



# TAIWAN COMMUNIQUÉ

Published by:

*International Committee for Human Rights in Taiwan*

**Taiwan** : 2Fl., 27 Hang-chow South Rd. Sec. 1, TAIPEI, Taiwan

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

**Canada** : P.O. Box 67035, 2300 Yonge Street, TORONTO, Ont. M4P 1E0

**U.S.A.** : P.O. Box 15182, CHEVY CHASE, MD 20825

International edition, September 1994

Published 6 times a year

**62**

## Towards a new Taiwan

### *The “New Name, New Flag, New Anthem” debate*

During the past years, Taiwan has been gradually evolving into a new country. The clearest signs yet came this Spring, when the democratic opposition initiated its “New Name, New Flag, New Anthem” campaign.

The debate on a new name had been going on for a long time. The ruling Kuomintang has been holding on to its last threads of linkage with mainland China by clinging to the name “Republic of China on Taiwan”, while the democratic opposition of the DPP has pushed for a clear break with the muddy Chinese past, and has insisted on presenting Taiwan at home and internationally as a new and democratic identity, with the name “Taiwan.”

To this debate the democratic opposition has now added the elements which are generally viewed as the symbols of a national identity: a new flag and a new anthem: the flag depicted

here was selected after a wide competition in which 187 different flags were entered. The green symbolizes the natural beauty of the island and the need to protect the environment, the white represents the original purity of the people, and the desire to return to that. The symbol in the middle depicts four hearts in harmony, representing the four population groups on the is-



**New flag for Taiwan**

land — aborigines, Hakka, Min-nan, and mainlanders — who have to learn to live together in peace.

\* \* \* \* \*

## The Road to the United Nations

The movement for Taiwan to join the United Nations gained further momentum during the past few months. On 27 June 1994, the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Legislative Yuan in Taiwan adopted a DPP-sponsored resolution that Taiwan should seek international recognition under the simple and straightforward name “**Taiwan**”, and that this name and not “**Taipei**” should be used to represent the island abroad. However, Foreign Minister Fredrick Chien shortsightedly decided not to follow the recommendation of the Committee.

On the United States side, it was moved forward with passage in the US Senate of Senator Paul Simon’s resolution and, on 14 July 1994, a hearing in the House of Representatives which endorses UN membership for the island (see **Report from Washington**, pp. 21-23).

In mid-July 1994, there was also a replay of last year’s attempt by a number of African and Latin American nations allied with the Kuomintang authorities to have an item included on the agenda of the upcoming 49th meeting of the General Assembly. The agenda item would be titled “*Consideration of the exceptional situation of the Republic of China in Taiwan in the international context, based*



**Chinese guard at the UN: "Oh no, here come those (Taiwanese) moles again !!"**

*on the principle of universality and in accordance with the established model of parallel representation of divided countries at the United Nations."* This time twelve nations signed the letter, instead of the seven who did in 1993.

Still, the move did not get very far: in the beginning of August 1994 UN Secretary-General Boutros Boutros Ghali, undoubtedly under heavy pressure by the Communist Chinese in Peking, rejected the proposal.

During the past two months, several major newspapers in the United States also published articles and editorials in support of Taiwan's membership in the United Nations. A listing is given below. Last, but not least: several Taiwanese organizations organized symposia and meetings to urge American and international policymakers to support Taiwan membership in the UN.

## ***Major publications support Taiwan entry***

During the past two months, several major United States and European newspapers published articles and editorials in support of Taiwan's membership in the United Nations. Below we present a listing:

**New York Times**, 17 July 1994: "Look again at Taiwan", Editorial.

**International Herald Tribune**, 18 July 1994: "Taiwan deserves respect", Editorial.

**International Herald Tribune**, 18 July 1994: "The Taiwanese need help as they edge towards sovereignty", by Gerald Segal of the London Institute for Strategic Studies.

**Washington Post**, 15 August 1994: "Yes, Taiwan exists", Editorial.

**International Herald Tribune**, 16 August 1994: "Do Better by Taiwan," Editorial.

**Washington Times**, 23 August 1994: "UN recognition overdue for Taiwan", by Mr. Arnold Beichman of the Hoover Institution.

**Christian Science Monitor**, 25 August 1994: "Taiwan looks for a Seat in the House of Nations", by Lucia Mouat.

**International Herald Tribune**, 30 August 1994: "Policy towards Taiwan needs a Clinton redo", by former Assistant Secretary of State William Clark Jr., presently with the Center for Strategic and International Studies.

## ***Three meetings promote UN membership***

In mid-September 1994 several Taiwanese organizations organized meetings and symposia to coincide with the opening of the next session of the General Assembly of the UN. On 16 September, the Center for Taiwan International relations (CTIR) held a symposium titled ***“UN for Taiwan: Why, When, and How ?”*** Several opposition politicians from Taiwan joined a number of American politicians and scholars as well as a number of European, African and Latin American diplomats in calling for a new UN policy, which would allow Taiwan to join the UN as a new nation.

