United States’ Taiwan Policy at the Crossroads

The United States’ Taiwan policy is at the crossroads: on the one side there are persistent efforts by a number of key members of Congress -- such as Senators Kennedy, Pell and Durenberger, and Congressmen Solarz, Leach and Torricelli -- who are pushing for improvements with regard to human rights and democracy on the island. On the other side stands the Reagan Administration which has been following a “do nothing” and “silent diplomacy” approach vis-a-vis human rights violations and the lack of democracy in Taiwan.

Congressional resolution urges lift of party-ban in Taiwan

On November 18, 1985 U.S. Congressmen Stephen Solarz (D - NY) and Jim Leach (R - IA) introduced a resolution in the House of Representatives expressing concern about the lack of political freedom and freedom of expression in Taiwan. The resolution -- which received the number “233” -- was submitted to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. On page 2 you find the full text of the Resolution.

Mr. Reagan's "Weapons Express" rides again
No Leverage ?
The key section of the Resolution states that it is the sense of the Congress that the authorities on Taiwan should “continue and accelerate progress toward a fully democratic system”, in particular by allowing the formation of genuine opposition political parties, ending censorship and guaranteeing freedom of speech, expression, and assembly, and moving toward full representative government.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 233
Expressing the sense of the Congress concerning representative government, political parties, and freedom of expression on Taiwan.

Whereas prosperity and educational progress on the island of Taiwan have created conditions in which a democratic system of government can thrive;

Whereas stability and peace prevail on the island of Taiwan and in the Western Pacific region;

Whereas the people on Taiwan, primarily in elections at the local level, have shown themselves fully capable of participating in a democratic political process;

Whereas in spite of this, only a small minority of the seats in the central legislature and central electoral college are filled through periodic election, with the vast majority of seats still being held by individuals who took office in the late 1940’s;

Whereas the system of martial law imposed in 1949 and other emergency provisions prevent the democratic opposition on Taiwan from organizing a genuine opposition party and constrain it from exercising the constitutionally mandated freedom of the press and freedom of expression;

Whereas the system of martial law provides the authorities broad latitude in charging political dissidents with the crimes of sedition and treason;

Whereas the preservation and enhancement of human rights of all the people on Taiwan are objectives of the United States;

Whereas section 806 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal years 1986 and 1987, states the sense of the Congress that “one important element of a peaceful future for Taiwan is greater participation in the political process by all the people on Taiwan” and that “accordingly, the United States should encourage the authorities on Taiwan to work vigorously toward this end”; and
Whereas a more free and open Taiwan, with full respect for human rights, would have an even stronger claim to the moral support of the American people: **Now, therefore, be it**

**Resolved** by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the authorities on Taiwan should continue and accelerate progress toward a fully democratic system, in particular by –

(1) allowing the formation of genuine opposition political parties;
(2) ending censorship and guaranteeing freedom of speech, expression, and assembly; and
(3) moving toward full representative government.

**Taiwan Communiqué** applauds this bi-partisan initiative by Congressmen Solarz and Leach, and we urge the U.S. Congress to speedily approve this Resolution. The United States should send a strong signal to the authorities in Taipei that it will no longer condone the violations of human rights and the lack of democracy which have characterized the Kuomintang’s rule of the island for the past four decades.

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

**How the Reagan Administration is “losing” Taiwan**

In stark contrast to the constructive approach followed by the United States Congress, we see a Reagan Administration that hasn’t even **started** to come to grips with Taiwan.

Some 35 years ago, a major debate raged in the United States as to who “lost” China. As China never “belonged” to the United States in the first place, this was a rather silly exercise, were it not for the fact that it masked a major failure of U.S. policymakers during and after World War II: the U.S. had failed to see that Chiang Kai-shek’s Nationalists were estranging the people of China by their corruption; and their repressive measures -- and were thereby driving the people of China straight into the arms of Mao Tze-tung.

At the present time the Reagan Administration is making the same mistake: it is so preoccupied with human rights violations in countries such as Poland and the Soviet Union, that it tends to gloss over much worse violations in countries like Taiwan, South Korea, Honduras, Chili, and Guatemala. With regard to the latter countries, Mr.
Reagan apparently tries to carry on an equivalent of a “constructive dialogue.” However, many people in these countries view this half-hearted approach as explicit support for the respective repressive regimes. In South Korea, Chili, and Honduras this has already led to open anti-Americanism. If Mr. Reagan continues his policy of silent diplomacy vis-a-vis human rights violations and the lack of democracy in Taiwan, the disappointment of the people of Taiwan will one day turn to anger at the United States for failing to live up to the ideals of freedom, democracy, and human rights, which Mr. Reagan so loudly proclaims.

Some Reagan Administration officials at times lamely argue that the United States has little leverage with the authorities in Taipei. Most democratically-minded people in Taiwan view this as an extremely weak excuse: as is depicted in the cartoon on page 1, the United States has ample leverage: each time Mr. Reagan sells another load of weapons to Taipei, he could put his foot down and demand significant progress towards democracy. Until now, Mr. Reagan has failed to do so.

