



Published by:

International Committee for Human Rights in Taiwan

Europe : P.O. Box 91542, 2509 EC THE HAGUE, The Netherlands

Canada : P.O. Box 487, Station "A", VANCOUVER, B.C., V6C 2N3

U.S.A. : P.O. Box 45205, SEATTLE, Washington 98105-0205

: P.O. Box 15275, WASHINGTON, DC 20003-5275

International edition, May 1988

Published 6 times a year

ISSN number: 1027-3999

34

The DPP debates Taiwan's future

“China does not have sovereignty over Taiwan”

On 16-17 April 1988, the opposition DPP-party held a special Convention in the southern city of Kaohsiung to discuss Taiwan's future. This in itself was an extraordinary move, because the ruling Kuomintang has until recently not allowed any discussion on the future of the island.

The DPP-Convention was convened after strong demands from within the party that a clause on “the freedom to advocate independence” be incorporated in the party's platform. These demands were prompted by the arrest and sentencing of two prominent opposition figures on charges of advocating independence. Reverend Ts'ai Yu-ch'uan and Mr. Hsu Tsao-teh were arrested in October 1987 and sentenced in January 1988 to respectively 11 and 10 years imprisonment (see Taiwan Communiqué no.'s 32 and 33).

The end-result of the DPP-Convention was a resolution reiterating Taiwan's independent status internationally, and emphasizing that Communist China does not have any sovereignty over Taiwan. The DPP thus underlined its adherence to the cause of independence in general, but skirted the question of direct advocacy of independence. It defined four conditions under which the DPP would formally call for independence: 1) if the KMT negotiates with the Communists, 2) if the KMT sells out the interests of the people of Taiwan, 3) if China attempts to take over Taiwan by force, or 4) if the KMT fails to implement genuine political reform.



DPP-Chairman Yao Chia-wen
Diplomatic skills

A Heated Debate

The Kuomintang authorities in Taipei still cling tightly to the idea that they are the legitimate government of all of China, and consider Taiwan a “province” of this China. They hold that the status quo should be preserved until mainland China can be “recovered.” In order to maintain their claim to legitimacy as government of China they have strongly suppressed the Taiwan independence movement.

However, an increasing number of native Taiwanese — who constitute 85 % of the island’s population — favor formal independence, and argue that Taiwan is already a de facto independent country. They feel that the outdated and unrealistic Kuomintang claims have driven Taiwan into deep international isolation, and are of the opinion that a free and democratic Taiwan would be able to live in peace with all its neighbours. They urge that Taiwan rejoin international organizations and re-establish diplomatic relations with other countries, thus preventing Taiwan from sliding further into diplomatic isolation.

The driving force behind the proposed “freedom to advocate independence” clause at the DPP-Convention was the New Movement group headed by deputy Secretary-General Chiu Yi-jen. They argued that the principle of freedom of expression includes the freedom to advocate independence and that the DPP should express its support of the two imprisoned independence advocates by formally incorporating such a clause into the Party’s platform.

The New Movement members also considered it essential to push this issue now, and debate it freely and openly, in order to guarantee Taiwan’s survival as an independent entity in the international arena. They said they don’t want to be faced by a fait accompli, like the people in Hong Kong, whose future was determined in secret negotiations between Peking and London.

Those favoring a more cautious approach urged that the DPP focus on immediate issues such as democratization first, and turn to the question of the international status of Taiwan at a later time. They feared a formal endorsement — at this time — of the right to advocate independence could lead to a confrontation with the Kuomintang and could provoke the ruling KMT to reverse the course of democratic reforms. This group included legislator Hsu Jung-shu, her husband Chang Chun-hung and former opposition leader Huang Hsin-chieh. The latter two are former political prisoners, who were released in May 1987. They argued that it was premature to include “the freedom to advocate independence” into the party’s charter, and that the party’s immediate goal

should be to bring about democratic reform by pushing for national elections for all seats in the parliament.

Interestingly, the proposed clause had the support of the majority of the DPP-party members: an opinion poll conducted just before the convention by the DPP's Center for Policy Research, showed that 61 % of the party members were in favor of the proposed clause, 35 % against, and the remainder no opinion or abstaining.

However, the KMT authorities threatened to take legal action against the DPP if the "freedom to advocate independence" clause were adopted into the charter. The authorities stated that this clause violated the national policy of "mainland recovery", and its adoption would be punishable under the National Security Law, which replaced the martial law lifted in July 1987.

The difficult task of attempting to reconcile the two opposing camps within the DPP — and of keeping the Kuomintang at bay at the same time — fell to DPP-party chairman Yao Chia-wen. Before and during the Convention he spent long hours negotiating with the different factions in search of a compromise. The positive end-result (see below) was to a large part the result of his diplomatic skills.

Mr. Yao's keynote speech on the first day of the Convention, presented to 186 delegates, touched on the heart of the matter: Any decision on the future of Taiwan, Mr. Yao said, should be based on the reality that Taiwan is an independent entity, outside the jurisdiction of the People's Republic of China. The sovereignty of Taiwan belongs to the people of Taiwan, he added, any change on Taiwan's international status must be decided in a referendum by the people of Taiwan.

Mr. Yao also referred to the San Francisco Peace Treaty of 1951 and the Sino-Japanese Peace Treaty of 1952, when Japan formally gave up its sovereignty over Taiwan. Those treaties left the sovereignty over the island undecided, "to be determined in due course, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations" (a clear reference to the principle of self-determination, which is enshrined in Article 1.2 of the UN-Charter — Ed.).

On the second day of the Convention, legislator K'ang Ning-hsiang presented a draft resolution on the future of Taiwan to replace the proposed clause. After more than five hours of intensive, sometimes heated debate, Mr. Kang's proposal was revised to include Article 2, which states the four conditions under which DPP will actively seek formal independence. The revision was proposed by lawyer Chen Shui-pien.

Resolution underlines independence

In the end, the DPP-Convention adopted a five-point resolution. It first reiterated in a Preamble that, although there existed disagreement on the inclusion of a clause on the freedom to advocate independence in the Party's platform, there was agreement on the proposed clause as a principle of freedom of speech. The Preamble also referred to the example of Hong Kong, where the people do not have a say in their own future, and to the above mentioned Treaties. The Preamble the continued:

"... the sovereignty over Taiwan does not belong to any country. It is naturally independent from the "People's Republic of China." Whether in the future Taiwan will maintain an independent international status, or reunite with China and become part of China should be decided by the people of Taiwan in a process of self-determination."

