



Published by:

International Committee for Human Rights in Taiwan

Taiwan : 4Fl., 5 Ching-tao East Rd., TAIPEI, Taiwan

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

Canada : 3636 Steeles Avenue E., Suite 303A, MARKHAM, Ont. L3R 1K9

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

International edition, July 2000

Published 6 times a year

ISSN number: 1027-3999

92

A Profile in Courage

First Lady Wu Shu-chen

One of the people propelled to the forefront of public life in Taiwan is Mrs. Wu Shu-chen, wife of President Chen Shui-bian. An image that is indelibly etched in the minds of her supporters is when, on the night of the March 18th election victory, the wheelchair-bound new First Lady spoke in a soft voice to the thundering applause of thousands of supporters, thanking them and reminding them of the heavy responsibility and the greater challenge ahead.

The story of A-bian and A-chen (her nickname) – their courtship, marriage and political career – has become a folktale in Taiwan. She hails from a rich and prominent family in Tainan, while he was a poor farmer's son, living in a mud-house. Her father wanted his daughter to marry a medical doctor to continue the family practice, but she married the young lawyer against the wishes of her family, and didn't get a dowry.

She was the driving force behind his political career. Twenty years ago, she convinced him to serve as defense lawyer for two defendants of the December 1979 Kaohsiung Incident, **Formosa Magazine** publisher Huang Hsin-chieh and human rights activist Ms. Chen Chü. When Mr. Chen hesitated, she told him: "*If you don't take on this challenge, it would be meaningless to continue to serve as a lawyer.*" It proved to be a watershed for Chen's political life.



Wu Shu-chen

After the 1980 Kaohsiung Eight trial, lawyer Chen became increasingly active in the budding *tangwai* democratic opposition. In 1981, he ran for a seat in the Taipei City Council, where he sharpened his skills in interpellation. In the meantime he continued his successful legal practice in maritime and commercial law.

In October 1985, Mr. Chen entered the race for county magistrate in Tainan, his home county in southern Taiwan. Although he ran a strong race in the election campaign, he lost by a slim margin. Two days after his defeat, on 18 November 1985, they returned to Tainan to thank people for their support. During a stop near Kuan Miao Temple, she was hit by a farm truck in a politically-motivated “accident.” The driver backed up to run over her two more times, shattering her spinal cord. He was briefly arrested, but the Kuomintang authorities never charged him. Shu-chen was left paralyzed from the waist down after, and would never walk again..

Photo: Taipei Times

In 1986, after Mr. Chen was imprisoned in a politically-inspired lawsuit against an opposition magazine he was associated with (see the article “*Who is Elmer Fung*” on p. 21) Shu-chen decided to seek justice by running for a seat in the national-level Legislative Yuan. It was just a few months after the Democratic Progressive Party had been founded, but martial law was still in force, and the Kuomintang threatened to crack down on the “illegal” party. She rode the wave of



President Chen carrying his disabled wife to their car on inauguration morning

sympathy votes and was elected. When Mr. Chen was released from prison in early 1987, he served as her chief counsel.

Three years later in 1989 and again in 1992, A-bian ran successfully for two terms as legislator, and in 1994 – in a hard-fought three-way race — was elected as mayor of Taipei, which laid the foundation for his recent run for the presidency.

President Chen's first month in office

At the time of this writing – the beginning of July 2000 -- President Chen and his new administration had been in office for slightly over a month. The general consensus was that the transition from President Lee Teng-hui and the Kuomintang to Chen Shui-bian and the DPP had taken place with only minor hitches. Below, we focus on four major issues/events during this period.

Inauguration: Taiwan stands up

Mr. Chen's inauguration speech on 21 May 2000, was awaited with great anxiety around the world because of China's insistence that he accept their "One China" concept. As it was, Mr. Chen's speech focussed largely on domestic issues, in particular on the need to strengthen Taiwan's democracy and root out corruption. Mr. Chen identified vote-buying and "black gold" as his "top-most" priority. Governmental restructuring and efficiency, judicial reform, quality of life and educational and cultural development all received ample attention.

An important symbol was the title of the speech: *Taiwan stands up*, a subtle reference to Mao Tse-tung's speech at the establishment of the PRC on 1 October 1949, when Mr. Mao stated "*China stands up.*" President Chen emphasized:

Taiwan stands up, demonstrating a firmness of purpose and faith in democracy.

Taiwan stands up, representing the self-confidence of the people and the dignity of the country.

Taiwan stands up, symbolizing the quest for hope and the realization of its dreams.

However, the international media, focused almost entirely on the cross-strait dimension, combed the last few paragraphs of the speech for clues as to how well Chen can handle the pressure from China.

Mr. Chen handled the issue skillfully, when he referred to *the question of a future "one China,"* emphasizing that "one China" is a topic that Taiwan is willing to discuss in talks, but not a precondition for talks. Standing firmly on the strength of Taiwan public opinion, he did not give in to China's demands for a concession on this point of principle, but continued to leave the door open for genuine talks.