The best hope for Taiwan lies in a speedy transition to a democratic political system, in which the majority of the people on the island have a commensurate say in national decision-making. The longer the Reagan Administration waits in the vain hope that the Kuomintang will voluntarily undertake reforms, the more unstable the situation will become and the less likely is a development of a truly free and democratic Taiwan.

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

Elections in Taiwan: Neither free nor fair

The recently-concluded local elections in Taiwan were neither free nor fair: they were marred by extensive harassment, intimidation, and fraud by the Kuomintang authorities, directed against the tangwai (“outside-the-party”) opposition, and by an apparent murder attempt in Tainan County. Still, the elections contained the seeds for new things to come for the island’s 19 million people: The island’s democratic opposition -- who are not allowed to form a party by the ruling Kuomintang -- brought a new level of confidence and political organization to the contest.

The voting took place on 16 November 1985, after a ten-day campaign period -- generally referred to as the “democratic holiday” by the Taiwanese people, since the ruling Kuomintang does not allow the opposition to hold political gatherings at any other time.
In total there were 191 contested seats, 77 positions in the Provincial Assembly, 51 in the Taipei City Council, 42 seats in the Kaohsiung City Council, and 21 county magistrates and mayors of major cities.

The ruling authorities tried to portray the election results as a “landslide victory.” To uninformed outsiders this might indeed appear to be the case: the Kuomintang won 146 out of the 191 seats, while the tangwai won 32 seats (including five “unaffiliated” leaning towards the tangwai), and the remainder went to unaffiliated candidates. However, since the ground rules set by the Taiwan authorities heavily favor the ruling Kuomintang, it is meaningless to look only at the numerical results of the election, but one has to take into consideration that severe restrictions are placed upon the opposition. The major elements of unfairness of the election system are:

* **Martial law** has been in force on Taiwan since 1949, and the authorities do not allow the opposition to form political parties; persons opposing the ruling Kuomintang can only run as individuals. On January 3, 1986 the Executive Yuan even reiterated its archaic position, claiming that the present “extraordinary situation” [a reference to the “temporary communist rebellion” on the mainland -- Ed.] made it “inappropriate” to lift the ban on the formation of new parties.

* During the months preceding the election campaign, a major censorship campaign virtually eliminated the opposition press. While pro-government newspapers for the first time gave some balanced coverage to tangwai candidates, reporting on the government-controlled radio and TV was heavily slanted in favor of KMT-candidates. Also, the authorities banned the use of videotapes -- which had been a popular means of communication during past campaigns.

* The election campaign was **limited to only five days** of open election activity, and a second five-day period during which only meetings organized by the government could be attended. During the first period the candidates could only hold a maximum of six rallies per day of no more than two hours each. During the second five-day period, campaigning could only take place at meetings organized by the authorities, where the speeches of tangwai candidates were sandwiched in between those of Kuomintang candidates in order to minimize their impact. Each speech was limited to 15 minutes.

* During the campaign-period the police often harassed people attending gatherings organized by opposition candidates. There were also many instances of intimidation of and violence against campaign aides of opposition candidates;
Police Blocking Access to Dr. You Ching’s campaign headquarters

* Plain-clothe policemen with videorecorders, cameras and tape recorders filmed and taped the campaign speeches of opposition candidates to make sure they did not touch on “forbidden topics”, such as self-determination, and political-prisoners.

* In several counties, particularly Ilan, Taoyuan, Pingtung, and in Hsinchu City, the Kuomintang bussed in large numbers of people -- usually military and civil service personnel -- in an attempt to overcome strong tangwai candidacies there. This strategy led to the defeat of the tangwai candidates in Taoyuan, Pingtung, and Hsinchu.

* Vote-buying by candidates of the ruling Kuomintang was widespread, particularly in the rural areas and in the southern part of the island. News reports indicated that in some areas the banks even ran out of NT$ 100 (U.S.$ 2.50) bank notes.

* Candidates were not allowed to have more than 40 poll watchers each, although in some constituencies there were more than 1,000 polling stations. Also, only election officials appointed by the Kuomintang could take the ballots to the central election headquarters for final certification. However, the authorities refused to appoint tangwai representatives as election officials “because they are not an official party.”
A new party taking shape

Although the Taiwan authorities did not allow the tangwai opposition to form a party, a “Campaign Support Committee” was formed, which met on September 28, 1985 in the Taipei Mandarin Hotel to endorse candidates. The Committee endorsed a total of 42 candidates for various positions: 11 candidates for Taipei City Council, six for the Kaohsiung City Council, 18 candidates for the Provincial Assembly, and seven candidates for mayoral and county magistrate positions.

In a strange development, the tangwai candidate for the position of Taoyuan County Magistrate, Mr. Lin Ching-sung, withdrew only a few minutes before the registration deadline. The tangwai were thus unable to find a replacement candidate. Opposition sources in Taiwan indicate that Mr. Lin was threatened, and decided to back out of the race after his KMT opponent paid him large bribe to quit.