Several days later, on 20 September, the Washington-based Formosan Association for Public Affairs organized a Congressional Luncheon, titled ***“United Nations membership for Taiwan”***, which brought together the supporters of a new US policy in both the Senate and the House.

Finally, on 22 and 23 September 1994, a rally and conference under the DPP’s banner were held in New York, titled ***“Taiwan: International Actor or Bargaining Chip ? Taiwan’s Place in the Post-Cold War World.”*** It drew a number of DPP-leaders and American and Taiwanese scholars, who analyzed Taiwan’s position in the fast-changing international arena, and presented arguments for Taiwan to be included in the UN.

\* \* \* \* \*

## **United States upgrades Taiwan relations - - by an inch**

On 7 September 1994, the United States Department of State announced its long-awaited Taiwan Policy Review. Although the review was touted as the first “major” change in US Taiwan-policy in 15 years and took more than a year in coming, the results were rather meager: the Review-document itself was not made available, and the changes in policy amounted to only two small cosmetic modifications of doing (un?)official business with Taiwan.

The changes are: 1) higher level officials from economic and technical agencies will, at the sub-cabinet level, be able to visit each other. 2) The Kuomintang’s office in the United States will from now on be called “Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office” (TECRO) instead of Coordinating Council for North-American Affairs (CCNAA).

In an excellent editorial page article in the **International Herald Tribune** on 12 September 1994, long-standing Asia expert Philip Bowring called the American “New” Taiwan policy timid and unimaginative. Mr. Bowring criticized the “...apparent immobility in US thinking at a time when Taiwan’s perception of itself, and the attitudes of others, have been changing.”

Mr. Bowring stated that the changes in Taiwan “...deserve a response from the United States rather more profound than last week’s tinkering.” He argued that “Taiwan policy should not be a card to be used for or against China; policy should recognize facts, not theory. The administration could have gone a lot further to recognize the current reality of one country, two states, without formally abandoning its one-China policy.”

### *US Congress: too small a step*

Almost immediately after it was announced, the new policy was also criticized in the US Senate and House as not going far enough to upgrade US-Taiwan relations: Senator **Frank Murkowski** (R-Alaska) welcomed the move as a first step, but stated that the US should go much further, and in particular:

- a. receive President Lee of Taiwan in the same manner as other “unofficial” dignitaries, such as the Dalai Lama and Yasser Arafat;
- b. support Taiwan membership in all multilateral institutions, including the United Nations;
- c. allow Taiwan to purchase all defensive arms it needs, without qualitative or quantitative restrictions;
- d. allow the AIT to issue visas from its Taipei address, instead of from Hong Kong, as is presently the case.

Senator Murkowski indicated that as ranking Republican on the East Asia and Pacific Affairs Committee he would urge the Committee to hold hearings in September to discuss additional changes that should be made.

Another Senator, Mr. **Hank Brown** (R-Colorado) was even more blunt in his criticism of the new non-policy. He termed the new policy another foreign policy blunder by the Clinton Administration, and stated: “It (the administration) treats one of our closest democratic allies in the Pacific worse than we treat North Korea, Cuba or Libya. ....

This policy change does not even recognize Taiwan, our fifth largest trading partner, as a political entity. ... At the same time, mainland China jails pro-democracy activists every time a US official travels there and sentences others to prison terms after secret trials. It is a tragic mistake to treat corrupt dictators better than democratic allies. ... This sends a terrible message to emerging democracies around the world.”

Finally, Senator **Paul Simon** (D-IL) welcomed the policy change as “slight improvements,” but added that the United States “..continues to give Taiwan the cold shoulder, while Taiwan has a multi-party system, free elections and a free press — the things we profess to champion — while we continue to cuddle up to the mainland government, whose dictatorship permits none of those.”

## *Communist China's hollow protests*

Not unexpectedly, the Foreign Ministry in Peking loudly proclaimed its opposition against the upgrading of the US ties with Taiwan. The vice foreign minister told US ambassador Stapleton Roy on 10 September 1994 that the move represented a “gross interference in China’s internal affairs and an infringement upon its sovereignty.”

*Taiwan Communiqué comment: China would do well to end its Cold-War rhetoric and move towards peaceful coexistence with Taiwan as a friendly neighbor. The Communist Chinese have never held sovereignty over Taiwan; the island has never been part of their China, and never will.*

*The people of Taiwan want to live in a free, democratic, and prosperous Taiwan, which they have built through long years of hard work. Not for one minute do they intend to live under the Communist dictatorship of the Communists, in a backward country which has a per capita income of US\$ 400.—, a level that is 1/28th of the per capita income of Taiwan at the present time.*

*Those on Taiwan, and in particular the Kuomintang authorities, who still cling to the outdated belief that Taiwan is a “province” of China, and that they want to unify with China should wake up from their anachronistic dream before it becomes a nightmare.*

*With regard to the name of Taiwan’s representative office in Washington DC we suggest that it is a reflection of the total lack of imagination by both the State Department and the Foreign Ministry in Taipei: TECRO does remind one more of a new type of zipper than anything else. In addition: the new name refers only to*

*Taipei, which makes one wonder where the people from the rest of Taiwan have to turn to to be represented. Perhaps the American Institute in Taiwan office in Taipei should be renamed Washington Economic and Cultural Representative's Office (WECRO).*

\*\*\*\*\*

## Mr. Brown goes to Peking *cozying up to Chinese dictators*

The cold shoulder which the US administration is giving the democratically-minded people of Taiwan must be contrasted with the warm embrace Commerce Secretary Ron Brown is giving the clearly undemocratic Communist Chinese leaders in Peking. At the end of August 1994, Mr. Brown led the first cabinet-level delegation to China since the Clinton-Administration decided to de-link human rights and trade.