The Resolution then continued with its operative section. Below you find the text of this operative part in full:

1. The DPP-party reiterates that Taiwan is a sovereign, independent entity. Its sovereignty does not belong to the "People's Republic of China" with its capital in Peking. Any changes of Taiwan's international status must be decided in a referendum by all the residents of Taiwan.
2. The DPP-party will actively seek formal independence if the KMT negotiates with the Communists, if the KMT sells out the interests of the people of Taiwan, if China attempts to take over Taiwan, or if the KMT fails to implement genuine political reform.
3. The DPP-party wants to give notice to the Taiwan authorities and to the major world powers that the nineteen million people of Taiwan have the right to decide their own future. "Taiwan" is not simply a geographical term in the Pacific region, nor is it just a strategic island in the confrontation of naval and land forces. Taiwan shall never be seized and divided by any foreign power or any political party. No one can treat Taiwan as their own possession, or claim themselves to be its mother-country or spokesman. The DPP-party urges the major powers, especially the United States and Japan, not to treat Taiwan as a mere chip in the global strategic game. Taiwan's future should not be used as a bargaining chip to pacify China in order to counter the influence of the Soviet Union. The major powers should establish political and diplomatic relations with Taiwan and request all other

countries to respect the right of Taiwan to participate as a full member in the international community.

4. The DPP-party requests that the ruling authorities face reality and swiftly make comprehensive adjustments of the political and legal structure, in order to normalize the country's polity.
5. The DPP-party shall hold public meetings to discuss the international status of Taiwan and the different solutions to the future of the island with the Taiwanese people. Also, special committees shall be formed to conduct intensive study on the original proposal and the various solutions on the future of Taiwan and submit a report with specific recommendations.

Taiwan Communiqué comment: *the debate at the Convention was thus not so much about whether to embrace the cause of Taiwan independence, but about the speed with which the DPP should move towards a formal endorsement of independence.*

Skeletons rolling out of the closet

The English language has a fascinating expression: “to have a skeleton in one’s closet,” meaning that a person or organization has a hidden secret, the revelation of which would be rather embarrassing. According to a recent Newsweek article (“Political archeology”, April 11, 1988), the Kuomintang “has more than most.” The Newsweek article continued:

“Throughout the long rule of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and his late son, Chiang Ching-kuo, more than half a century’s worth of family scandals and skulduggery was routinely suppressed, thanks to a muzzled press and the regime’s tendency to jail its detractors.”

However, during the past three months, a number of these skeletons have rolled out of the Kuomintang’s closet, and the surprising thing is that some of the skeletons are still alive. Below we discuss the most important ones:

General Sun Li-jen's house arrest ended

General Sun Li-jen, age 89, has been under house arrest for the past 33 years on charges of “plotting a coup” against Chiang Kai-shek in 1955. On 25 February 1988, he finally broke his silence and denied the charges in an interview with the Independence Evening Post. “I want to see justice done and my name cleared,” General Sun was quoted saying.

The interview triggered a wave of press probes into the events that led to his fall from grace in 1955. Even the normally staid pro-KMT newspapers joined the fray in order to boost their circulation.

The most startling revelation was the publication of a petition to President Chiang Ching-kuo, written in 1983 by a former subordinate of General Sun, Major Kuo Ting-liang in which he recounted how he was tortured, and forced by the former chief of Military Intelligence Bureau, General Mao Jen-feng, to implicate General Sun by fabricating a story that he was a communist spy and he “plotted a coup.” Major Kuo, who was sentenced to life imprisonment, was promised an eventual pardon. But the sudden death of General Mao in October 1955 left Major Kuo incarcerated on Green Island, where he is still under house arrest at the present time. Major Kuo's 1983 petition was never acted upon by the former President.

At the time of the supposed coup attempt, General Sun — who earned international fame as a World War II hero, particularly at the Burma theatre — was the commander of the army and personal chief of staff of President Chiang Kai-shek. Chiang apparently feared Sun's popularity and envied his good relations with the American military. Already in the early 1950's, the U.S. military top reportedly lost its confidence in Chiang, and General MacArthur wanted the U.S.- educated Sun Li-jen (Purdue University and the Virginia Military Institute) to replace him. For an authoritative earlier account of the Sun case, see George H. Kerr, “Formosa Betrayed,” pp. 425 & 448.



General Sun Li-jen

The Journalist, a well-respected news magazine based in Taipei, disclosed in an extensive piece of investigative reporting in its April 4-10, 1988 issue that General Sun's downfall was expedited by his opposition to attempts by Chiang Ching-kuo —

who was then head of a military academy — to consolidate his power base by expanding his influence in the military intelligence network.

In the beginning of March 1988, General Sun's children wrote to DPP legislators for help to clear their father's name and to bring an end to the house arrest. The legislators and DPP Control Yuan member Ms. Lin Chun-tzu started interpellations about the case and urged the release of a 1955 Control Yuan report which cleared Sun. The report had concluded that the "coup attempt" was in fact a petition for military reforms, which Sun's subordinates intended to submit to Chiang Kai-shek on 6 June 1955. The report was never published.

At first Defense Minister Cheng Wei-yuan and even Premier Yu Kuo-hwa denied that Sun was under house arrest, but several opposition members who tried to visit the general were turned away by military guards. Then, on 20 March 1988, Defense Minister Cheng Wei-yuan suddenly turned up at General Sun's residence in Taichung, and told him that his house arrest was being ended. Still, it wasn't until 2 May 1988 that the military guards were withdrawn and replaced by four guards from a private security agency.

Lei Chen's Family Wants Rehabilitation

The publicity surrounding General's Sun rehabilitation prompted the 86-years' old widow of another well-known former political prisoner, Mr. Lei Chen to ask the Control Yuan to launch a new investigation in the arrest and sentencing of her husband in 1960. She asked the Control Yuan to also clear her late husband's name.

In the late 1950's, Mr. Lei Chen, a prominent mainlander within the Kuomintang's political hierarchy, had become disenchanted with the one-party dictatorship of Chiang Kai-shek, and had started to publish the Free China Fortnightly which advocated democratization and the foundation of an opposition party. This was not to Chiang Kai-shek's liking, and in 1960, Mr. Lei was arrested and sentenced to 10 years imprisonment. He was charged with "spreading propaganda for the communists and harboring a communist spy." This type of charges were until very recently used rather routinely by the Kuomintang authorities to bring down critics.



Mr. Lei Chen

Even after Lei was released in 1969, his movements were restricted. He was constantly followed by secret police agents, and his house was kept under permanent surveillance, with bright floodlights shining on it at night. Mr. Lei died on 7 March 1979.