While many of Mr. Chen's supporters were disappointed that he felt the need to mention the so-called "five no's" in his speech, Mr. Chen added an important qualifier: "as long as the CCP regime has **no intention to use military force against Taiwan.**" Thus, unless China renounces the use of force, he reserves the right to take any of the five steps named. The text of Mr. Chen's statement:

Copyright: Taipei Times

Therefore, as long as the CCP regime has no intention to use military force against Taiwan, I pledge that during my term in office, I will not declare independence, I will not change the national title, I will not push forth the inclusion of the so-called "state-to-state" description in the Constitution, and I will not promote a referendum to change the status quo in regards to the question of independence or unification. Furthermore, the abolition of the National Reunification Council or the National Reunification Guidelines will not be an issue.



Therefore, as long as the CCP regime has no intention to use military force against Taiwan, I pledge that during my term in office, I will not declare independence, I will not change the national title, I will not push forth the inclusion of the so-called "state-to-state" description in the Constitution, and I will not promote a referendum to change the status quo in regards to the question of independence or unification. Furthermore, the abolition of the National Reunification Council or the National Reunification Guidelines will not be an issue.

In the closing part of his speech, Mr. Chen referred to another important symbol, Taiwan's historical name "Formosa", and the fact that the island has its own 400-year of recorded history, instead of perpetuation the fiction that it is part of China's 5000-year history. President Chen:

Dear countrymen, 400 years ago, Taiwan was called "Formosa" — the beautiful island — for its lustrous landscape. Today, Taiwan is manifesting the elegance of a democratic island, once again attracting global attention, as the people on this land create a new page in our history.

The full text of President Chen's speech can be found on the web-site of the **Taipei Times** at <http://www.taipeitimes.com/news/2000/05/21/print/0000036938>

A press conference: one month after

On 20 June 2000, President Chen's held his first press conference. Standing on the grass lawn of the government's Taipei Guest House, the President made a 40-minute speech and then answered questions from representatives of local and worldwide media. The full text of the speech and the Q&A can be found on the website of the Presidential Office at <http://www.oop.gov.tw/english2000/index.htm>

Inspired by the mid-June 2000 meeting between the leaders of North and South Korea, President Chen Shui-bian appealed to Chinese leader Jiang Zemin to engage in a similar "historic handshake," as the two Kims had done. *"We, Jiang and I, could sit down and shake hands in a spirit of reconciliation anywhere, on any lines, but without preconditions,"* Chen said. *"That is the common wish of all people on both sides of the Taiwan Strait."*

Photo: Taipei Times

Chen told reporters that he had hung a picture in his study of South Korean President Kim Dae-jung and North Korean leader Kim Jong-il shaking hands during their meeting last week in Pyongyang. *"The Koreans have made a historic stride forward,"* Chen said, *"we can also make changes and create history. I believe we will bring the same wisdom*



Chen Shui-bian in his "rose garden" press conference

and imagination to bear on what may seem to be a similar mission impossible." However, on the next day, his overture was rejected by Beijing.

Chen also reaffirmed that he expected the US to play a more active role in improving cross-strait relations. He went on to praise President Bill Clinton for reminding Beijing of the need to solve problems that exist between the two sides of the Taiwan Strait peacefully, as well as to respect the democratically expressed will of the 23 million

people of Taiwan. He said: “For the first time, this year President Clinton has added an important fourth pillar to US policy, namely that the issues should be resolved with the consent of the people of Taiwan.”

Chen stated that he appreciated that President Clinton warned Beijing against using military force and urged China to respect Taiwan’s right to self-determination, adding, “that is how the US can play an active role.”

The “One China” confusion

On 30 June 2000, President Chen reiterated his rejection of the “One China” concept on Beijing’s terms, and vowed to defend Taiwan’s dignity and sovereignty. In a meeting with Mr. William J. Flynn, chairman of the National Committee on American Foreign Policy, President Chen said: “From Beijing’s view, One China refers to the PRC, and that Taiwan is part of it. This is not acceptable to the Taiwanese people.”

The move came after Mr. Chen caused quite a bit of confusion a few days earlier, on 27 June 2000, when he stated during a meeting with Mr. William Fuller of the Asia Foundation, that he was willing to accept the 1992 “One China, each his own interpretation” agreement between the KMT and the Communist rulers in Beijing. Mr. Chen added that “1992” allowed the sides to go forward with talks, while agreeing to disagree on the definition of “One China.”



The international press pulled the June 27th statement out of context, and implied that Mr. Chen had “accepted” the One China concept. The **Washington Post** had the erroneous headline “Taiwan leader backs ‘One China’ idea” on its front page, while the **International Herald Tribune** mistakenly stated that Mr. Chen had accepted the “One China” principle.

Taiwan Communiqué comment: *This episode of course should be a lesson that it would be wise for officials in Taiwan to say less about this issue for the time being. Mr. Chen and his new administration have made all the friendly gestures possible, and now should sit back and wait for China to reciprocate.*

As the Taipei Times said in an excellent editorial on June 29th, the 1992 “One China, respective interpretations” notion is a useless fig-leaf, and that going back to that idea would be a major step backwards.