The result was rather disastrous: the gullible Mr. Brown was given some empty promises that the Chinese would “resume discussions on human rights at some point in the fall.” However, at the same time the Communist authorities clamped down on the most vocal of the Chinese dissidents, in order to prevent them from voicing their views during Mr. Brown’s visit.

Mr. Brown further muddied the picture by agreeing to throw overboard two long-standing principles of US foreign trade in East Asia: the principle of opposition to “tied-aid” and the rules of origin under the US quotas for textile imports from China, Taiwan and Hong Kong, thus significantly undercutting the latter two countries. By agreeing to tied-aid through the Import-Export Bank the US will only increase the stranglehold the Chinese leaders have on trade with the United States: Peking can manipulate each of these major deals for its own political purposes, and use American businesses as levers in the process.

Mr. Brown’s kowtowing to Peking was strongly criticized in the American press. Titles like “Cozying up to the Chinese dictators” (**Washington Post**, 1 September 1994) and “Grim Commerce in China” (**New York Times**, 30 August 1994) were only some of the milder ones. One publication (**Washington Telecom News**, 5 September 1994) also reported that Mr. Brown grossly overstated the amount of contracts signed by American companies, and that the real amount was significantly lower.

## *For a China Boycott*

Taiwan Communiqué comment: it is essential for the Clinton Administration to take a strong position on human rights in China. Its present failure to do so diminishes its credibility as a defender of human rights and democracy around the world. Mr. Brown's trip was a sorry sight in this respect.

Perhaps the American people should follow the suggestion made by commentator A.M. Rosenthal in the **New York Times** ("*For a China Boycott*", 30 August 1994): "Use stockholders' rights to demand a rights code for every US business investing in China. It worked for South Africa. And in combination: boycott .... shoes, toys, tools and the thousands of other exports to the US that give Peking its \$30 billion annual trade bonus from America."

Mr. Rosenthal suggests that such a movement would show a better achievement of human rights in China than today's appeasement policy: "*that stands at zero, and getting lower.*" We concur.

\*\*\*\*\*

## **Chinese negotiators not welcome**

### *Tang Shubei visit runs into trouble*

At the end of July and the beginning of August 1994, yet another round of talks were held between the two "puppet-on-a string" organizations which conduct the unofficial dialogue between the Nationalist Kuomintang authorities on Taiwan and the Peking Communists.

The meeting was the first one since the Qiandao Lake Tragedy, in which 24 Taiwanese tourists were murdered while on a tour in China (see *Taiwan Communiqué* no. 61, pp. 1-4). The discussions were to deal with fishing disputes and repatriation of mainland hijackers.

However, the people in Taiwan were hardly in a mood to welcome the Chinese negotiators to Taipei: the continued hard line China is taking in refusing to allow Taiwan to join international organizations, and the total inadequacy of the Chinese authorities to deal with the Qiandao Incident were the major reasons.



When the first group of delegates arrived on 29 July at the Taoyuan International Airport, it was met by a large group of demonstrators, carrying placards with messages such as: “Taiwan is not the territory of China” and “Taiwan is Taiwan, China is China.”

A few days later, Mr. Tang Shubei, the main Chinese negotiator arrived, and was also greeted by hundreds of protesters at the airport. He barely escaped a fusillade of eggs and tomatoes, and was spirited away by the police via a secret route.

Pro-independence protesters and relatives of the victims of the Qiandao Lake tragedy kept a vigil in front of the hotel where he stayed. Braving the typhoon weather, thousands of protesters demonstrated almost daily in front of Taipei International Convention Center, where the meetings were held. They unfurled banners, saying “Taiwan is not part of China” and “oppose the hegemony of China.” A PRC flag was burned.



AFP

The protests were organized by **“One-Taiwan, One-China Alliance”** a coalition of several pro-independence organizations, which also delivered a letter to Mr. Tang. The letter emphasized that the 21 million people of Taiwan have the right to decide their own future and political status. Taiwan has its own independent sovereignty. Only on the basis of “Taiwan is Taiwan, China is China,” can a peaceful, mutually beneficial, and stable relations between Taiwan and China be established.

The opposition DPP also held two press conferences to criticize the meeting between the Kuomintang’s negotiator, Chiao Jen-ho, and Tang Shubei. In response to accusation by Tang Shubei that DPP used violence, DPP chairman Shih Ming-teh pointed out that DPP protesters threw only eggs, but that Beijing has continued to threaten the use of military force against Taiwan. Mr. Shih also criticized China’s callous handling of the Qiandao Lake tragedy on March 31.