On 13 April 1988, Mr. Lei's widow Sung Ying, who is a member of the Control Yuan herself, requested the Control Yuan to make public documents related to an investigation conducted by the Control Yuan in 1960, including the confession of the self-proclaimed communist, Liu Tzu-ying, whose secret testimony played a major role in implicating Mr. Lei. In addition, Mrs. Lei wanted the return of Mr. Lei's memoirs, which were written in prison but were confiscated by the prison authorities.

On 24 April 1988, the Control Yuan did agree to try to locate Lei's memoirs, but rejected Mrs. Lei's request for a new investigation of the case, using the pretext that the related documents were "missing." However, Mr. Lei's family did not relent, and on 6 May 1988, three of Mr. Lei's children, who had returned from the United States, held a press conference in Taipei and again asked for a retrial to clear their father's name.

“Sian Incident” general (more or less) free again

Another interesting historical case which has been hitting the headlines in Taipei during the past three months, is that of the “Young Marshall” Chang Hsueh-liang, now 89 years old, who kidnapped Chiang Kai-shek in the famed “Sian Incident” in 1936.

Disenchanted with Chiang's hesitation in fighting Japan's invasion of China, the Young Marshal kidnapped Chiang on 12 December 1936 and held him under house arrest in Sian in order to convince him to unite with Mao Tse-tung's Communists in fighting the Japanese. However, after machinations by Chiang's wife, Soong Mei-ling, Chiang Kai-shek was released on 25 December 1936, and the Young Marshal put under house arrest in Nanking. For a detailed account of the Sian Incident, see Sterling Seagrave, “The Soong Dynasty”, pp. 348-358.

In a public statement issued on 25 March 1988, the old general — who lives in the Taipei suburb of Peitou — said that his life is now “simple and tranquil” and that he and his wife are “content with tending flowers.” On 28 March, general Chang was received by President Lee Teng-hui, who — according to press reports in Taiwan — “engaged Chang in an intimate and profound discussion of the religious way of life.”

What is in a Name ?

On rejoining the Asian Development Bank and GATT

During the past few months the Kuomintang authorities in Taipei are displaying a new “flexibility” with regard to the membership in inter- national organizations. Until very recently the KMT’s representatives immediately left in a huff when any organization admitted the PRC. Now, however, they have finally come to the realization that this rigid attitude has led to Taiwan’s isolation and has contributed to an increasingly high international profile of the PRC.

Thus, when the Asian Development Bank met for its annual convention in Manila at the end of April 1988, the Kuomintang authorities sent a delegation. Taiwan had been a member of the ADB since its founding in 1966 under the name “Republic of China”, but it boycotted its meetings since 1986, when the ADB admitted the PRC as a member.

However, for the April 1988 meeting the ADB had stipulated that the Taiwan representatives could attend under the name “Taipei, China.” This had apparently been agreed by the PRC. This name was not to the liking of the delegation from Taiwan, which resorted to little silly gestures — such as placing a sign “under protest” next to the name- plate — to express its displeasure. Obviously the Taiwan delegation wished to continue to be represented under the name “Republic of China,” which would not be acceptable to the Peking authorities.

A similar exercise seems to be coming up with regard to the Geneva-based General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT): after the Taipei authorities learned that the PRC is making its case for admission as a full member of GATT, there was suddenly a flurry of activities in Taipei: discussions were held and a task force was set up to study ways in which Taiwan could rejoin GATT. As in the case of the ADB, Taiwan was a member of GATT under the name “Republic of China” when the organization was founded in 1948. However, it left in 1950, when the Communists came to power in Peking.

Taiwan Communiqué comment: Taiwan should indeed be a full member of international organizations such as GATT and the Asian Development Bank, but simply under its own name, “Taiwan.” Some international observers and commentators who also support Taiwan’s readmission (such as the Wall Street Journal in its editorials on this topic- “Rich China, Poor China”, WSJ, 28 March 1988; and “At GATT’s gate”, WSJ, 22-23 April 1988), overlook an essential aspect:

The major stumbling block in this whole matter is not just the rigid Peking position, but even more so the fact that the Kuomintang authorities still call themselves “Republic of China” and claim themselves to be the rightful government of all of China. Because of this rather unrealistic and outdated pretense, the international community continues to be faced with the dilemma of two competing claims (by the PRC and the so-called ROC) for one and the same seat in international organizations.

In order to avoid further diplomatic isolation, the Taipei authorities should let their claim to be the rulers of China dissolve, and focus instead on gaining a rightful place for Taiwan in the international community. In such a situation — when Taiwan has become fully democratic and indeed calls itself Taiwan — it would be much easier for international organizations such as GATT and the ADB to accept a de facto separate political entity as its member.

The KMT’s diplomatic make-believe

One method through which the Kuomintang is continuing to pursue its outdated policy of representing China is by inviting second-rank foreign politicians and dignitaries for “all-expenses-paid” trips to Taipei. Since they only have diplomatic ties to a handful of countries, such as some tiny island-states in the Pacific and Caribbean, a few Latin American dictatorships, and some South African homelands, this results in a motley stream of visitors. These visits are prominently displayed in Taipei’s pro-government press in order to create the impression that the authorities still have diplomatic ties with many countries. A few recent examples:

* on 12 April 1988, the Prime Minister of Fiji, Mr. Ratu Kamisese Mara, was received by President Lee Teng-hui, who stated that the ROC and Fiji should strengthen their ties despite a lack of diplomatic relations.

* on 20 April 1988, the commander of the Garrison Command in El Salvador, Mr. Rafael Humberto Larios Lopez, received the “Grand Cordon of the Order of Cloud and Banner” in Taipei for his contribution to promoting friendship and military cooperation between the ROC and El Salvador.

*On 3 May 1988, the Prime Minister of Swaziland, Mr. Sotsha Ernest Dlamini, was decorated in a special ceremony in Taipei with the “Order of the Brilliant Star with Special Grand Cordon” for his “ceaseless efforts to strengthen relations with the ROC.”

*On 6 May 1988, the president of the Guatemalan National Congress, Mr. Alfonso Alonso Brillas, also received the “Order of the Brilliant Star with Special Grand Cordon” for his “contribution to promoting friendship between the two countries.”

Within Taiwan there is increasing criticism of this game of diplomatic make-believe. In particular, the DPP-opposition is poking fun at the unending stream of gullible visitors, and are in a sense saying: “The emperor hath no clothes.”

However, there are also signs that the younger generation within the Kuomintang itself is moving (rather slowly, though) towards a new sense of realism: at the end of March 1988, Dr. Wei Yung, the Chairman of the Cabinet-level “Research, Development and Evaluation Commission” generated an interesting discussion with a proposal of “dual recognition”: Taipei should strive for simultaneous diplomatic relations of foreign countries with both Peking and Taipei.