Taiwan should thus wait for China to make some goodwill gestures — such as dismantling the more than 200 missiles aimed at Taiwan, or stating that they will work towards a peaceful solution instead of threatening with war all the time — and avoid looking too eager to make any further opening towards China.

For instance, business leaders and Kaohsiung mayor Hsieh Chang-t'ing should look for business opportunities and strengthening ties with democratic countries in the West instead of being so pre-occupied with China.

Keeping the US engaged

By Li Thian-hok. *Mr. Li is a board member at large of the Formosan Association for Public Affairs and chair of the diplomacy committee of World United Formosans for Independence (USA).*

If Taiwan plans to continue to rely on US support to keep its status quo, the Taiwanese need to prove the strength of their commitment to democracy and their resolve to maintain a separate existence from China.

Taiwan's history may be characterized as an incessant struggle for liberty against alien rulers. On May 20, the Taiwanese realized the dream of their forefathers with the inauguration of Chen Shui-bian as president. However, Chen faces daunting challenges. At home, he has a mandate to remove organized crime and tainted money interests from politics. Abroad he needs to keep peace with China and strengthen the support of the US, Japan and other nations, while preserving the de facto independence of Taiwan.

None of this policy agenda is achievable without an adequate national defense, which in turn hinges largely on US policy regarding Taiwan's security and its future. In engaging the US government, the Chen administration will be well advised to consider the following aspects of US policy towards Taiwan.

1. There is no consensus regarding Taiwan's ultimate status

Since the US is a democracy there are discordant views on Taiwan's future among those elements who can influence foreign policy. Thus, while President Bill Clinton leaned toward Beijing's "One China" position in June 1998 by enunciating the "three no's," the US Congress repudiated his action by a near unanimous majority right after Clinton's return. The realist school of academics and former government officials tend to be Sino-centric, stress trade with China to the exclusion of other considerations such as human rights, China's proliferation of nuclear technology, Taiwan's security and even US security. This group, supported by corporate America, will not object to Taiwan's absorption by China, even though they pay lip service to the principle of peaceful settlement and the desirability of democratizing China.

The neo-conservative school of scholars, former government officials and media commentators, on the other hand, are more concerned about the US' national security and the potential threat from a rising, expansionist China. They are also more committed to advancing democracy. They are more prone to accept the Taiwanese's right to self-determination, provided the people of Taiwan can clearly demonstrate their will regarding Taiwan's future. The media and the US public are generally sympathetic to the plight of the Taiwanese. Whether Americans will be willing to shed blood in defense of Taiwan depends on the resolve of the Taiwanese to defend their freedom and the Taiwanese armed forces' performance in resisting Chinese aggression.

2. Shifting policy stance

US policy towards Taiwan is based on the Taiwan Relations Act of 1979, the three joint communiques of 1972, 1979 and 1982, and President Ronald Reagan's six assurances in 1982. Over the years, however, US policy towards the ultimate status of Taiwan has gradually shifted from a neutral stance to one which leans towards Beijing's version of "One China." This is due largely to the KMT government's National Unification Guidelines and its professed goal of eventual unification.

Even though the KMT government did stipulate three stringent preconditions [Taiwan must be treated as an equal, there must be economic parity, China must first

democratize], the international community tended to just notice KMT's objection to Taiwan independence and to ignore the preconditions. Thus it saw little need to recognize an interim regime.

However, it should be noted that contrary to Beijing's assertion, the US has not formally recognized China's claim of sovereignty over Taiwan. The US' "one China" policy differs from the Chinese version. Any outcome of Taiwan-China negotiation is acceptable to the US so long as it is peacefully arrived at. The DPP government needs to stand firm on the non-negotiable principle of Taiwan's independent sovereignty so as to prevent a further weakening of US neutrality.

3. The "three no's" are an aberration

The Clinton administration is peculiarly devoid of a world strategic vision. It has concentrated on access to the China market and commercial profit and has at times been even oblivious of the basic requirements of US national security. It has often violated the letter and spirit of the Taiwan Relations Act, which promised the preservation and enhancement of the human rights of the people of Taiwan. Clinton's acceptance of China's "three no's" formulation was an unwise departure from the carefully crafted, flexible US policy towards Taiwan. It is highly questionable whether the "three no's" can be deemed official US policy. It was never codified. It was overwhelmingly rejected by Congress. Also, nonsupport is not the same as objection.

Clinton's term will end in January 2001 and a new administration will take power, which will most likely review and update US policy towards Taiwan taking into account: (1) Taiwan's democratization and Taiwanization, (2) China's military modernization and active preparation for war against Taiwan and (3) China's White Paper ultimatum to attack Taiwan if Taipei is slow in negotiating the terms of unification with China.

The DPP government should not be hasty in negotiating direct links with China or relaxing its restrictions on investing in China, pending the outcome of such US policy review or clarification of the next US administration's policy stance.