The tangwai candidates ran under a common symbol, a flag representing the suffering and hopes of the Taiwanese people. The flag itself is green (dark areas) and white. The green areas stand for peace and prosperity, while the white symbolizes cleanliness and purity. The cross represents a crossroads at which the island and the people find themselves.

The tangwai candidates also endorsed a joint platform, consisting of the following five points:

* Self-determination, the future of Taiwan should be decided by the people of Taiwan;
* An end to the suspension of constitutionally guaranteed civil liberties;
* Enactment of formal laws increasing local government autonomy (presently most local government takes place under decree, and positions such as governor of Taiwan, and mayors of Taipei and Kaohsiung are appointed);
* An end to martial law and the release of all political prisoners;
* An end to arbitrary arrests, detention, and torture by the intelligence agencies. Severe punishment of police misconduct.

The Kuomintang authorities specifically prohibited two of the five points: “self-determination” and “release of political prisoners.”
Chang shun-hsiung, who served as executive director of the *tangwai* “Campaign Support Committee”, said that this election was a watershed for the opposition movement. He said that for the first time, they were able to function as an embryonic political party, by nominating its candidates in a general assembly and by coordinating campaign assistance to its candidates.

**A brief analysis of the overall results**

Below is a table with an overall numerical picture of the election results. It presents the numbers of candidates and winners for the Kuomintang, the *tangwai*, and unaffiliated. The first category encompasses the candidates endorsed by the Kuomintang. The second category the candidates includes those formally endorsed by the *tangwai’s* “Campaign Support Committee” and several persons leaning towards the *tangwai*, but running independently. In the third category, “unaffiliated”, one finds:

* a number of candidates who ran fully on an individual basis, since they had a considerable local power base,
* a few Kuomintang-candidates who failed to get the nomination of the party, but ran anyway (most of these lost),
* several candidates associated with non-partisan Mr. Su Chiu-cheng; all of these lost.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>Elected</th>
<th>Percentage of seats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mayors/County magistrates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuomintang</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>80.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Tangwai</em></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaffiliated</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provincial Assembly</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuomintang</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>76.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Tangwai</em></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaffiliated</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taipei City Council</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuomintang</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>74.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Tangwai</em></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaffiliated</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.9 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It must be pointed out that the tangwai did receive a much higher percentage of the votes that of the seats. This is partly due to the fact that in some areas tangwai candidates ran against each other, thereby splitting the vote. Also, the Kuomintang was able to manage an amazingly even spread of votes, thereby that few votes were “wasted.” Overall, the Kuomintang approximately 70 percent of the popular vote, while the tangwai and unaffiliated received the remaining 30 percent. In the voting for the positions of mayors and county magistrates the tangwai and unaffiliated even achieved some 35 percent.

Below follows a short review of the most significant wins and losses among the tangwai.

**Mayors and County Magistrates:**

**Kaohsiung County** Magistrate: in perhaps the most significant gain for the tangwai, Mrs. YU Chen Yueh-ying, age 60, presently member of the Legislative Yuan, won in her bid to unseat KMT-incumbent Tsai Ming-yao.

In **Taichung City**, Mrs. Hsu Jung-shu, age 49, who presently serves as a member of the Legislative Yuan, lost in her bid to unseat incumbent mayor Chang Tsu-yuan. Mrs. Hsu is the wife of imprisoned opposition leader and Formosa editor CHANG Chun-hung.

In the race for **Tainan County** Magistrate, a fierce battle was fought between the tangwai candidate, Mr. Chen Shui-pien, age 35, defense lawyer at the 1980 trial of the “Kaohsiung Eight”, and former member of Taipei City Council, and his KMT-opponent, incumbent Lee Ya-chiao. Mr. Chen’ lost by narrow margin.
In **Pingtung County**, *tangwai* incumbent magistrate CHIU Lien-hui, who had performed admirably well during the past four years, was defeated by KMT-candidate Shih Meng-hsiung. Local observers in Ping-tung blame it on KMT vote buying, and on a split in the area’s sizable Hakka vote.

In the race for **Taipei County** magistrate, *tangwai* candidate Dr. YOU Ch’ing, lost out to his KMT-opponent, Mr. LIN Feng-chen, but he received some 300,000 votes out of some one million cast. *Tangwai* Legislative Yuan member Cheng Yu-cheng, who was not endorsed by the Committee, but who decided to run anyway, received only some 60,000 votes.

Dr. You gained considerable attention in Taipei with his Greenpeace-inspired “Rainbow Warriors” campaign posters, and with his campaign theme: “Recover Taipei county” (an obvious reference to the Kuomintang’s worn-out promise to “recover” the mainland). Up until this campaign, few *tangwai* had ventured to run for an executive position in Taipei County, and the area had been considered a *tangwai* “desert.”

In **Ilan County** an unaffiliated non-KMT candidate, Mr. CHEN Ting-nan, ran and won because of his considerable local power base. The same occurred in Chiayi City, where the incumbent mayor, Mrs. CHANG Po-ya, was re-elected.