Apparently, Mr. Wei Yung’s bosses considered the time not quite ripe yet for this idea: on 22 March 1988, Foreign Minister Ding Mou-shih dismissed it as a “hypothetical question”, while a few days later, Prime Minister Yu Kuo-hwa said that the idea was “just theoretical”, and that it had “nothing to do with official foreign policy.” However, a few days later, an opinion poll in the Taipei area showed that 54 % of the respondents were in favor of the proposal and only 14 % against, the rest presumably having no opinion (yet ?).

Uneasy ties with Washington

During the past few months, the unofficial ties between Taipei and Washington soured significantly, due to a number of developments. Below, we briefly discuss the most significant ones.

Disappearance of nuclear scientist has fall-out

On 8 March 1988, two DPP-legislators, Mrs. Wu Shu-chen and Mr. Yu Cheng-hsien, questioned Defense Minister Cheng Wei-yuan on reports that the military Chungshan Institute of Science and Technology was involved in the development of nuclear weapons. In particular, they wanted a clarification of the disappearance of the Institute’s deputy director, Mr. CHANG Hsien-yi, who was rumored to have been granted sanctuary in the United States after he supplied Washington with information on Taiwan’s programme to develop nuclear weapons.

The Defense Minister denied that Taipei was in any way involved in the development of nuclear weapons, a claim which was reiterated time and again during the following two weeks by a variety of government spokesmen. Meanwhile, the Taipei authorities and pro-government media heaped accusations upon the missing scientist, claiming that he was a “spy”, and that he had left Taiwan with the assistance of the American CIA.

However, the denials and accusations by Taipei suddenly fell silent when the New York Times reported on 23 March 1988 that the Taiwan authorities had halted work on a secret installation that was allegedly used to manufacture plutonium, a main ingredient in nuclear weapons.

Chickens and pigs running in the streets

When trade talks between the United States and the Taiwan authorities were held between 21 and 25 March 1988 in Taipei, the U.S. delegation ran into some unexpected opposition: chickens and pigs running in the streets. The animals had been let loose in the area around the American Institute in Taiwan by irate farmers, who were protesting the planned relaxation by the Taipei authorities of regulations restricting the import of U.S. turkeys and fruits. In contrast to the large-scale meat and fruit production industry in the United States, chicken-raising and fruit-farming in Taiwan is a small-scale business, involving thousands of family farms.

Even before the trade talks started, the Taiwan authorities seemed to be giving in to U.S. pressure to redress the existing trade imbalance between Taiwan and the U.S. by opening up Taiwan’s markets to agricultural imports from the United States. However, the chickens farmers prepared themselves: on 3 March 1988, they set up the Taiwan Farmers’ Rights Association and announced they would demonstrate against the dumping of U.S. products in Taiwan.

On 16 March 1988, some 3,000 farmers from around the island converged on Taipei. Accompanied by some 1,000 supporters and thousands of onlookers, the brown-faced, banner-waving farmers marched towards the offices of the American Institute in Taiwan, which was heavily guarded by police armed with clubs. A small delegation delivered a letter to AIT officials, demanding that the U.S. stop dumping fruit and turkey in Taiwan, “so that local farmers can have rice to eat.” After some further speeches, the gathering ended peacefully.

The atmosphere was significantly more tense a few days later, when on Monday, 21 March 1988, the farmers again headed for Taipei. Sensing that the Taipei authorities had already given in, the farmers brought along some 500 hundred live chickens, thousands of eggs, and some pigs. When they reached the AIT building, they let loose the animals in the heavy traffic — which came to a screeching halt — and pelted the building with the eggs.

An AIT official, Mr. Peter Chase, chief of the economic section, came out and accepted a petition. Satisfied that the AIT would convey the message to Washington, the protesters left for the offices of the Board of Foreign Trade, the organization responsible for the trade negotiations. When Mr. Vincent C. Siew, the Board's director, tried to address the crowd, he was pelted with eggs.

The March negotiations did not result in an agreement between Taipei and Washington. At the time this Taiwan Communiqué was going to press, we received reports of major confrontations between police and farmers following the 20 May 1988 farmers' demonstration. On page 22 you find our first report on that case.

The Henry Liu Murder Case Closed ?

In Taiwan Communiqués no. 18, 19, 20 and 22 we reported on the case of the murder of Henry Liu, a Chinese-American writer who was murdered on 15 October 1984 in his home in Daly City, a suburb of San Francisco. U.S. investigators discovered that the murder had been ordered by top-officials of the Military Intelligence Bureau in Taipei, and had been committed by three members of the Taiwan-based Bamboo Union gang. However, the gangsters were able to flee the United States and resurfaced in Taiwan.

In April 1985 — after strong pressure from the United States — a civil court in Taipei sentenced two of the three Bamboo Union gangsters, gangleader Chen Chi-li and gangmember Wu Tun, to life imprisonment. However, the Taipei authorities refused to extradite the two men to the United States to stand trial there, and refused U.S. investigators access to the three Military Intelligence Bureau officials involved in the case.

In April and May 1985, the trial against the three top Military Intelligence Bureau officials took place in military court. The MIB-director, vice-admiral Wang Hsi-ling, was sentenced to life imprisonment, while major-general Hu Yi-ming and colonel Chen Hu-nen each received sentences of two-and-a-half years for their involvement in planning the murders (the latter two were released in mid-1987).

Recently some new developments occurred in this case: on 8 March 1988, a trial started in Redwood City, California against the third Bamboo Union hitman, Mr. Tung Kueisen, age 35. Mr. Tung was arrested in Brazil in September 1985 at the request of the U.S. government and extradited to the United States. In 1986 he was convicted on heroin smuggling charges and sentenced to 20 years imprisonment. He was then moved to California, where he had to stand trial for his part in the Henry Liu murder.

During the trial in Redwood City, Mr. Tung testified that gangleader Chen Chi-li had told him that President Chiang Ching-kuo's son Chiang Hsiao-wu, presently a member of Taiwan's trade delegation to Singapore, had been the "big boss" behind the murder scheme, and had ordered the killing. At the time of the murder, Mr. Henry Liu had just completed a critical biography of President Chiang Ching-kuo. Chiang Jr. apparently wanted to forestall its publication. At that time, Chiang Jr. was executive secretary of Taiwan's National Security Council, a supervisory body which coordinates the approximately dozen different security agencies on the island.