Mr. Li Thian-hok

4. Basic guidelines of US policy

The US policy towards Taiwan follows certain guidelines. Any dispute between Taiwan and China must be settled peacefully. This principle is designed to deter military conflict and hence US involvement, to protect the people of Taiwan and also to preserve the US role as the guarantor of peace and stability in East Asia. If China were to “liberate” Taiwan with US acquiescence, the credibility of the US-Japan security alliance would be destroyed and the US will have to withdraw from the Pacific island chain which runs from Japan, South Korea, Okinawa, Taiwan to the Philippines and Indonesia. If China invades Taiwan, the US will be compelled to act to protect its geopolitical and strategic interests.

Taiwan should not unilaterally declare formal independence. Such an act would almost certainly precipitate a war in the Taiwan Strait. While such conflict may be inevitable in the long run, the US prefers the status quo. Some scholars believe it is better for the US to fight a stronger China later rather than a weak China now, because Beijing will have more at stake.

Democratization of China is desirable. This is one of the reasons given for China’s entry into the WTO and the US granting it permanent normal trade relations. The preservation of Taiwan’s democracy as a model for China is consistent with this policy goal. Pro-China scholars argue spuriously that Taiwan’s democracy can be preserved within the framework of one China, two systems. However, China has consistently violated the basic human rights of its citizens and minorities. Beijing has already disregarded much of the agreement it has made with Great Britain in connection with the return of Hong Kong.

There is no reason to believe that China will honor any agreement it makes with Taiwan or that it will treat the Taiwanese any better than its own citizens.

While it is important for the Chen administration to assure the US it will not act rashly or do anything to provoke China, it is equally important to make Taiwan’s position unequivocally clear — that it will not under any circumstances give up its independent, de facto sovereignty. The strength of US support for Taiwan is ultimately dependent on the strength of the Taiwanese people’s commitment to democracy and their resolve to maintain a separate political existence apart from China.

This article first appeared in the Taipei Times, 14 June 2000. Reprinted with permission.

China's military threat continues

US DOD issues a new report

On 22 June 2000, the US Department of Defense finally submitted its long-overdue report, titled “**Annual Report to Congress on the Military Power of the People's Republic of China**” to Congress. According to the FY2000 National Defense Authorization Act, the annual report should have been submitted by 1 February 2000. The delay was reportedly due to footdragging by the Clinton White House, eager to avoid any further bumps in the rocky relations with China.

The report addresses (1) China's grand strategy, security strategy, and military strategy; (2) developments in China's military doctrine and force structure, to include developments in advanced technologies which would enhance China's military capabilities; and, (3) the security situation in the Taiwan Strait.

One of the major conclusions of the report is that China is building up military forces in preparation for a possible conflict with the United States over Taiwan involving high-technology warfare. The unclassified version of the report states that “a cross-strait conflict between China and Taiwan involving the United States has emerged as the dominant scenario guiding [People's Liberation Army] force planning, military training and war preparation.”

The Pentagon notes that “China seeks to become the preeminent power among regional states in East Asia. Beijing is pursuing a regional security strategy aimed at preserving what it perceives as its sovereign interests in Taiwan, the South China Sea, and elsewhere on its periphery and protecting its economic interests, while at the same time promoting regional stability.”

But the report gives China wiggle room by saying that “[S]ome in China are aware that war with Taiwan could be economically and politically devastating. China's main national policy priority remains economic reform and development within an environment that is both peaceful and stable. To that end, Beijing has avoided activities that might threaten its economic growth and its access to foreign markets, investment, and technology. In initiating a military conflict with Taiwan, Beijing would run the risk of jeopardizing both its continued economic development and its political standing, especially among those regional states with which it has unresolved territorial disputes. China's resolve to employ military force, however, should not be discounted.”

The report discusses developments in Chinese military doctrine, including “wars of no-contact” where air-power is the primary means of winning, exploiting critical vulnerabilities in adversarial defenses, “asymmetrical” warfare methods, and combining information warfare with irregular special and guerrilla operations.

Opposite Taiwan, Chinese missile forces pose a growing danger to the region, the report says. The Chinese military is acquiring an array of weapons that could be used in a “pre-emptive strike” against Taiwan, including long-range cruise missiles, air-launched bombs and short-range ballistic missiles, the report says.

The report states that Beijing’s missile force will “grow substantially” with new missile facilities being built opposite Taiwan. The new bases mean China could attack the island “with little or no warning.” “Should China decide to attack Taiwan, Beijing’s goal would be to erode Taipei’s will to fight with sufficient alacrity to avoid escalation of the conflict and potential third party intervention in the hope of forcing a political resolution in Beijing’s favor,” the report says.

The report suggests that China might resort to nuclear weapons if the U.S. intervenes in Taiwan’s favor. “If a third party were to intervene militarily in a regional conflict involving China, the PLA would employ all means necessary in the hope of inflicting high casualties and weakening the intervening party’s resolve,” states the Pentagon.