In the race for the seat of **Hsinchu City** mayor, Mr. SHIH Hsing-jung, age 50, a dentist who is the older brother of former mayor Shih Hsing-chung -- imprisoned in July 1985 on false charges -- was not successful in his bid to gain his brother’s seat. There are strong indications of election fraud by the Kuomintang: the Washington Post reported (December 12, 1985) that busloads of retired veterans, teachers and their families were brought in from neighbouring counties to ensure that the KMT-candidate won. At one
single polling station (no. 64) in Hsinchu, Mr. Shih’s campaign aides registered 17 buses. Election authorities refused to investigate the matter.

The suspicion of election fraud led to a five-hour demonstration by Mr. Shih’s supporters in the evening of November 16. A crowd estimated at 2,000 gathered in front of the Hsinchu Government Office. In the ensuing melee three government cars were overturned. The authorities arrested eleven people, who were charged with “disturbing the peace and obstruction of official duties.” When the eleven appeared in Hsinchu District Court on December 27, 1985 they said they had been tortured by police during interrogation.

**Taiwan Provincial Assembly**

Of the 18 candidates who were endorsed by the “Tangwai Support Group”, 11 gained a seat in the Assembly. In addition, three “leaning towards the tangwai” candidates were elected.

Two out of the three members of the well-known “Iron Triangle” regained their seats in the Assembly:
* Mr. SU Cheng-chan, age 38, of Pintung, won;
* Mr. YU Shyi-kun, age 37, of Ilan, won;
* Mr. HSIEH San-sheng, age 42, of Tainan, lost;

Further winners, who are relatives of well-known opposition leaders or political prisoners:
* Ms. YU Ya-ling, age 36. She is an incumbent member of the Assembly. Her mother, Yu Chen Yueh-ying, won the race for the position of Kaohsiung County Magistrate;
* Mrs. SHIH Chuang Chi-mei, age 42, wife of imprisoned former mayor of Hsinchu City, Mr. Shih Hsing-chung;

**Taipei City Council**

In a major victory in Taipei, all eleven tangwai candidates for Taipei City Council won, three of them with the highest number of votes in their respective districts.
* Mr. HSIEH Chang-t’ing, age 39, a prominent tangwai lawyer, won re-election;
* Mr. LIN Cheng-chieh, age 33, publisher of Progress Magazine (which recently also stopped publishing due to the authorities’ press censorship campaign) also won his bid for re-election;
Mrs. HUANG Lan Mei-chin, age 41, wife of former Legislative Yuan-member and Neo-Formosa publisher Huang T’ien-fu, is a newcomer to the Council;  
Mr. LIN Wen-Lang, age 40, a prominent businessman, who won with the highest number of votes in his district;  
Mr. CHANG Teh-ming, age 47, a former member of the Legislative Yuan. Mr. Chang is associated with opposition leader K’ang Ning-hsiang;  
Mr. CHOU Po-lun, age 31, publisher of _New Route_ magazine. Mr. Chou received the third highest number of votes of any candidate in Taipei. However, after the election, he was charged by the Taipei Election Committee with “sedition” because he had “slandered the head of state.” One of Mr. Chou’s campaign fliers pictured a family-tree of the Chiang family and described it as “the No. 1 privileged family.” In the flier, Mr. Chou listed the various government- and business-positions held by members of Taiwan’s ruling family.

**Kaohsiung City Council**

Mrs. LIN Li-chen, age 38, wife of “Kaohsiung Eight” theologian Lin Hung-hsuan, gained a seat in the Kaohsiung City Council. Her victory is particularly significant, because she is the fifth relative of a “Kaohsiung Eight” prisoner to be elected to public office. She not only had to overcome widespread KMT vote-buying, but also a fierce campaign by Ms. Hsieh Hsiu-hsiang, an opposition activist who failed to receive the tangwai nomination and launched vicious personal attacks on Mrs. Lin.

**Murder attempt in Tainan County**

The suspicious circumstances surrounding an accident in Tainan County -- in which the wife of tangwai candidate Chen Shui-pien was severely injured -- has led opposition members in Taiwan to suspect foul play. Mrs. Chen Wu Shu-chen, age 34, was run over by a farm vehicle, and suffered four broken ribs, a fractured shoulder blade, and severe injury to the backbone, resulting in damage to the central nerve system. She is now paralyzed from the chest down.

A female campaign aide, Ms. Yu Hwei-chu, age 21, was also injured during the accident: she suffered a broken leg and a fractured pelvic bone.

On November 18, 1985, Mr. Chen, his wife, and the campaign aide were travelling
around Tainan County to thank Mr. Chen’s supporters for their efforts during the campaign. Two days earlier, Mr. Chen had narrowly lost a hotly contested race for the position of Tainan County Magistrate. At around noontime, they got out of their car and walked into a dead-end road towards a restaurant to have lunch. While they walked into the alley, a farm tractor drove into them from behind at high speed, knocking over Mrs. Chen and the campaign aide. The driver then backed up, driving over Mrs. Chen again, and then moved his tractor forward, driving over her a third time.

Mrs. Chen said later that just before she was hit by the tractor, she heard someone call out “the one in red dress and wearing eyeglasses is Mrs. Chen Shui-pien” -- which in her opinion was an indication that several people were working together to make the “accident” happen.