On 16 March 1988, Mr. Tung was convicted for his role in the Henry Liu murder, and on 11 May he was sentenced to a prison term of "27 years to life."

The renewed indications of a possible involvement of Mr. Chiang Hsiao-wu prompted DPP-legislators Hsu Kuo-tai and Chu Kao-chen on 18 March to request that Mr. Chiang Jr. be recalled from Singapore for investigation and clarification of his role. They also demanded that the Foreign Minister, Defense Minister, and Justice Minister appear before the Legislative Yuan to testify on the allegation. However, the Kuomintang majority in the Legislative Yuan stonewalled the requests.

The failure by the Taiwan authorities to come to the bottom of this matter will thus remain a sore point in the relations between Taipei and the United States.

Prison Report

Supreme Court refers FPPA case back to the High Court

The case of Reverend Tsai Yu-chian and Mr. Hsu Tsao-teh — who were sentenced in January 1988 on charges of advocating Taiwan independence — took a new turn on 25 April 1988, when the Supreme Court ordered the Taiwan High Court to "review"

the case because of “flaws in the High Court procedures” (see also our report on the trial in Taiwan Communiqué no. 33, pp. 2-7). In particular the Supreme Court wanted to know whether Mr. Hsu Tsao-teh indeed refused to make his final statement (as was concluded in the High Court verdict), or that he was not able to make his final statement because of exhaustion and the refusal of the High Court judges to grant his request for medicine for his heart condition. At the time this issue of Taiwan Communiqué was going to press, we learned that a hearing was planned in the High Court on Saturday, May 28th, at 9:30 a.m.

Shih Ming-teh on hunger strike again

On 22 April 1988, Mr. Shih Ming-teh Taiwan’s most prominent opposition figure remaining imprisoned, started a hunger strike to protest the rejection by the Justice Ministry in Taipei of an application by Shih’s family for his medical bail. He vowed to continue his hunger strike indefinitely.

On 28 April, after a member of Taipei-based Taiwan Association for Human Rights was able to visit Mr. Shih in the Three Services Military Hospital, it was disclosed that Mr. Shih had not been taking solid food since 28 March 1986. For more than two years, he had been force-fed twice a day with liquid protein and vitamins. Since 22 April 1988, Mr. Shih has rejected the force-feeding and has taken only water. Mr. Shih is seriously ill as a result of the protracted long-term hunger strike. He suffers from high blood pressure, calcification of the arteries and problems involving spine, liver and kidneys.

In the beginning of May, Mr. Shih’s health condition was deteriorating rapidly. On May 7, a medical team from the hospital — assisted by eighteen (!) guards — forced Mr. Shih to take glucose and liquid nutrients. It was administered in the presence of Mr. Shih’s family and two members of the Taiwan Association for Human Rights, who reported that the force-feeding was against Mr. Shih’s will.

On 6 May 1988, supporters of Mr. Shih held a protest in front of the Legislative Yuan in Taipei to urge the Taiwan Authorities to release Mr. Shih. The “Committee to Rescue Shih Ming-teh” was formed on 6 May 1988 and held a large-scale demonstration on 12 May 1988 to appeal to the public to express its support for Mr. Shih’s release. Mr. Shih has been imprisoned since January 1980, when he was arrested for organizing a major human rights demonstration on 10 December 1979, in the southern city of Kaohsiung. The gathering ended in chaos after police used teargas to break up the gathering and pro-government instigators incited violence. The authorities later used

the incident as an excuse to arrest virtually all prominent opposition leaders. They were subsequently accused of “sedition” and sentenced to long prison terms. Mr. Shih is the only “Kaohsiung” prisoner who remains imprisoned. He has been adopted by Amnesty International as a prisoner of conscience.

Two Overseas Taiwanese arrested, and held Incommunicado

Around the beginning of this year, the Taipei authorities arrested two overseas Taiwanese from Latin America.

Mr. Chuang Kuo-ming, age 32, was arrested on 26 December 1987, three weeks after returning from Argentina, where he had been living for the past six years. The authorities accuse Mr. Chuang of being a member of the World United Formosans for Independence (WUFI), the major overseas Taiwanese organization working for Taiwan independence. The Kuomintang authorities accuse Mr. Chuang of involvement in the bomb attacks against two pro-government newspapers in Taipei in April 1983 — the United Daily News (owned by a member of the KMT’s Central Standing Committee) and the Central Daily News (owned by the KMT itself).. Mr. Chuang has been held incommunicado since his arrest. He was first interrogated by the Investigation Bureau and “confessed.” He was later turned over to the Prosecutor’s Office of the Taiwan High Court, where he retracted his confession, saying that he had been tortured.

In January 1988, another person was arrested and charged of being vaguely “connected” to the same case. His name is Huang Kuang-hsiung, age 47, a medical doctor who emigrated to Argentina in 1984. Huang returned to Taiwan on 7 December 1987 and was detained by the Investigation Bureau of the Ministry of Justice on 26 January 1988. Before emigrating to Argentina, Dr. Huang was active in politics: in 1980 he ran for a seat in the Legislative Yuan and in 1981 for a seat in the Taipei City Council. He lost both times.

In March 1988, there was strong concern in the opposition and the human rights community in Taiwan that the authorities were using the two arrested men from Argentina to “create” another plot, which was to be used to frame Dr. Chen Yong-hsing, a major human rights activist, who in 1987 served as chairman of the Taiwan Association for Human Rights. Dr. Chen, a psychiatrist, was the driving force behind

the campaign to commemorate the “February 28” incident of 1947, when Chiang Kai-shek’s troops murdered some 20,000 Taiwanese, after large-scale protests against corruption and repression by the Nationalist Chinese, who were just arriving from the mainland. Dr. Chen’s efforts to campaign to have February 28 declared a “National Peace Day” generated wide public interest and focused attention on the events following the 1947 Incident (see also the Far Eastern Economic Review, “Haunted by the past”, 10 March 1988).

Eight Political Prisoners Remain Imprisoned

On 22 April 1988 an amnesty was announced in Taipei in commemoration of the death of President Chiang Ching-kuo. Some 18 political prisoners and approximately 6,000 “common” detainees were released, while some 22,000 prisoners had their sentences reduced.

The amnesty fell short of a general amnesty: a number of well-known political prisoners remain imprisoned. Below we list the eight most important ones. Following that is a short description of several of the 18 political prisoners who were released. The full list is available upon request.