The report also states for the first time that, “After 2005. . . if projected trends continue, the balance of air power across the Taiwan Strait could begin to shift in China’s favor. . . .” This is a consequence of a build-up of new Russian fighters and fighter bombers, plus Israeli radar planes and better tactics and training. The new warning should be added to those of last year about the Chinese military’s gathering short-range missile threat, which should be substantial by 2005, and a warning about Taiwan’s inability to break through a naval blockade.

The report adds more information about the high-technology focus of the People’s Liberation Army. The PLA is “investigating the feasibility of ship-borne laser weapons for air defense.” Only the U.S. is known to be doing the same. China’s “theoretical understanding” of stealth technology is said to be “excellent,” and it is building a new, stealthy jet fighter.

The report sees China’s qualitative edge over Taiwan’s military forces growing strongly by 2010. The report underscores a key element in the Taiwan Security

Enhancement Act – the need for operational training between U.S. and Taiwanese forces to meet the PLA’s integration of advanced systems.

“The change in the dynamic equilibrium of forces over the long term will depend largely on whether Taiwan is able to meet or exceed developments on the mainland with programs of its own. Its success in deterring potential Chinese aggression will be dependent on its continued acquisition of modern arms, technology and equipment, and its ability to integrate and operate these systems effectively, and its ability to deal with a number of other systemic problems - primarily the recruitment and retention of technically-qualified personnel and the maintenance of an effective logistic system - lest Taipei once again risk losing its qualitative edge.”

China’s strategic intentions and goals

On Wednesday, 21 June 2000, one day before the Pentagon report was issued, the House Armed Services Committee held a hearing on the “Strategic Intentions and Goals of China.” Taiwan was very much a focus of concern. In his opening remarks, Committee Chair Floyd Spence (R-SC) noted, “The divergent security interests between the United States and China, especially as they relate to Taiwan, have led to increased concern that our two nations may be on a path that leads to more serious confrontation in the future.”

Other hearing witnesses echoed Spence’s concerns. Rear Adm. Michael McDevitt, USN (Ret.) stated in his testimony: “China is in many ways already a rival in East Asia. But being a rival is not the same as being an enemy and it would be a mistake for US policy to assume a hostile predisposition. The best orientation for US security policy would be to ensure that the United States continues to be appreciated by the vast majority of the countries of East Asia as a stabilizing presence. Emulating Teddy Roosevelt’s formulation to “speak softly, but carry a big stick” would be a good way to do that.”

Larry M. Wortzel of The Heritage Foundation also focused on the U.S. “strengthening traditional alliances based on shared values and systems.”

The most comprehensive analysis was given by Professor Arthur Waldron, who is Lauder Professor of International Relations at the University of Pennsylvania and Director of Asian Studies at the American Enterprise Institute. On the next pages is a summary of prof. Waldron’s testimony.

Prof. Arthur Waldron's testimony

Prof. Waldron started his testimony by comparing the relations between the West and China now with those between the West and the Soviet Union just after WWII: in 1947, many in the West expected that after the joint defeat of Hitler, relations between the Soviet Union and the West would blossom. It didn't happen, because the Soviet Union was a Communist dictatorship, and needed external enemies to stay in power. George Kennan's 1947 "X article" applies to China today as it applied to Russia 50 years ago..

Prof. Waldron emphasized that China is carrying out a massive military buildup not because it faces threats or dangers — it does not — but rather because it remains a communist dictatorship which needs enemies. In spite of the fact that China is a poor country, it is spending tens of billions of dollars every year on costly military programs, ranging from a manned space program to extensive nuclear warhead development to the perfection of new generations of mobile, solid-fueled ballistic missiles, to submarines to aircraft to aircraft carriers, not to mention communications, satellites, and electronics. "To what end, since China today faces no identifiable enemy?" Waldron asked.

He identified three major reasons: 1) the increasingly important role of the military in politics, 2) the need to define external and patriotic—and therefore acceptable—missions for them. One of these now is to prevent aggression by the US or Japan. Another is to recover Taiwan. And 3) the Communist party's absolute rule can only be justified by invocation of external enemies, enemies so threatening as to make plausible the postponing of any political reform until the problem is solved. He thus expects that, absent some systematic change in China, a steady level of military tension with Beijing with the real possibility of a crisis must be expected in the years ahead.

Prof. Waldron then discussed the Taiwan issue, saying that it is an issue chiefly because Beijing says it is one. "The island itself poses absolutely no threat whatsoever to China, unless we agree with Beijing that a fully functioning Chinese democracy is threatening", said Waldron. He stated that the expectation, which has been around since the 1970s that a deal was coming soon by which Taiwan settled pretty well on Beijing's terms—"one country, two systems"—has now definitively failed. Taiwan has a new president and a reinvigorated administration that will insist on sovereignty and equality.

Professor Waldron went on to say that China's big problem, is not with Taiwan, but with the fact that some in China envision an Asian order in which China somehow dominates. In order to make this happen, it is actively working to reduce US alliances in Asia. The recent Korean diplomacy, in which China clearly had a major role,

prepares the way for a campaign to end South Korea's close alliance status with the United States. That in turn will bring the Japanese alliance into doubt.