Mr. Shih reiterated that the two sides of the Straits are two independent, sovereign states, and DPP insists that any disputes between Taiwan and China should be resolved in a peaceful manner.

---

\* \* \* \* \*

---

## **DPP issues policy paper**

On 2 August 1994, the DPP also issued a nine-page statement regarding Taiwan's future and its policy toward mainland China.

The DPP stresses that self-determination is an underlying principle of the United Nations and the keystone of a modern world order. Therefore, Taiwan's future political status should be determined by the 21 million people of Taiwan.

Under the principle of self-determination, the DPP advocates redefining Taiwan's political status as a sovereign state, based on the reality of the territories over which the government has effective control. Below is the full text of the statement in English:

### **“Taiwan is Taiwan, China is China”**

#### ***A Practical Basis for a New Cross-Strait Order***

Democratic Progressive Party Central Headquarters, August 2, 1994

#### **I. Introduction**

In August, 1993 the PRC government in Beijing issued a white paper presenting its position on the status of Taiwan, In July, 1994, Taiwan's ruling KMT followed suit with its own white paper on the relative status of Taiwan and China. As an indigenous party representing the interests of Taiwan's people, the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) offers the following critique of both papers, in hopes of facilitating a more realistic and productive dialogue in the future.

The DPP believes that the KMT and PRC white papers suffer from several flaws:

- \* Lack of candor and realism
- \* Distortion of historical fact
- \* Distortion and willful ignorance of the principles of international law

- \* Disregard for the interests and wishes of Taiwan's people
- \* Failure to address current concrete problems in cross-Straits relations
- \* Failure to build a framework to achieve equal, peaceful, mutually advantageous future relations

This statement is a critical response to the white papers of the PRC and the KMT, and offers a rational, realistic conceptual framework for progress in cross-Straits relations.

## II. The Principle of Self-Determination

This ultimate basis for a state's sovereignty is popular consent. Aggressive states often claim "sacred historical rights" when using military force to extend their sovereignty over new territory (e.g. Iraq vs. Kuwait), but the international community today recognizes the primacy of self-determination in establishing sovereignty.

This principle is affirmed in the First Article of the U.N. Charter, which states that the mission of the United Nations is "to foster friendly relations among nations based on respect for human equality and the principle of self-determination." Article 55 re-emphasizes the right to self-determination, and the principle is also unequivocally stated in numerous U.N. treaties and proclamations.

The DPP bases its China policy on the Taiwan people's right to self-determination. We are resolute in the following principle: No person or government shall be permitted to decide Taiwan's future without the consent of its people. The DPP advocates defining the issue of Taiwan's sovereignty in accordance with international law and the principle of self-determination.

## III. Taiwan Belongs to the People of Taiwan

Ignoring the facts of historical development, the PRC's white paper grandly proclaims that "Taiwan has belonged to China since ancient times," that "Chinese people on both sides of the Taiwan Strait have struggled unremittingly to oppose foreign incursion into Taiwan."

These claims are without basis. In fact, ever since settlers began arriving from China 400 years ago, Taiwan's history has been one of resistance to oppression and outside domination. Having passed through periods of Dutch, Chinese, and Japanese occupation, today's Taiwanese are repulsed by China's appeal to the "historical sanctity of China's territory" or a "Chinese nationalism in opposition to foreign interference," an

appeal it does not hesitate to back up with military threats. Not only do such threats run against the principles of international law, but they make Taiwan's people even more resentful of the PRC's aggressive designs,

#### **IV. The Essence of the “Taiwan Problem”: Taiwan’s lack of Appropriate International Status**

China argues that Taiwan was retroceded to China after WW-II (as promised in the Potsdam Declaration), but remained separate due to the intercession of American military power, China claims that Taiwan is legally part of its territory, The KMT, meanwhile, asserts that China's division is due to a struggle between two systems. The KMT argues that there is no Taiwan Problem, only a China Problem: reunification would be possible only the mainland were to accept Sun Yat-sen's “Three Principles of the People,” the ostensible philosophical basis of the KMT's rule.

Both arguments fail to withstand critical examination. The historical facts are as follows:

1. The 1945 Potsdam Declaration never achieved formal treaty status. The first post-World War II treaty regarding Taiwan was the 1951 San Francisco Peace Treaty, which superseded the Potsdam Declaration. It officially ended Japanese claims to Taiwan, but did not assign sovereignty over Taiwan to any other country,
2. The PRC has never at any time exercised effective control over Taiwan,
3. The Chinese Communist Party (CCP) took effective control of mainland China in 1949. According to the principles of international law, it then became the sole legal Government representing China,
4. The definition of national sovereignty in international law is as follows: an independent nation must administer a certain territory and population, and must have a government that can effectively administer Internal and foreign affairs. By this definition, Taiwan is in fact an independent state.