The driver of the tractor, who claimed to be a bricklayer, was taken into police custody. He said that his brakes were out of order. However, an examination by the prosecutor showed that they were working fine. Mr. Chen also noted that the driver’s hands looked like those of someone working at a desk and not of a person engaged in manual labour. In spite of this, the police announced right away that it was a “pure accident.” At the police station the driver was well treated, quite unlike the treatment given to criminals as a whole.

Three days before the accident -- on the day before the voting -- Mrs. Chen’s mother had received an anonymous letter, saying that if Mr. Chen didn’t leave politics immediately, he would “suffer the pain of a broken home and agony over a dead wife.” A few hours after the accident, Mr. Chen’s campaign office in Tainan received a phone call, asking if Chen would dare to run for office again.
Fraud and dirty tricks

Earlier during the election race, Mr. Chen himself was also apparently a victim of foul play. On the night of November 10, 1985, he suffered a severe case of diarrhea and vomiting. He had to be rushed to the hospital for treatment. It was suspected that his tea was drugged: a white substance was discovered in the tea pot, from which Mr. Chen had drank several cups of tea while he was delivering a campaign speech. Other members of his staff who also drank the same tea, also suffered diarrhea. Also during the campaign, two aides of Mr. Chen were beaten up by some unknown people.

According to the official election results, Mr. Chen lost the race to his KMT opponent, Mr. Lee Ya-chiao, by approximately 15,000 votes. Mr. Lee received 173,743 votes, while Chen received approximately 160,000 votes. However, during the counting of the votes on the evening of November 16, an unusual power outage occurred at a number of key polling stations in Tainan County, leading opposition politicians to suspect fraud.

Outspoken lawyer

Mr. Chen, age 35, is considered to be one of Taiwan’s most outspoken opposition lawyers. At the 1980 “Kaohsiung Incident” trial, he was the defense lawyer for Legislative Yuan-member and Formosa Magazine publisher Huang Hsin-chieh, then the major opposition leader, who subsequently received a 14-years’ prison sentence.

In 1981 Mr. Chen ran for a seat in Taipei City Council and was swept into office with the highest number of votes cast in his district. He recently resigned from this position after he and two other top-officials of Neo-Formosa Magazine -- banned or confiscated 51 out of 52 times during the past year by Taiwan’s “thought police” -- were sentenced to one year imprisonment in a government-inspired libel suit. An appeal is still pending.

He has also earned a high reputation as a human-rights lawyer: due to his persistent efforts, Mr. Chang Ming-ch’uan, a young soldier who was wrongly sentenced to death for murder, was finally found innocent by the Supreme Court.

Minor charges

The driver of the tractor, Chang Jung-ts’ai, was prosecuted by the Tainan District Court Prosecutor’s office on very minor charges (negligent behaviour resulting in injury). On December 2, 1985 when the first hearing took place in Tainan District Court, the court
room was jammed with people. Interestingly, several key witnesses at the scene of the accident did not appear in court to testify. One opposition legislator in Taiwan pointed out that the indictment sounded more like a statement. Several questions and pieces of evidence Shui-pien were either ignored or left out that the defense lawyer presented by Mr. Chen unanswered by the prosecutor.

Prison Report

Wei T’ing-ch’ao: profile of a scholar-prisoner

Mr. Wei T’ing-ch’ao -- nicknamed “the saint” by his friends -- is well-known for his gentle and tolerant nature. Even his jailers admire him for his ability to maintain peace of mind in a very dismal environment. But ironically, Mr. Wei has been in and out of prison three times on political charges. Mr. Wei’s two young children, an eight-year-old son and a six-year-old daughter (who was born a month after her father’s arrest in December 1979), have to wait until May 1987 to welcome their father home. By the time he is released, the former editor of Formosa Magazine will have spent a total of more than 16 years in jail.

After his latest arrest -- following the December 1979 “Kaohsiung Incident” -- Mr. Wei was sentenced to six years in prison. In July 1984 he was granted parole after four and a half years in prison, but he was not allowed to go home: the Taiwan Garrison Command transferred him to another prison to serve another two years and 10 months -- the remainder of an earlier sentence, which was commuted in 1975, when a clemency was granted on the occasion of the late president Chiang Kai-shek’s death.

Mr. WEI T’ing-ch’ao

Mr. Wei’s troubles with Taiwan authorities began in 1964, when he -- together with professor Peng Ming-min and a fellow law-student, Hsieh Tsung-min -- drafted a declaration that called on the ruling Kuomintang Party to abandon the fiction that it ruled all of China, and to establish a democratic government on Taiwan. Professor Peng was then chairman of the department of political science of National Taiwan University, and an internationally known law scholar.
Mr. Hsieh Tsung-min was Wei’s classmate at the law department of the University. During the printing of the declaration, an informant betrayed them to the police. They were immediately arrested and put in prison.

During investigation sessions at the Taiwan Garrison Command, Mr. Wei was treated to non-stop interrogation under a glaring light in order to obtain his confession. He lost several teeth as a result of beatings.