NAME	AGE FROM BIRTHDATE	SENTENCE & DATE OF ARREST, CHARGE & OTHER DATA.
<u>Persons whose sentences were reduced from life to 15 years.</u>		
1. SHIH Ming-teh	(施明德) 47 Kaohsiung	The only remaining prisoner from Kaohsiung Incident of December '79.
2. WANG Hsin-nan	(王幸男) 47 Tainan	Taiwanese businessman from the U.S. Arrested Jan. 1977. Accused of sending letter-bomb to then vice-president Hsieh Tung-min.

Sentence reduced to 2/3 of original or commuted sentence.

NAME	AGE FROM BIRTHDATE	SENTENCE & DATE OF ARREST. CHARGE & OTHER DATA.
3. LIN Jung-hsiao (林榮曉)	58 Pingtung	Life, Arrested Sept. 1978, Wu Tai-an case. Term reduced to 15 years in July 1987, further reduced to 10 years.
4. CHEN Kuo-hsun (陳國勳)	37 Ilan	12 Arrested May 1985, Charged with trading with China. Sentence reduced to 6 years in July 1987, further reduced to 4 years.
5. LIN Chia-t'ien (林家田)	38 Chiayi	10 Sentenced to 3 years reform. educ. in Jan. 1979. In March 1980 sentenced to 7 years for "propaganda for the communists." Sentence reduced to 3½ years in July 1987. Has to serve an additional 18 months (reduced to 9 months) for attempts to escape.
6. HSU Chao-hung (徐肇宏)	50 Miaoli	6 Businessman, arrested in March 1985 for attempting to form an opposition party, and for having a namecard with "Taiwan Democratic Party" on it. Term reduced to 4 years.
7. Shao Ts'ui-hua (邵翠華)	35 Shantung	10 Date of arrest not known. Term reduced to 5 years in July 1987, further reduced to three and a half years.
8. LIU Teh-chin (劉德金)	26 Kwantung	5 Arrested in July 1986. Term reduced to three years and four months.

Why They Were Arrested and Imprisoned

On the following pages we present a brief background-description of six of the eighteen political prisoners who were released on 22 April 1988.

Mr. Pai Ya-tsan's case has already been reported earlier in Taiwan Communiqué (issue no. 22, pp. 15-18, and issue no. 33, pp. 15-16). In 1975, he was sentenced to life imprisonment for distributing a campaign leaflet with questions addressed to the former President Chiang Ching-kuo, who was then prime minister.. Mr. Pai, a candidate in the election for Legislative Yuan, asked Mr. Chiang 29 questions, covering a wide range of topics, varying from his personal wealth to domestic and foreign policies. Such questions are commonplace today, but in the 1970s, raising such questions was considered seditious. Mr. Pai was held incommunicado, tried in camera and shipped to Green Island to spend the next 13 years of his life. The owner of a small printing shop in Taipei, where the campaign leaflets were printed, had to serve a 7-years' prison term.



DPP and human rights officials welcoming the released prisoners

Mr. Chang Hua-min, 62, a mainlander who came to Taiwan in 1949, was imprisoned twice for his writings and has spent 17 years in prison on charges of “making propaganda for the Communists.” Mr. Chang, a journalist, was first arrested in 1966, after he published articles criticizing the Kuomintang authorities for continuing the myth that they represented all of China. He was sentenced to eight years imprisonment. In 1979, he was sentenced to 10 years in prison after he published a book with an analysis of Chinese culture.

Mr. Cheng Chen-tung, 29, a mainlander, who defected to Taiwan from Kwangtung in a fishing boat in 1979 to seek freedom, was not welcomed as an “anti-communist hero.” Instead he ended up in the Green Island prison to serve a 14-years prison term.

When Mr.Cheng defected, he thought he had landed in the land of freedom, and was ready to begin a new life. However, eight months after his defection he was ordered by the military intelligence to go back to the mainland to work as a KMT undercover agent. He did, but soon his cover was blown, and he was arrested by the Communists. After a year in prison he was released, and made his way back to Tai wan. But the military intelligence insisted that he should return to the mainland again to carry on his assignment. After he refused the order to go back to China, he was arrested and was severely beaten during the interrogation. In 1981, he was sentenced to 14 years imprisonment on charges of being a “communist spy.”

Mr. Kuo Yueh-wen, a businessman from Hong Kong, came to Taiwan in 1977 on a sightseeing trip. He was arrested as soon as he got out of the airport, and was sentenced to life imprisonment on charges of being a “communist spy.” After his release, he told the Taipei-based magazine The Journalist: “I never knew why I was arrested. I came to Taiwan as a tourist, but the KMT authorities accused me of collecting intelligence.” Mr. Kuo thought he caught the attention of the secret police because he had traded with China. He was separated from his family in Hong Kong for more than 10 years.

General Ta Fei. In 1949, when Chiang Kai-shek retreated to Taiwan with his troops after losing the civil war to the Communists, General Ta opted to stay in China to fight a guerrilla war against the Communists. He was later arrested by the Communists and sentenced to life imprisonment. He spent many years working in a labor camp. In 1978, China repatriated a group of former Kuomintang generals, among whom Mr. Ta. However, when he returned to Taiwan, he was arrested and sentenced to 12 years imprisonment. The whereabouts of the other repatriated generals remains a mystery. There are unconfirmed reports that they were either executed or remain imprisoned.

Huang Shih-keng. Mr. Huang was imprisoned for a crime allegedly committed by his older brother, Huang Shih-tsung. The Taipei authorities have said that the older Huang was the chief suspect in a bombing of the offices of two pro-government newspapers, the United Daily News and the Central Daily News in 1983. The older brother had already returned to Latin America, but the younger brother was arrested and sentenced to 10 years in prison for “harboring a fugitive.”

Articles and Publications

Asia Watch reports on human rights in Taiwan

In 1985, the Fund for Free Expression, a U.S.-based human rights group, set up an “Asia” counterpart for its highly successful and influential “Helsinki Watch” and “Americas Watch” groups. Within a short time, **Asia Watch** had established itself as an effective and objective organization, with good links to the U.S. Congress.

In December 1987, Asia Watch published an excellent report on human rights in Taiwan during the period 1986-1987. A summary of the main conclusions of the report:

“For the past thirty-eight years, Taiwan has been ruled by an authoritarian government that has exercised pervasive control over the civil and political life of the island. While much of this rigidity remains in late 1987, the last two years have been extraordinarily significant for human rights in Taiwan, as the government has responded to opposition calls for democratic reform. Dozens of political prisoners have been released, an opposition political party has been formed, and the government has lifted martial law.