Prof. Waldron considered this deeply worrying, because the pattern is so similar to what occurred before World War II: the cutting of Japan's alliance with Britain, the substitution of a weak multilateral system, an international tilt toward China that left Japan feeling cheated — and finally, of course, Japan's catastrophic decision that, because the international community was unwilling to take her security needs seriously, therefore she had no choice but to act unilaterally.

Prof. Waldron described how China is building up a network of her own, cultivating Russia by pouring money into the floundering ex-Soviet arms industry, and receiving in return technology that greatly increases her military wherewithal. He sees an opportunistic triangulation in order to bring pressure on Washington and make the occasional million dollars from arms sales.

He then analyzed how China is pursuing hegemony over the Asia region in very much the same way Germany was pursuing its dominance over Europe, including its fascination with lightning victory, with strategems, deception, very much in the same way as Germany's "Blitzkrieg." Waldron states that China is planning hard to use this approach with Taiwan, while counting on keeping the United States out of the conflict with nuclear threats and the capability to attack US carrier task forces.

Professor Waldron concluded with a number of recommendations on what the United States should do, some of which are:

Rebalance our diplomacy. Move away from the current administration's almost obsessive focus on China to deal with other states as well. We need to strengthen our political and military ties with other democratic states, and always put our allies first.

Make the Chinese arms buildup an issue. US pressure prevents Taiwan from developing missiles, and Japan has none. But China's missile program gets a free pass. Waldron stated that the US has reportedly intervened to prevent our Korean and Japanese allies from making demarches to Beijing about their missile program. Yet, what drives the entire arms race in Asia is China's missile program.

See to it that China cannot use free world finance for military plans. China has received some three hundred billion dollars in foreign investment since the 1970s and now regularly works in foreign capital markets. There is no reason for the rest of the world to finance a Chinese military buildup.

Covering Taiwan under TMD

One of the major issues in China's threat against Taiwan is the rapid increase in the number of short-range ballistic missiles aimed at Taiwan. In the beginning of 1999, a US DOD report indicated that the number deployed at that time was between 150 and 200, and that this number was expected to increase to a level of 650 by 2005.

One of the best ways to help defend Taiwan against this increasing threat, is to bring Taiwan under the umbrella of the Theatre Missile Defense (TMD) program presently being considered by the United States. The TMD is a smaller, regional version of the National Missile Defense which is so hotly debated these days, following the mishap on 7 July 2000, when a test missile failed to separate from its booster and thus did not hit the intended target missile.

As was so eloquently stated in a 9 July 2000 editorial in the **Washington Post**, titled "*The Missile Misses*", this test failure doesn't change the underlying reason for the missile defense system. The Washington Post:

One such reason [for deployment of the TMD] was eloquently provided last week by China's Communist rulers as they argued vociferously on the other side. They didn't bother to mask their rationale: China claims a right to bomb or invade the democratic country of Taiwan, and it doesn't want anyone to stand in its way. It opposes a theater missile defense that might protect Taiwan.

And it opposes a U.S. continental defense that would reduce China's ability to threaten the United States with nuclear missiles and thus, its leaders hope, discourage America from coming to Taiwan's aid in a crisis. To listen to China's complaints is to understand one rationale for missile defense.

At around the same time, US Assistant Secretary of State for Arms Control, stated during a visit to Beijing that the United States has not ruled out that at some time in the future it will provide Taiwan with Theatre Missile Defense capabilities to protect itself against a missile attack by China ("*Taiwan may get antimissile technology*", **Washington Post**, 9 July 2000).

Taiwan Communiqué comment: *Bringing Taiwan under the TMD shield is the best way to avoid a future conflict in the Taiwan Strait. Unless the United States makes it crystal clear that it will help defend Taiwan, China will continue to threaten and intimidate the democratic island. Perpetuation of Mr. Clinton's "strategic ambiguity" will only embolden the Communist leaders in Beijing and the hardheaded generals in the PLA.*

The Israeli Phalcon AWACS sale

In our previous issue, we reported on Israel's plans to sell China at least one, and perhaps as many as eight Russian-made Ilyushin-76 AWACS planes equipped with the Israeli-designed Phalcon radar, and urged Israel to cancel the deal ("*Caught between principle and greed*", **Taiwan Communiqué** no. 91, pp. 20-22).

In the intervening two months, the deal has become a major political issue between the United States and Israel, with Congress threatening to cut funding for military aid to Israel, and the Clinton Administration – to its credit — putting significant pressure on Israel not to go ahead with the deal.

It appears likely that the matter will continue to fester unless Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak terminates the deal. At the end of June 2000, the House Appropriations Committee voiced strong objections to the deal, and endorsed a non-binding resolution calling on Israel to terminate the existing US\$ 250 million contract for the first aircraft.