At the time of his arrest, Mr. Wei had a promising career working as a historian at the prestigious Academy Sinica in Taipei, the highest academic research institute in Taiwan. He was respected and admired by his colleagues and superiors for his dedication to his scholarly work. After receiving his law degree from National Taiwan University, he held positions at the Ministry of Economic Affairs, and later at the Ministry of Defense as a research scholar in the military intelligence section.

The trial took place in March 1965. Prof. Peng’s international reputation compelled Taiwan authorities to hold a relatively open military trial. The judicial process was swift, nevertheless. The final verdict was handed down after only one session. Mr. Wei received a sentence of 8 years imprisonment, Prof. Peng 8 years and Mr. Hsieh 10 years.

In 1969, Mr. Wei was released after his sentence was commuted on the occasion of the commemoration of Dr. Sun Yat-sen’s 100th birthday. Mr. Hsieh was released later in 1969. Prof. Peng was released from prison in 1966 and put under house arrest, but was able to flee Taiwan at the end of 1969.

Mr. Wei enjoyed only a brief period of freedom: in the early morning of February 24, 1971, he was arrested together with Hsieh Tsung-min on false charges of involvement in the bombing of United States Information Offices in Taipei and Tainan. His house was ransacked and turned upside down. Even music notes were seized by security agents as “secret codes.”

Mr. Li Ao, another well-known writer who was critical of the KMT authorities, was later arrested on similar charges. The investigation dragged on for more than four years because the authorities were unable to present convincing evidence to support their cooked-up charges. The final verdict was handed down in September 1975. Mr. Wei received a sentence of eight-and-a-half years in prison, but was soon released under a clemency on the occasion of the late president Chiang Kai-shek’s death.
In October 1977, Mr. Wei married Chang Ching-hui, a school teacher. The next year they had a son. In August 1979, he joined Formosa Magazine as an editor. He was at Kaohsiung when Formosa organized the well-known December 10, 1979 celebration to commemorate International Human Rights Day. He was there to report on the speeches to be delivered by several prominent opposition politicians.

Instead, he became a witness to a turmoil when the police attempted to disperse the peaceful gathering by driving into the crowd and releasing tear gas, causing a stampede in which several policemen and a number of demonstrators were injured. Mr. Wei was arrested and sentenced to 6 years in prison for “wearing a tri-colored flowered sash, carrying a torch, and shouting slogans” at the Kaohsiung meeting [literal text of the indictment].

Mr. Wei first went to prison at the age of 29. When he leaves prison in 1987, he will be 51 years old. He is a dedicated journalist, scholar and a talented linguist -- he has excellent command of three languages, English, Japanese and Chinese. Nevertheless, he spent the best of his adult years in prison for expressing his political views. The KMT authorities would do themselves a favor by releasing Mr. Wei immediately.

Postscript: After treatment at the Tri-Services military hospital, Wei T’ing-ch’ao is now able to use his left hand again. In May 1985, he complained about difficulty in moving the fingers of his left hand. Mr. Wei is being held in the Chingmei Detention Center of the Taiwan Garrison Command on the outskirts of Taipei. He works in the laundry department.

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

**Theologian Lin Hung-hsuan released on medical bail**

In the beginning of October 1985, it was reported in Taiwan that theologian Lin Hung-hsuan was suffering from a thyroid tumor. Mr. Lin’s wife learned this during a visit to the Green Island Prison on September 25. According to the medical clinic, at the Green Island prison, Mr. Lin suffered from an enlarged thyroid gland, and had two lumps in his neck, which gave him considerable pain. Mr. Lin also suffered from pains in his spinal chord, which disrupted his sleep. A high blood pressure condition had been stabilized following medication. Mr. Lin himself had appealed for release on medical bail, but this was rejected.
Mr. Lin had been in solitary confinement since he was transferred to Green Island in November 1984. The prison authorities only allowed Lin’s family to see him via a television screen. Mr. Lin repeatedly requested a face to face meeting with his wife, but this was also rejected.

On October 15, 1985, Mr. Lin was sent to the Army Hospital in Hualien, where he initially received a blood test and other medical examinations. However, he was not given any medical treatment or further examination until the end of November.

On November 4, Mr. Lin was visited by his wife Li-cheng and his brother Sinlam, who is a medical doctor. The hospital refused to reveal the results of the medical examination to Sinlam and Licheng. Sinlam wanted to review Lin’s medical records, but he was not permitted to do so. Lin complained that he had not been allowed any outdoor activities, which he enjoyed once a day before his transfer to the hospital.

On November 22, Lin’s sister Helen visited him. His situation remained the same: no treatment, no further examinations, no outdoor activities. Helen applied for Lin to be transferred to the Tri-services Military Hospital in Taipei or the Veterans Hospital, since the Army Hospital at Hualien was not equipped to treat thyroid tumor that Lin suffered.