Despite these developments, Asia Watch finds that citizens of Taiwan are still deprived of internationally recognized civil and political rights, and calls for an end to:

- * restrictions of freedom of expression and association in the new National Security Law and other legislation;
- * censorship of opposition publications;
- * mistreatment of “common” criminals and suspects;
- * political interference in the judiciary;
- * restrictions on the rights of workers to organize and bargain collectively,

Asia Watch also calls upon the government to enact constitutional and electoral reforms that would ensure that the people of Taiwan have democratic control over the vital decisions that affect their future.”

The report is also highly critical of the Reagan Administration for its (lack of) policy. It states: “Unfortunately, the U.S. has not spoken forcefully enough on behalf of human rights and democratization” (P. 264). The report goes on to give a number of examples, such as the fact that the chairman of the AIT, Mr. David Dean, devoted only four out of 25 pages prepared testimony to Congress in May 1986 to questions relating to human rights and the lack of democracy.

The report also notes that the Department of State avoided obvious opportunities to express support for human rights and democratization: e.g., the Department did not comment publicly when the DPP was formed. However, when the KMT announced it was planning to “lift” martial law and simultaneously enact an undescribed “National Security Law”, the Reagan Administration — without waiting to see what the NSL would entail — was quick to hail this as a “heartening sign of the Taiwan authorities’ commitment to to political development and an improved human rights situation.” Asia Watch indicates that a more cautious statement was warranted, particularly in view of the restrictions subsequently imposed by the National Security Law. It chides the State Department for not even commenting on these restrictions.

The Asia Watch report concludes that “the failure of the Administration to promote human rights on Taiwan more vigorously is particularly unfortunate because both logic and experience demonstrate that there are few countries where the U.S. could play a more decisive role.”

The report is available at US\$ 12,— per copy from:

Asia Watch

36 West 44th Street, Suite 911

NEW YORK, NY 10036, U.S.A.

Farmers’ demonstration ends in confrontation with police

On Friday, 20 May 1988, a major demonstration by Taiwanese farmers against the agricultural policies of the Kuomintang authorities ended in chaos after riot troops attempted to disperse the crowds. More than 100 persons were injured during the afternoon and evening of 20 May, when riot troops fought demonstrators in a number of running battles. Eight persons were seriously hurt.

Some 96 persons were reportedly arrested. Among them, two well-known opposition figures and approximately 15 students who were trying to prevent a confrontation between police and farmers. The two arrested opposition figures are: Ms. Hsiao Yu-chen, who ran for a seat in the National Assembly in the 1986 elections; and Mr. Lin Chu-shui, the editor of the DPP-party’s Democratic Progressive News.

The demonstration -- attended by some 4,000 farmers -- started at Sun Yat Sen Memorial Hall in Taipei at around noontime. In the early afternoon the gathering proceeded peacefully and was in a festive mood, moving towards the Legislative Yuan to the music of Ravel's "Bolero." Many of the farmers obviously considered it almost a touristic "holiday trip" to the capital. They carried banners and placards, and issued a formal statement expressing the farmers' concerns about seven agricultural issues, ranging from a comprehensive insurance plan, prices of fertilizers and rice, the tight government control over farmers' unions, water utilization, and regulations concerning agricultural development and land registration.

At around 2:30 pm, after the crowd had arrived at the Legislative Yuan, the gathering suddenly and unexpectedly erupted into violence when the police "Thunderbolt Unit" arrested two demonstrators after a disagreement broke out over the use of the restrooms inside the Legislative Yuan building.

The crowd later moved towards the Central Headquarters of the Kuomintang Party, where they were stopped by some 600 riot police with barbed wire fences and water cannons. Later in the afternoon and during the evening the disorder spread through the center of the city. Confrontations occurred at the headquarters of the National Police Administration, the building of the Executive Yuan (Cabinet), and the Chen Chung police station on Chunghsiao West Road.

At around 11:00 p.m., one of Taiwan's most prominent human rights lawyers, Mr. Lee Sheng-hsiung -- who had not been present during the events of the afternoon and evening -- received a phone call that there was trouble at the Cheng-chung Police station. He went over to see if he could be of help in solving the problems. There, some five plainclothesmen surrounded lawyer Lee and started beating and kicking him. He pulled out his lawyer's identification, but to no avail. They continued beating and kicking him until he rolled outside. There the plainclothesmen called upon the uniformed police to beat Lee with their batons. Lee was finally able to make his way back to the relative safety of the crowd. He suffered numerous bruises and a cracked toe.

A major confrontation occurred just after midnight, when -- at around 1:35 a.m. -- more than 2,000 riot police, armed with shields and wooden clubs, charged into a crowd. More than 40 students attempted to prevent the confrontation by positioning themselves in a seated position on the ground between the police and the crowd, shouting "peace, peace". However, the riot police charged into them and beat them up, trampling and kicking them.

At around the same time, an **Independence Morning Post** reporter, Mr. Lu Tung-shi, was beaten severely by military police when he tried to cover the events near the Chengchung police station. He told the military police that he was a reporter, and showed his press card. The military commander turned around and said to his men: "drag him away." Immediately, he was surrounded by a group of military police, who began to beat him up. He had to be taken to the hospital, where a gaping wound on his forehead needed four stitches. His nose was broken.

A short time later, at around 3:00 a.m., DPP-legislator Chu Kao-cheng -- accompanied by a friend named Wu and a reporter from the **Independence Evening Post**, Ms. Lin Mei-na -- also visited the Chengchung police station. He observed that many injured demonstrators, were arrested and were taken into the station. When he tried to stop a policeman from kicking an injured demonstrator, who was being carried up the steps, the policeman slapped him in the face.

Then he was encircled by a group of policemen, who ganged up on him. Chu shouted: "I am a legislator." But the policemen retorted: "You are the one we want to beat up." They then systematically beat him with their batons and fists, and kicked him with their shoes. When the reporter shouted: "You can't beat a national legislator!", she was also pushed to the ground and hit repeatedly with police batons.

Between 4:00 and 6:00 a.m., one or more groups of up to 50 youths, armed with clubs and iron bars roamed the center of the city, destroying telephone booths and parking meters, and setting fire to several trucks. They also threw gasoline bombs at a post office, which fortunately did not catch fire. They disappeared when police arrived at the scene, only to re-appear somewhere else to start trouble there. At this moment, nothing is known about the background of these people.

Conclusions:

1. By all accounts, the demonstration started out peacefully and in a festive mood. There was no "intent" by the organizers to create trouble. The farmers wanted to express their concerns about a number of legitimate issues.
2. Violence erupted over the rather mundane issue of using the restrooms at the Legislative Yuan. The violence spread, and was intensified, because police used long sticks to beat the farmers and threw back stones and bricks at the crowd.
3. In the course of the evening, the police used indiscriminate and excessive force, beating everyone in sight -- even those not connected with the demonstration.