The Russian Ilyushin at Tel Aviv airport, awaiting installation of the Phalcon radar

A leading Democratic member of the Committee, David Obey (D-Wisconsin) stated that Israel has until September to rectify the situation, otherwise the Congress would surely take punitive action against Israel by cutting the military aid funding.

In Israel itself, the press has started to see the seriousness of the matter, and has published editorials urging the Barak government to give up on the deal and to maintain good relations with the United States government and Congress. In an editorial on 22 June 2000, the **Ha'aretz** urged Barak to cancel the deal sooner rather than later, to avoid irrevocable damage to US-Israeli relations. The daily **Ma'ariv** expressed itself in similar vein.

On the other hand, some Israeli industry leaders were quoted in the **Washington Times** as saying that canceling the China deal would be "bad for business" since it would reduce the possibility to market the Phalcon system elsewhere, such as in Turkey, India and South Korea ("*U.S. pressure bad for business*", *Washington Times*, 3 July 2000).

Taiwan Communiqué comment: *Those people in Israel who still favor the sale of the AWACS to China still don't seem to have gotten the basic message that this sale to a repressive, Communist country that threatens its neighbors is equivalent to selling weapons to Hitler Germany.*

Israel, where is your moral standard? Where is your sense of decency? Is business profit the only thing you care about? You know very well what it is like to be a small nation threatened by belligerent neighbors. Instead of looking for financial profit, you should display solidarity with the people in Taiwan – and Tibet for that matter – instead of assisting the Chinese aggressors. Or does Israel intend to become the latest “merchant of death?”

Mr. Zhu is the joke

At the end of June 2000, Chinese Premier Zhu Rongji dismissed Taiwan's democratic presidential election as a ‘joke’ and derided the island's boisterous democracy as “corrupt.”

“If you say the president there [Taiwan] was democratically elected, I believe this is a joke,” Zhu reportedly told the Italian news agency ANSA. “In Taiwan, he only got 40 percent of the vote, he has no administrative experience and even they acknowledge that Taiwan engages in ‘black-gold politics,’” Zhu added. Below, we reprint an open letter to Mr. Zhu, written by Michael Fonte, of the Formosan Association of Public Affairs in Washington DC.

An open letter to Zhu Rongji

Well who elected you, Mr. Zhu? Maybe it is hard for you to understand anything else but ‘voting’ where an election is rigged. Taiwan happens to have a plurality voting system and 40% was more than enough for Chen Shui-bian to win the basically three-way race. By the way, Mr. Zhu, over 82% of Taiwan's eligible voters went to the polls and they overwhelmingly rejected the candidate of a KMT party that had been in power for over 50 years.

Mr. Chen won largely because he opposed the ‘black-gold’ politics of the KMT. Voters had had enough. Oh, and you played a role in Mr. Chen's victory as well. In this close race, you made many Taiwanese angry with your denunciation of Mr. Chen and your

suggestion that if the people of Taiwan were dumb enough to vote for him, they might never get a chance to vote again. Footage of your finger-wagging performance was played endlessly on the island and, instead of frightening Taiwanese voters, emboldened many to stand up to your bullying.

The votes were counted honestly. And then, *mirabile dictu*, there was a peaceful transfer of power from that KMT party to Mr. Chen's Democratic Progressive Party. Does all this scare you, Mr. Zhu? Does it raise too many nightmares about the rapid fall from power of the Communist Party in the old Soviet Union and

the possibility that you and your fellow Chinese Communist Party leaders are headed for the same dustbin of history? Is that why all your democracy activists are in jail or exile?

Good Leninist party that it was, the KMT tried jailing, intimidating and even killing those who spoke out for human rights and democracy during the 'White Terror' that gripped the island until the mid-80s. Chen Shui-bian and his fellow DPP members, as well as a host of other activists, didn't give up. The KMT finally had to relent. Is this what's eating at you, sir? Strike too close to home?

You should read U.S. policy makers' statements carefully, Mr. Zhu. Perhaps you have and that is another reason for your discomfort. For you see, the U.S. has taken full note of democratic development in Taiwan and now sees this as an integral part of its own "one China policy."

President Clinton has twice stated forcefully that the U.S. "will continue to reject the use of force as a means to resolve the Taiwan question, making absolutely clear that the issues between Beijing and Taiwan must be resolved peacefully and with the assent of the people of Taiwan."



As you may have guessed by now, Mr. Zhu, President Chen is no fool. Here's his pickup, in the 11 April 2000 **Asian Wall Street Journal**, on President Clinton's statement, "This sentence of Clinton's is extremely important. Clearly, according to all the opinion polls, Taiwanese people will not accept being a province of China, or the one country, two systems formula, or becoming a second Hong Kong. If the cross-strait problem is to be resolved with the consent of the Taiwanese people as Clinton said, then any effort to force Taiwanese people to accept the one-China principle is a very serious subject."