On November 29 Mr. Lin was transferred to the Tri-services Military Hospital in Taipei. There a biopsy of his thyroid nodule was taken, which showed that he had cancer. However, it wasn’t until December 21 -- after considerable international pressure had been applied -- that Mr. Lin was released on medical bail and was transferred to the hospital of Taiwan National University in Taipei. On December 27, he underwent surgery, which -- according to the first reports -- was successful.

**An old prisoner’s story**

It was reported recently in Taiwan that for the past ten years the Kuomintang authorities have been holding an old mainlander imprisoned for allegedly having joined the Communist Party when he was a local government official in Hunan before the Communist take-over in 1949. Mr. **KAO Chih-li**, now 83-years old, escaped to Hong Kong in 1950 after the Communists arrested and imprisoned his father, who later died in prison.

In 1962 Mr. Kao came to Taiwan through the help of some friends from his hometown. For several years he lived on the charity of his friends, because his meager income from
the sale of paintings was insufficient to sustain him. In 1970 he was no longer able to earn an income because of his declining health, and he moved into a nursing home.

In 1975 an informant reported to the Investigation Bureau of the Ministry of Justice that Mr. Kao had “joined the Communist party” when he was on the mainland. He was taken to the local Investigation Bureau office for interrogation. He denied the charges and produced evidence that he and his family had actually been persecuted by the Communists.

However, at the age of 73 he was sentenced to 12 years imprisonment. From 1976-79 he was held in Chingmei Detention Center. In 1979 he was transferred to Green Island, where he developed heart problems, high blood pressure and arthritis due to the damp and dismal prison conditions.

In March 1985, at the age of 83, he was brought to Jen Ai Detention Center, where he is required to attend re-education classes six hours a day, and has to participate in all other activities.

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

Freedom of the Press?

Censorship in 1985: It was a very bad year

If the year 1984 had an Orwellian ring to it for the opposition press in Taiwan, 1985 was even worse: during the first four months of the year -- while the authorities were busy containing the damage caused by the murder of Henry Liu in the United States and the Tenth Credit Union bank scandal -- confiscation and banning ran at an average of “only” 70 percent. However, in the beginning of May the “Chung Hsing” campaign went into full swing, and more than 1,000 plain-cloth and uniformed policemen systematically raided printing shops, distribution points, and newsstands to confiscate magazines.

During the period May through September the authorities banned or confiscated -- on the average -- 90 percent of the opposition publications. Of some magazines, such as Neo-Formosa Taiwan Weekly, and Progress, every issue was confiscated or banned. By the beginning of September most magazines were in serious financial difficulties, and one after the other they were forced to suspend their operations. Only three weekly magazines (The Eighties, New Route, and Min Chu Tien Ti, and one monthly, CARE, survived. These magazines continued to be subjected to frequent confiscations:
during the crucial period before the November elections, hardly any opposition magazines were available on the newsstands.

During the first three quarters of 1985 Taiwan Communiqué counted approximately 230 bannings, confiscations, and suspensions of opposition magazines in Taiwan, an 87% increase over the same period in 1984. The total censorship figure for 1984 (188 actions) was already a fivefold increase over the preceding year.

A total figure for 1985 is difficult to give at this time. We presently estimate it to be 260, but we may have to revise this figure as more information comes in. Also, this figure gives an incomplete picture, since during the last three months of the year there were only a few magazines remaining. The resulting statistics thus understate the intensity of the censorship campaign.

**PROGRESS officials sentenced by High Court**

On December 10, 1985, the Taiwan High Court in Taipei handed down the final verdict in the libel suit against Progress Time, which was brought against the magazine by former Kaohsiung mayor Wang Yu-yun. Ms. YANG Tsu-chun, director of the magazine, and Mr. TSAI Jen-chien, publisher of Progress Time, were both sentenced to six months imprisonment. However, they may not have to serve the prison term: for sentences of six months or less a fine can be paid instead. A third magazine official, editor Chen Yu-hsin, was acquitted.

Ms. Yang is a well-known member of the opposition. In the December 1983 elections she ran for a seat in the Legislative Yuan. She is the wife of Mr. LIN Cheng-chieh, an outspoken tangwai-member of the Taipei City Council, who was recently re-elected to his position in the Council.

Former Kaohsiung mayor Wang Yu-yun is an ardent supporter of the Kuomintang, who is generally known for his corruption and for his close connections with organized crime in Kaohsiung. He filed charges against Progress Time after the magazine published an article about Mr. Wang’s unsavory connections in February 1984. In January 1985 the Taipei District Court sentenced the three top executives of the magazine to eight months imprisonment. However, they appealed.

Interestingly, while the appeal was being studied by the High Court, Mr. Wang Yu-yun himself offered to drop the charges, “for the sake of social stability.” However, the High Court prosecutor insisted on continuing the case.
Articles and Publications

Asia Resource Center: “Martial law in Taiwan”

At the end of 1985 an excellent new publication came out in the United States, titled “Martial law in Taiwan.” This 48-page booklet was published jointly by the Washington-based Asia Resource Center and the New York-based Formosa Association for Human Rights. It was written by two well-known East- and Southeast Asia specialists, Don Luce and Roger Rumpf, and presents valuable detailed information about martial law in Taiwan and its disastrous effects on human rights and democracy on the island. The publication costs $5.-- a copy (reduced prices available for larger orders). Orders can be sent to: Asia Resource Center, P.O. Box 15275, Washington, D.C. 20003, U.S.A.