4. Several reporters, a prominent lawyer and a prominent legislator were singled out by the police for beatings.
5. Many of the wounded demonstrators who were arrested, were beaten and kicked severely after they had been taken into custody.
6. There are indications that certain confrontations and particular incidences of violence were possibly caused by instigators. Sources in Taiwan point to:
 - a. a small group of particularly violent “farmers”, who played a major role in inciting the conflict at the Legislative Yuan. They did not respond to pleas by the organizers of the demonstration to stop throwing stones;
 - b. a man named Men Chien-chiu, who rammed his car into a group of riot-police. He was arrested at the scene, but he was released almost immediately on NT\$30,000 bail, in contrast to many regular participants in the demonstration, who were arrested but not released.
7. It is likely that hard-liners within the Kuomintang are using the incident to attempt to slow down the process of democratic reform. In fact, three days after the incident a recommendation was made to President Lee Teng-hui to issue an emergency decree to suspend freedom of assembly. Fortunately, the recommendation was not accepted.

Notes

Blacklisting of overseas Taiwanese expanding

In the previous issue of Taiwan Communiqué we discussed the fact that the Taiwan authorities have barred many overseas Taiwanese from returning to Taiwan because of their support for human rights and democracy on the island (issue no. 33, p. 14). At that time, the unofficial representative of the Kuomintang authorities in Washington D.C. confirmed that a “reference list” with some 100 names existed.

The matter prompted DPP-legislators in Taipei to raise the issue in the Legislative Yuan. On 2 March 1988, Mrs. Hsu Jung-shu urged the Executive Yuan to end the blacklisting, and to allow all politically-active overseas Taiwanese to return home.

On 9 May 1988, the Executive Yuan issued a written response to the interpellations, denying again that a blacklist existed, but at the same time acknowledging that under the provisions of the National Security Law — passed in July 1987 to replace the 38-years’ old Martial Law — some 324 persons had been barred from entering Taiwan, and 417 people from leaving the island.

The DPP and the overseas Taiwanese can be expected to increase the pressure on this issue in the next few weeks: the “World Federation of Taiwanese Associations” — the worldwide umbrella organization for overseas Taiwanese — has planned its annual congress to be held in Taiwan in August this year, and many active overseas Taiwanese are planning to attend. Since its founding in 1974, the organization has always held its meetings on a rotating basis in cities in the United States, Canada, Japan and Europe. This will be the first meeting to be held in Taiwan itself.

In a related development, U.S. Congressman Stephen Solarz, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs in the U.S. House of Representatives, is investigating Taiwan’s barring of its overseas critics, and is planning to hold hearings on the progress in human rights and democratization in Taiwan.

In a personal note, Taiwan Communiqué may mention that its editors are now apparently blacklisted: on 25 April 1988, the unofficial representative in The Hague, the “Far East Trade Office,” informed Dr. Gerrit van der Wees and his Taiwanese wife Mei-chin that their visa application for a family visit to Taiwan had been rejected. Even after repeated requests, no reasons were given.

The rejection is highly surprising, because both in 1984 and in 1986 — when martial law was still in force — we traveled to Taiwan and had no problem whatsoever in obtaining a visa. We are almost tempted to conclude that the restrictions were less stringent under Martial Law than they are now, under the present-day National Security Law.

Military Officers Dismissed for Joining DPP

When Mr. Liu Shui-keng, a career army officer with the rank of lieutenant colonel, joined the opposition DPP in August 1987, he did not know that such a seemingly simple step would end in his dismissal from the army.

On 25 December 1987 Mr. Liu attended a demonstration, organized by the DPP, calling for national elections of all members of the legislature. A few weeks later, in January 1988, he was arrested and detained for 58 days on vague charges of “insubordination.” He was subsequently prosecuted, but the charges were dropped in the beginning of Marc — after DPP-legislators raised the issue with the Defense Minister and in the Legislative Yuan. However, a few days later — on 6 March 1988 — Mr. Liu was dismissed from the army.

Mr. Liu was not the only such case: on 1 February 1988 another military officer, Mr. Chen Yung-chang, a military judge with the rank of lieutenant, was forced to retire on trumped-up charges of “mental instability” after he was discovered to have had contacts with leading DPP members.

In his interpellation on the case of lieutenant colonel Liu Shui-keng, DPP-legislator Chu Kao-cheng urged the Kuomintang authorities to respect the basic rights of servicemen to freely choose their party affiliation. He also called on the ruling KMT to loosen its grip on the military, so that the military can become a politically neutral force, loyal to the nation, and not to the ruling party. He termed the Kuomintang’s tight control of the military a major obstacle on Taiwan’s road to democracy.

However, the Defense Ministry subsequently issued a statement to all military units, warning career officers and enlisted servicemen not to take part in “anti-government” demonstrations, saying that these persons would be charged for “insubordination.” On 25 March 1988, Defense Minister Cheng Wei-yuan reiterated in the Legislative Yuan that servicemen were “free” to join any political party, but could not take part in “anti-government” protests.

Taiwan Communiqué comment: *the difficulty is of course the definition of “anti-government.” The military authorities are likely to define any DPP-gathering as anti-government.*

The two cases highlight the tight control of the ruling Kuomintang over the military. In Stalinist tradition the Kuomintang has had “political commissars” in all military units. These commissars ensured the party’s control over the military. Throughout the past 38 years of martial law, the Kuomintang has required all military officers to join the KMT party, while there was heavy pressure on enlisted men to join. Those who did found it much easier to obtain favors and to move up to desirable positions. High-ranking military officials were rewarded with attractive “diplomatic” appointments overseas or with lucrative positions in state-controlled organizations and industries such as China Airlines.

Even within the Kuomintang party itself, there are a number of plush positions reserved for the military: in the upcoming 13th KMT party Congress to be held on 7 July 1988, some 131 out of 829 seats allocated to delegates from Taiwan, are reserved for the military.

The emergence of the DPP as an opposition party has been perceived by high military officials as a threat. DPP legislator Kan Ning-hsiang pointed out in a recent interpellation

tion that in military television programs on political indoctrination, the opposition DPP is portrayed as a “seditionary” organization on the same footing as the Communists.

Another example was reported in March 1988, by the *Independence Morning Post*: in a directive on military security issued in October 1987, Chief of Staff, General Ho Pei-tsun instructed that any currently-serving soldiers who join the DPP or appeal to the DPP for assistance, would be “severely punished according to the law.” Any activities by the DPP in the military would be considered “infiltration by the enemy,” and be “dealt with severely.”