Thus China's claim to sovereignty over Taiwan contravenes both international law and the principle of self-determination. The claim does not fulfill the criteria for sovereignty, set out in international law,

Meanwhile, the KMT has enmeshed itself in a web of contradictions. On the one hand, it bases relative status of Taiwan and China on the divided nation concept of “Two co-equal political entities”; on the other hand, it insists on the principle of “One China.” But, the KMT maintains, this “One China” is not the PRC, recognized by the international community and admitted to the United Nations in 1971. Adding to the confusion, the KMT has stated it will no longer contend with the CCP to represent all of China internationally, the KMT hopes to participate -alongside China in international organizations — how is this to be justified if Taiwan is part of China, as the KMT insists?

In summary, the DPP believes that:

1. The 21 million people of Taiwan constitute a sovereign state according to international law.
2. The PRC has never exercised authority over Taiwan, by treaty or force, nor have Taiwan’s people consented to accept PRC rule, Its claim to Taiwan thus has no basis in international law.
3. The KMT regime lost sovereignty over mainland China in 1949, when it was replaced by the CCP. Its current claims to sovereignty over mainland China are thus a fantasy without basis in international law.

## **V The Absurdity of “One Nation, Two Systems” and “One China, Two Equal Political Entities”**

China advocates “One Nation, Two Systems” as its solution for the “Taiwan Problem,” in which Taiwan would be a privileged province of China, and its government a provincial government. China’s unyielding insistence on this principle has prevented cross-Straits talks from making any substantive progress. Although China promises Taiwan would have a “high degree of autonomy,” Hong Kong’s current experience demonstrates how easily this is compromised in actual practice. There are no guarantees: while promising Taiwan a high degree of autonomy, China’s white paper also states “All sovereign nations have the right to use any means they deem necessary, including military force, to protect their territorial integrity.”

The KMT rightly rejects this offer as tantamount to surrender, yet maintains the untenable fantasy of “One China, two equal political entities.” This is not only internally contradictory, but counterproductive as well, for the cruel fact is that the

world recognizes the “One China” to be the PRC, whose capital is Beijing, Neither the world community nor the PRC government will ever accept the KMT position of “Two equal political entities in one country.”

## **VI. “Taiwan is Taiwan, China is China”: A Realistic Framework for Cross-Strait Relations**

Taiwan and China have been diverging socially, economically, and politically for a century now. Both sides must face the facts and respect each other’s territorial integrity. “The DPP believes that any resolution of the current situation between Taiwan and China must recognize that neither side has exercised authority over the other for nearly a half a century. Such a pragmatic realization would allow the establishment of equal, peaceful, and stable relations, furthering trade and prosperity into the 21st Century, and bringing tremendous benefits to both sides.

The DPP recognizes that “One China” refers only to the PRC, Taiwan, on the other hand, lacks appropriate international status as a sovereign state. The DPP sees this as an issue of human rights and national survival. In a world of increasing economic and political integration, the interests of peace, prosperity, and international law demand that Taiwan be welcomed into the community of nations — the United Nations.

---

\*\*\*\*\*

---

## **Taxi Drivers Protest Closure of Radio Stations**

During the past years, the Kuomintang authorities have kept a tight control over radio and TV. Although professing to move in the direction of more openness and democracy, this tight control has still stifled freedom of expression on the island.

The official radio and TV stations, which are either owned or controlled by the ruling Kuomintang, mainly broadcast in Mandarin, the mainland Chinese dialect originating from the area around Peking, and either do not cover opposition views and activities or portray them in a negative light.

To get around this direct and indirect censorship of the electronic media, the democratic opposition set up scores of small-scale cable-TV networks and underground radio stations, which broadcast popular Taiwanese-language programs and call-in radio shows. These networks also increasingly became a channel for the opposition to reach the broader public.

The increasing popularity of the radio stations became a thorn in the flesh for the authorities, and on 30 July 1994, in the early morning hours, officials from the Government Information Office and police raided 14 of the radio stations in Taipei, Taichung, Tainan and Kaohsiung. It was a swift, large-scale, military style operation: While police cordoned off the streets, helicopters flew over buildings to pick up the confiscated equipment.

The crackdown angered supporters of the radio stations, and on 1 August 1994, some 500 persons — mainly taxi drivers who are avid listeners of the stations — staged a protest in front of the Executive Yuan and demanded the return of the confiscated equipment. A vehicle belonging to a pro-KMT TV station's news crew was set ablaze, and police used water canon to disperse the protesters, who fought the police with rocks and debris picked up from the nearby construction site. The police also beat up demonstrators indiscriminately and smashed windows of scores of taxicabs. Nearly 40 people were injured in the violent confrontation.

The crackdown on 30 July 1994 was primarily intended to prevent the radio stations from calling on listeners to join the demonstrations against the Chinese official Tang Shubei, who arrived in Taiwan on 7 August 1994 for talks with his counterpart, Mr. Chia Jen-ho of the semi-official Strait Exchange Foundation. In the past, the pirate stations have been very effective in calling on listeners to go and join anti-government demonstrations.

Ironically, the raid did not silence the radio stations. After a week, many stations went back on the air: they were able to purchase new equipment after hosting a series of fund-raising dinner parties.