Notes

Asian Development Bank: what’s in a name?

On November 28, 1985 the Asian Development Bank’s headquarters in Manila announced that it expected the PRC to become a member of the ADB, while Taiwan would continue as a full member but would be referred to as “Taipei, China.” The announcement reflected an agreement which had apparently been reached by the ADB and the PRC.

It was not clear at the time of this writing whether the authorities in Taipei would accept the name change in order to remain in the ADB. Until now they have stubbornly clung to the name “Republic of China”, reflecting their ludicrous claim to be the government of all of China. However, since the ADB was founded in 1966 -- long after the KMT had left China -- the contributions and voting power were calculated as representing Taiwan.
In the middle of December, some 40 members of the Legislative Yuan in Taiwan urged the Kuomintang authorities to be flexible and not to leave the ADB. On December 30, 1985 Taiwan’s Foreign Minister Chu Fu-sung stated in a press conference in Taipei that they might “accept equal status with Peking” in the ADB, saying that “Chinese -- Taipei” and “Chinese -- Peking” should be the respective titles.

Taiwan Communiqué comment: while the admission of the most populous nation to the ADB is to be welcomed, and while it is also to be applauded that an arrangement has been found whereby Taiwan can remain a full member of the ADB, we believe that the names proposed by both sides are rather ridiculous. Wouldn’t it be most simple and logical if the international community refer to Taiwan as “Taiwan”?

### Aborigines want to keep their own name

In October 1985, twelve young leaders from Taiwan’s two major aboriginal tribes staged a one-day hunger strike to protest the KMT authorities’ practice of arbitrarily replacing their aboriginal names with Chinese surnames. They demanded that they be given back their original ancestral names. The protest was held in front of a monument in central Taiwan on the 55th anniversary of an uprising by the aborigines against Japanese colonial repression.

Mr. Lin Wen-cheng, a member of Pai-wan tribe, pointed out that for the past four decades, the aborigines have been given Chinese surnames when they apply to the Census Bureau for their identification card. Every citizen of Taiwan is required to carry such an I.D. card. In aboriginal areas, the Census Bureau assigns the first 50 applicants a given Chinese name, for instance, “Lin”; the next 50 applicants “Chang”, etc. Members of the same family often are assigned different Chinese surnames. Aborigines who migrated away from their ancestral home and settled in urban areas thus sometimes marry their own relatives unknowingly.

### And now…A “Language Law”?

The Ministry of Education in Taipei announced on October 26, 1985 that it was in the process of drafting a language law, which would require that only Mandarin -- the Peking dialect which the mainlanders brought over from China after 1945 -- be spoken at public occasions, such as public meetings, public speeches, when performing official duties and conversations taking place in public places. Violators would receive a
warning the first time, but would be fined an amount of between NT$3,000 (US$ 75) and NT$10,000 (US$ 250) for the second and subsequent “offenses.”

“Language” is a sensitive issue in Taiwan, because during the past three decades the ruling Kuomintang has pursued a policy of promoting Mandarin as “the official language”, and suppressed the use of the Taiwanese languages. For the majority of the people on Taiwan, Mandarin is a foreign language: some 72 percent of the people speak Taiwanese (“Min-nan”), while approximately 12 % speak Hakka.

The announcement set off a storm of protests from the public. Many scholars and politicians expressed fear that the new measure would deepen the divisions between the Taiwanese and the mainlanders. Some people raised the tongue-in-cheek question if the language law would be applied to government officials too, as many of them still speak their own mainland provincial dialects. Particularly Premier Yu Kuo-hwa’s high-pitched Chekiang dialect has so baffled legislators during interpellations, that few were able to understand his answers. Mrs. Hsu Jung-shu, a tangwai legislator, once asked the Premier to bring an interpreter along during interpellations.

The language law was mainly targeted at two groups of people -- the tangwai opposition politicians and the Presbyterian Church. During election campaigns, tangwai candidates, deprived of the support of a party machine and media exposure, are able to attract large numbers of people to their campaign rallies by delivering speeches in Taiwanese. Requiring the tangwai candidates to speak Mandarin during election campaign would severely hamper them in their communication with the electorate.

The Presbyterian Church, the largest Christian denomination in Taiwan, has used the Taiwanese language in the preaching of the Gospel ever since it was established on the island more than a hundred years ago. The Church has taken a strong stance on human rights and democracy, which has brought it into conflict with the authorities. In June 1983, the Taiwan authorities attempted to introduce a “Law to Protect Religion”, which was aimed at restricting the activities of the Church, including the use of Taiwanese language in evangelization. The law was retracted after strong protests from Church and human rights organization at home and abroad. Critics believe that “the language law” is the old “religious law” in disguise.

At the end of December 1985, Prime-Minister Yu Kuo-hwa announced that the “Language Law” proposal would be withdrawn.
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