allowed to exist. Any new organization could only be set up with government approval, and should be registered with the authorities.

The statement by Mr. Wu raised the interesting question why there were three political parties (the Kuomintang, the China Youth Party and the Young Socialist Party). The response from the Ministry of Interior was that for political parties no approval from the government was necessary. This in turn created an interesting opening for the tangwai, who wondered aloud whether the authorities would allow them to form a new party. The response from the government was a quick and decisive “no.”

“In a press conference on the same day, the chairman of the PPRA, Legislative Yuan-member Fei Shi-ping, stated that in a democratic country it should be possible to establish organizations such as the PPRA, since they strengthened democracy. The TV evening news brought the statement by Minister Wu as the first item in the broadcast, but didn’t say a word about the response from the tangwai.”
During the next few weeks the discussion regarding the legal status of the PPRA and other tangwai organizations continued. Opposition magazines likened Minister Wu’s statement to repressive tactics of military regimes elsewhere and published cartoons such as the one above, showing a tank crashing through a wall of the meeting place of the PPRA. At the time of this writing, no compromise had been found.

The Kuomintang authorities reportedly pressured the tangwai to delete the words “tangwai” and “public policy” from the name of the organization.

2. Taiwan Association for Human Rights founded. On December 9, 1984 a number of prominent tangwai ("outside-the-party") legislators, lawyers, doctors, businessmen, and scholars formally announced the formation of the Taiwan Association for Human Rights (TAHR). The objective of the organization is to promote human rights in Taiwan and elsewhere in the world. Its president, Mr. Chiang Peng-chien, is a tangwai member of the Legislative Yuan and a lawyer. He declared at a press conference in Taipei in the afternoon of December 9, 1984 that the Association intends to establish contacts with international and national human rights organizations. The Association has no restriction on the nationality of members. New members need to be recommended by two sitting members, and approved by the 15-member executive committee.

The TAHR is yet to be recognized by the Kuomintang authorities, which require that all civilian organizations apply for registration. The authorities have indicated they might refuse the registration of TAHR, “because there is already a Chinese Association of Human Rights.” This semi-official organization, headed by the elderly Mr. Han Li-wu, is basically an extension of the Kuomintang government. The Kuomintang authorities base their refusal of the registration of the TAHR on the abovementioned 1942 law, promulgated on the mainland when Taiwan was still under Japanese rule, which says that within the same functional category, only one civilian organization is allowed to exist.

Chiang Peng-chien, the president of TAHR, said in response: “There are close to 800 human rights organizations in the United States. If the Taiwan authorities invoke a law, which was written in 1942 on the mainland in a period of emergency, to ban the formation of a new human rights organization, then the Taiwan authorities’ refusal must be considered an act of violation of human rights.” He said that this law, written so long ago, was totally out of touch with the reality in Taiwan today. Besides it has been superseded by the Constitution, promulgated in 1946, which -- in theory at least -- guarantees the freedom of assembly and association.
3. **A “welcome home” to political prisoners.** To commemorate the International Human Rights Day on December 10, 1984, the three major native Taiwanese opposition organizations, the “*Tangwai* Public Policy Research Association”, the “*Tangwai* Editors and Writers Association” and “Care Center” planned to organize a gathering for former political prisoners. After several rounds of negotiations with the authorities, they were finally granted permission to hold a “welcome home” party in a hotel in Taipei. More than 100 former political prisoners attended this party, including the recently released Kaohsiung prisoners, and several long-term prisoners who had been imprisoned more than 10 years. One of them even spent 27 years in prison. Writer Wang T’o, who himself spent approximately 4-1 years in jail after the “Kaohsiung Incident” of December 10, 1979, spoke for the released prisoners. He emphasized that they would continue to work for the *Tangwai* movement in order to build democracy and freedom on Taiwan.