The first pirate station was **The Voice of Taiwan**, which was set up in 1993 and offered call-in programs, where listeners go on the air to vent their anger and frustration about the traffic congestion in Taipei city, bad government policies, etc. It became an instant success. The broadcaster, Mr. Hsu Jung-chi, virtually became a cult figure. He was instrumental in mobilizing listeners to go and join many pro-democracy and environmental demonstrations.

The success of The Voice of Taiwan spawned many newcomers in Taichung, Tainan and Kaohsiung. There are more than 10 stations in the greater Taipei area. These pirate stations offer an outlet for ordinary citizens to voice their views. Many DPP politicians set up their own radio stations in order to cultivate a political base.

In view of the upcoming elections in December 1994, many DPP supporters are trying to set up new radio station to rally support for DPP candidates. Although the KMT authorities had long promised to open up radio channels for civilian use, they have been dragging their heels in granting new licenses for the stations.

\*\*\*\*\*

## President Lee has a change of heart -- gradually

Since he became President in January 1988, after the death of his predecessor Chiang Ching-kuo, President Lee Teng-hui has consolidated his position, and has been the main architect of the “Taiwanization” of the originally very mainlander-dominated Kuomintang party. Still, to many on the island he remained an enigma: how could a Taiwanese still talk about “reunification” with the mainland as the long-term goal? Or was it just tactics to outmaneuver the right-wing of the Kuomintang and the Chinese Communists in Peking?

### *Interview with Asahi Weekly*

In an interview in late April 1994 with Japanese writer Liudaro Shiba, President Lee Teng-hui talked very candidly about his views on Taiwan history, culture and politics. The interview entitled “The sadness of being Taiwanese”, and was published in the **Asahi Weekly**. It revealed for the first time his sympathy for the Taiwan independence movement and his criticism of the policies of his own KMT-party.

President Lee revealed that it was his wife who suggested that he talked about “*The sadness of being Taiwanese*” in the interview. He began by mentioning that he was deeply saddened by the sufferings of the people of Taiwan. He pointed out that the people of Taiwan have been oppressed by foreign powers for nearly a hundred years from the Japanese period to KMT era. He said that KMT was a foreign regime and he wanted to transform it to a party of the Taiwanese.

He mentioned the personal experience that people of his generation in the past could not sleep easily at night — a reference to KMT “white terror” repression in the 1950s when independence sympathizers were arrested in the middle of the night.



He said that Taiwan has lived under the shadow of China for too long. He also pointed out that Taiwan and China are two separate political entities. He mentioned Taiwan's absurd educational system, which teaches students Chinese history and geography at school but not Taiwanese history and geography.

He emphasized that his mandate comes from the people of Taiwan. Only with the support of the people, can he carry out his policies. He also spoke as a Christian by referring himself as the Moses who would someday lead the Taiwanese to the promised land.

## ***Meeting with World Federation Leaders***

Another indication of Mr. Lee's change of heart came on 9 August 1994, when he met with a dozen key members of the **World Federation of Taiwanese Associations** (WFTA), the umbrella organization for overseas Taiwanese. They urged him to move forward and present Taiwan internationally as "Taiwan", and drop the anachronistic "Republic of China" title, in order to facilitate Taiwan's bid for membership in the United Nations.

This meeting reflected the change of political development in Taiwan. Many of the WFTA leaders who met with President Lee are Taiwan independence activists, who were blacklisted and refused visas to enter Taiwan only a few years ago.

The WFTA has chapters in 20 different countries across the five continents. Its members come from North America, Europe, Japan, South America, Australia and New Zealand. They were concluding a four-day meetings in Taipei on August 7. The meeting resolved to pursue the goal of Taiwan's membership in the United Nations and an independent Taiwan.

During the two-hour meeting with President Lee, the WFTA leaders made a number of recommendations to revise the "one China" policy and to apply for membership in the United Nations using the name "Taiwan."

President Lee was supportive of a proposal by Mr. **Lin Wen-teh**, chairman of the WFTA, that the 20 branches of the WFTA form a global lobbying organization to lobby the host countries to support Taiwan's bid to join the United Nations.

## Upcoming elections — another tough battle

On 3 December 1994, the first-ever elections for the governor of Taiwan and mayors of Taipei and Kaohsiung will be held on the island. Up until now the positions were appointed positions, which the Kuomintang used to strengthen its stranglehold on the political system on the island. Two years ago the National Assembly approved an amendment to the Constitution to allow for direct popular elections of these positions.

It is expected that both the ruling KMT and main opposition DPP will try their utmost to capture all three seats or at least two of them. For the KMT, the December election will give an indication whether its support has bottomed out or whether it will drop further: during the past three elections the KMT's support has been dwindling steadily (see graph in TC#60, p 5).

For the DPP the December election is going to be an uphill battle. The three KMT incumbents have tremendous advantage. They receive almost daily exposure on television, and have the government resources at their disposal.

The gubernatorial election is the first large scale election covering all 21 counties and cities. The KMT is in control of 15 counties and cities. The DPP controls five counties and the mayor of Chia-yi is an independent.