4. **P’eng Ming-min: “A taste of freedom”**. Just over twenty years ago, on 20 September 1964, Dr. P’eng Ming-min -- a prominent native Taiwanese who was then chairman of the Political Science Department at National Taiwan University in Taipei -- was arrested together with two of his students for drafting a “Declaration of Formosans.” The Declaration called on the Nationalist Chinese government of Chiang Kai-shek to give up its aim of “recovering” the mainland. It proposed the establishment of a new country and a democratic political system with a government responsible to the people of Taiwan. It also suggested that Taiwan become a new member of the United Nations, and establish diplomatic relations with other nations striving for world peace.

The manifesto was evidently not liked very well by the Kuomintang authorities: Dr. P’eng and the two students -- Mr. Hsieh Tsung-min and Mr. Wei T’ing-chao -- were accused of “sedition”, and sentenced by a military court to prison sentences ranging from eight to ten years. Dr. P’eng spent one year in prison. Because of strong international pressure he was later released and placed under house arrest, but Mr. Hsieh and Wei spent five years in prison. Dr. P’eng escaped from Taiwan in January 1970 and -- after a brief time in Europe -- has lived and worked in the United States, where he has become a prominent spokesman for the native Taiwanese.

---

Dr. Peng Ming-min
community. He has written and lectured about Taiwan’s international legal status and the future of Taiwan.

On several occasions he presented testimony to the U.S. Congress about American policy towards Taiwan and China. In 1972 he published an autobiography, titled “A taste of freedom, memoirs of a Formosan independence leader.”

On September 15, 1984, more than 400 Taiwanese from the United States, Japan, Canada and Brazil attended a meeting at Drew University in Madison, NJ, to commemorate the 20th anniversary of the Declaration’s publication. Professor P’eng and Mr. Hsieh were able to attend the gathering, but Mr. Wei is still a prisoner in Taiwan’s dark dungeons: he was released on the 1964 charges in 1969, but was rearrested in February 1971 and imprisoned from 1971 through 1975. Presently he is the only one of 33 persons tried in civil court after the 1979 Kaohsiung incident who remains in prison (see our “Prison Report” on page 16 of *Taiwan Communiqué* no. 17).

Dr. P’eng pointed out in his keynote speech during the meeting that the Declaration was simply a straightforward conclusion, which anyone would draw if looking at reality. The reality after twenty years has in effect turned harsher for the ruling Kuomintang in Taiwan.

1. The ruling Kuomintang’s policy of recovering the mainland remains a dead-end policy. The Chinese Communists are in firm control of the mainland. The Kuomintang Chinese can never go back to the mainland.

2. The ruling Kuomintang’s claim of being the government of China is the laughing stock of the international community, but KMT keeps clinging to this illusion.

3. The large majority of the Taiwanese do not want to be ruled by either the Chinese Communists or by the Nationalist Chinese Kuomintang. However, the rule of martial law denies the Taiwanese people a say in the national affairs of the island-nation.

4. The ruling Kuomintang does not have the support of the majority of the people on the island.

He emphasized that Kuomintang must make fundamental changes in its policies. He said that cosmetic changes such as holding supplementary elections for a small number
of seats in the Legislative Yuan and National Assembly are meaningless, because it changes the form but not the substance.

He said the people in Taiwan are openly talking about self-determination, which was a major plank in the election platform of the tangwai during the December 1983 elections. The Presbyterian Church, which is deeply rooted in the Taiwanese society, has published a declaration advocating the establishment of a new and independent country.

He concluded by saying that the future poses a major challenge for Taiwan -- the threat from China is now greater than 20 years ago. We must think carefully and plan ahead how to deal with this challenge.

5. Changes at the Southeast Asia Resource Center. In our Taiwan Communiqué no. 16 we referred to the activities and publications of the SE Asia Resource Center and gave its address in New York. Since then we have learned that -- as of October 1, 1984 -- the Center has changed its name to “Asia Resource Center” and has also moved to a new address:

   Mailing address: Office Location:
P.O. Box 15275  538 7th Street, S.E.
   Washington, DC 20003  Washington, DC 20003
   U. S. A.  U.S.A.

   Its telephone number is: (202) 547-1114