**Elections in Taiwan: President Lee pulling the KMT cart, the DPP in teamwork on their bicycle, and Mr. Jaw Shau-kang soloing on his monocycle.**

Even though the DPP is constrained in its financial resources and manpower, the DPP is good at organizing election rallies. It has a team of very eloquent speakers including legislators and former chairmen of the party, who can draw large crowds.

Whether to participate in these elections was a hot item within the DPP: in June 1994, Legislator Mrs. Yeh Chu-lan called on the DPP to boycott the gubernatorial election on the ground that DPP does not consider Taiwan to be a province of China. However, the DPP leadership argued that participation in these elections would be an opportunity to gain more experience in reaching the general public. The DPP leadership also felt that the elections for governor and mayors would give it a stepping stone towards the presidential elections. It pledged to gradually phase out the provincial government if it wins the election.

## *Governor elections, proxy fight*

The elections are thus a crucial contest, and a prelude to an even bigger election contest in 1996: the first-ever presidential elections on the island. For the DPP, it will give an indication how soon it can become a ruling party: the winner of the upcoming elections will be in an advantageous position to win the presidential elections in 1996.

Former county commissioner of Ilan, Mr. **Chen Ting-nan** of Ilan, won the DPP nomination to run for Governor. Mr. Chen, a legislator, served two terms as county commissioner of Ilan in the mid-1980s. He joined the DPP less than a year ago, and decided to contest the nomination in June. Although Mr. Chen started as an underdog in the primary against former DPP general secretary Chang Chün-hung, his reputation as “Mr. Clean and Mr. Efficiency” won him support among party members.

During his two terms as the Ilan county commissioner from 1982 to 1989, Mr. Chen earned a reputation as an effective administrator. He rooted out corruption in the county government. His most outstanding achievement was cleaning up the polluted Tung-shan river in Ilan and turning it into a tourist attraction by building a scenic park along the river.



**DPP-candidate for Governor, Mr. Chen Ting-nan**

The KMT nominee is the incumbent governor Mr. **James Soong**. Mr. Soong was the former secretary-general of the KMT. He is considered one of the fast-climbing KMT politicians and is one of President Lee's trusted allies.

Although Mr. Soong is a mainlander, he has tried to learn the Taiwanese language. Recently he tried to boost his popularity by delivering speeches in Taiwanese and singing popular Taiwanese songs and Hakka folk songs during banquets.

Mr. Soong also attempted to win the hearts and minds of people by playing Santa Claus. Since his arrival at the provincial government, he has made regular visits to villages and townships to meet the local people and allocate funds for some local construction projects.

## *Taipei and Kaohsiung mayor elections*

**Taipei.** The KMT nominated the incumbent mayor Huang Ta-chou as its candidate for mayor of Taipei in spite of Mr. Huang's low popularity rating in opinion polls. Mr. Huang, a former scholar, is known for his gaffes. The scandals surrounding the construction of the Taipei's rapid transit system seriously damaged his credibility. The KMT party has hired a public relations firm to polish up Mr. Huang's image.

The DPP's nominee is legislator **Chen Shui-bian**. Recent opinion polls showed Mr. Chen to be the most popular candidate. An opinion poll by the China Times found Chen to have 34.1 percent support, followed by Jaw Shau-kong of the New Party, a breakaway right-wing group from the Nationalists, with 14.6 percent. KMT candidate Huang was the most unpopular of the three leading candidates, with just 8.9 percent support in the city of three million.

Mr. Chen has served two terms as legislator. Before he was elected to the Legislative Yuan, he was a member of Taipei city council. Mr. Chen gained national prominence during the trial of eight defendants in connection with the Kaohsiung incident of 1979. He was the youngest in a member of 12 defense lawyers.



**DPP Taipei mayoral  
candidate Chen Shui-bian**

Mr. Chen is known for his diligent work in exposing corruption in the government and in the military. Many of his interpellations on arms purchase scandals became major headlines in the newspapers and turned Mr. Chen into one of most popular politicians in Taiwan today.

Mr. Chen won the party's nomination in a primary held on July 17 after he defeated Legislator Hsieh Chang-ting by a small margin. Mr. Hsieh is also a popular politician and is known for his wit and eloquent speeches. In the end, it was the support of the Movement faction that tilted the balance in favor of Mr. Chen. Mr. Hsieh has pledged his support for Mr. Chen and has accepted his invitation to be his campaign manager.

Mr. Jaw Shau-kong is the candidate of The China New party, which split from KMT and formed a new party in 1992.

**Kaohsiung.** In the election for the mayor of Kaohsiung, the KMT candidate, the incumbent mayor Wu Tuen-yi has received a higher popularity rating than the DPP candidate, legislator Chang Chun-hsiung in recent opinion polls.

Mr. Wu as the incumbent mayor has the support of big business groups in Kaohsiung. Kaohsiung as the center of industry has the highest concentration of laborers and workers, who are usually the loyal supporters of DPP. The DPP in previous legislative elections received more than 40 percent of the votes.

\*\*\*\*\*

## Report from Washington

*by Coen Blaauw, Formosan Association for Public Affairs (FAPA)*

### *Senate adopts Paul Simon's UN Resolution*

On 10 June 1994 the Senate adopted by voice vote Senator Paul Simon's Resolution S.RES. 148. The Resolution consists of two parts. The first part deals with Cabinet level exchanges between the United States and Taiwan: "It is the sense of the Senate that Cabinet-level exchanges between Taiwan and the United States should take place in the interests of both nations."

The second part of the Resolution deals with United Nations membership for Taiwan: "It is the sense of the Senate that the President . . . should encourage the United Nations to permit representatives of Taiwan to participate fully in the activities of the United Nations. "

Taiwan Communiqué comment: We commend Senator Simon for his efforts, and the skillful way he guided the Resolution through the Senate. This is the first time in the past 20 years that an initiative of the United States Congress endorsing the aspiration of the people of Taiwan to participate in the international community was approved by the full Senate. Now it is up to the Clinton Administration to follow suit.

## *“Taiwan-into-the-UN” Hearing in the House*

On 14 July 1994, a joint hearing was held on UN membership for Taiwan in the Subcommittees on Asian and Pacific Affairs and on International Security, International organizations and Human Rights. All witnesses agreed that the 21 million people on the island of Taiwan deserve international recognition. In addition, three of the five panelists “voted” for Rep. Torricelli’s Resolution H.CON.RES.166 which supports UN membership for Taiwan over Rep. Solomon’s H.CON.RES.148 which supports membership for Taiwan under the name “Republic of China on Taiwan”.

Some quotes: Rep. **Benjamin Gilman**: “There is a general feeling in Congress to see that an independent Taiwan join the UN. But how do we resolve this issue until Taiwan’s Government indicates how they want to be represented: as ROC or as Taiwan? Shouldn’t we decide that first before we promote UN membership for Taiwan?”

Rep. **Tom Lantos**: “I will use the name “Taiwan” for that name is more familiar to the general public.” “Taiwan’s ambiguous identity seems increasingly anachronistic in this day and age.” “Taiwan’s continued absence from the UN can only be seen for what it is: a flagrant exercise in intimidation, the flexing of raw political muscle by an obstructionist power.”

**John R. Bolton**: “[Taiwan] is simply seeking separate UN representation for its own citizens, on whose behalf the PRC quite obviously does not speak.” “... the PRC’s position opposing Taiwan’s efforts to secure representation is impairing the security, humanitarian and economic functioning of the UN, all because of a Cold-War era dispute.”

Rep. **Sherrod Brown**: “The people of Taiwan are not Chinese. Taiwan is not China, not for a single day -since 1949- did Taipei exercise any control over China, nor did Beijing exercise any control over Taiwan,” suggesting that the people of Taiwan should join the UN as an independent country.

Dr. **James D. Seymour**: “If [Taiwan’s] government is serious about gaining UN membership it should bite the bullet and establish itself as a nation state, and then round up support of the sort that will preclude China’s using her veto power.” “Taiwan’s government has to make the following decision: Be in as Taiwan or out as the Republic of China.” “A declaration of independence is a requirement for UN membership.” “The real message of the (KMT’s) White Paper is that the Taipei government lacks the political will to do what is necessary to establish Taiwan as an entity eligible for UN membership. Under these circumstances, there is little role for the U.S. Congress to play.”

Professor **Lung-chu Chen**: “Taiwan has existed as a sovereign, independent state for more than forty years. The question today is to acknowledge Taiwan as an independent state in name as well as in fact.” “China’s territorial claim to Taiwan is as absurd as Iraq’s territorial claim to Kuwait.” “Americans’ sense of fair play and democracy should be shocked at Taiwan’s continuing absence from the UN.” “Above all, the KMT regime must rid itself of its dangerous, outdated policies, the same policies that 23 years ago squandered Taiwan’s chances for its rightful representation in the UN and other international governmental organizations.”

## ***Torricelli’s UN Resolution Receives Major Bi-partisan Support***

Congressman Robert Torricelli’s (D-NJ) UN Resolution — H.CON.RES.166 — states that “the 21 million people of Taiwan should be represented in the United Nations and in other international organizations.” It promotes UN membership under the name “Taiwan.”

On August 20 it reached the symbolic mark of 100 co-sponsors. It is co-sponsored by both Republican and Democrat leadership such as David Bonior (the Majority Whip) , Newt Gingrich (the Minority Whip) and Benjamin Gilman (the ranking Republican on the House Foreign Affairs Committee) - And by Representatives prominent in Asian affairs such as Nancy Pelosi (D-CA) and Sam Gejdenson (D-CT). Of the 45 Members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee 22 co- sponsor the Torricelli Resolution; almost half of the total number of Members.

***Taiwan Communiqué Comment***: *We strongly urge the House to pass Mr. Torricelli’s UN Resolution before the 103rd Congress adjourns at the end of October. This would be a significant and welcome boost for the people of Taiwan in their quest for participation in the international community in general, and the United Nations in particular.*”