Chen has a constituency to report to, and he knows it. In the ASJ piece he went on to say, "If the one-China principle means that Taiwan is part of the P.R.C., or that Taiwan is a province of the P.R.C., then never mind that Chen Shui-bian couldn't accept it, the overwhelming majority of Taiwanese people also couldn't accept it. Therefore, the principles for talks or negotiations must be founded on certain common beliefs. But at the moment there aren't any. That is why I have suggested that the one-China principle be a topic for discussion, but the outcome shouldn't be decided ahead of time, or discussion precluded."

In a May 24th speech Richard Bush, chair of the American Institute in Taiwan, ran his own riff on President Clinton's statement: "*This election should also remind us all that Taiwan's democratization has in a rather profound way transformed the cross-Strait political equation. Taiwan's willingness to move forward on cross-Strait relations is no longer just a function of the views of Taiwan's top leaders; it is also a function of the views of the public at large, the press, members of the legislature, and the leaders and factions of political parties.*"

Mr. Bush added: "*The people of the island themselves will have to be convinced that any arrangements reached in cross-Strait dialogue are in their fundamental interests. And to the extent that Taiwan people interpret the actions of the Mainland side as hostile or bullying, it makes it that much harder for Taiwan's leaders to get support for cross-Strait initiatives. If, on the other hand, the people are convinced that cross-Strait arrangements are appropriate, then they will be more enduring because they enjoy broad support.*"

Democracy has its discontents, Mr. Zhu, no doubt about it. It demands accountability and can be a messy process. But protecting the right of a people to run no-accounts out of office and to have a real voice in decisions that affect them is dear to American and Taiwanese hearts. We still believe Churchill's statement, "Democracy is the worst system of government in the world, except for all the others."

Who is Elmer Fung ?

During the past months, one of the most outspoken pro-unification ideologues in Taiwan has been New Party legislator Elmer Fung. In the March 2000 Presidential election campaign he served as the running mate of New Party candidate Li Ao — who made an abysmal showing, eking out just 16,782 votes or **0.1 percent** of the total.

These days, Mr. Fung is quoted frequently in the newspapers and makes frequent trips to Beijing, where he is received at the highest levels. In fact, in the beginning of July 2000, he arrived in Beijing, heading a 10-member New Party delegation, which was scheduled to meet Vice-Premier Qian Qichen, as well as several other top officials. Sometimes, even the international press quotes Fung, and thereby give him a credibility he doesn't deserve.

Who is Mr. Fung? Interestingly, he is a long-time nemesis of president Chen Shui-bian: in 1986, he caused the imprisonment of then Taipei City Council member Chen, after he filed a libel suit against **Neo-Formosa** Magazine, where Chen served as legal advisor and director.

In 1984, **Neo-Formosa** was one of the budding *tangwai* (“outside-the-party”) magazines which opposed the one-party rule of the Kuomintang and its martial law, which had been in effect since 1949, and wasn't lifted until 1987. This was not an easy task: during the period mid-1984 until mid-1985 a record 51 out of 52 issues published by the magazine had been banned and confiscated by the secret police.

In its 19 June 1984 issue, **Neo-Formosa** had carried an article criticizing a book by the pro-KMT professor Fung Hu-hsiang (“Elmer”), titled “A Critique of New Marxism”, saying that Mr. Fung had plagiarized foreign publications, and had presented this as his own scholarly work.

In October 1984, Mr. Fung filed his libel suit against the magazine, and named three magazine executives, including now-President Chen Shui-bian and Mr. Huang Tien-fu, brother of *tangwai* leader Huang Hsin-hsieh. Interestingly, the suit came ten days after a later-leaked “thought police” meeting of high-level civilian, military and secret police officials, in which the KMT authorities decided to take a “more active” approach against the opposition press, and specifically mentioned libel suits as a possible tactic. The London-based **Index on Censorship** published a full-text translation of the minutes of the thought-police meeting in its June 1985 issue.

In January 1985, Mr. Chen and his co-defendants were sentenced in Taipei District Court to one year imprisonment and payment of NT\$ 2 million to Mr. Fung. They appealed and the case dragged on until 30 May 1986, when they were sentenced to eight months imprisonment and payment of the compensation. Interestingly, the High Court hearing the appeal refused to consider a 77-page report by the North American Taiwanese Professors' Association (NATPA), which provided substantive evidence that Mr. Fung committed extensive plagiarism in his book.

Mr. Chen went to prison in June 1986 and served the full eight months. In August 1986, he went on a hunger strike to protest the restrictions imposed on his correspondence with his family. For more information on the case, see **Taiwan Communiqué** no.s 26 and 27, August and October 1986 respectively.

***Taiwan Communiqué comment:** Mr. Elmer Fung is thus a dangerous extremist, who does not have any credibility, and whose words should carry no weight. He and his New Party have no support in Taiwan whatsoever.*

Notes

Sloppy News Reporters

It is sad to see that many of the news organizations which report on developments in and around Taiwan are so sloppy. This includes Associated Press, Reuters, Agence France Press, CNN, and on occasion the Washington Post and New York Times. Below we present a couple of recent examples, and hope these newswires will take note.

Associated Press, for instance, repeats *ad nauseam* the phrase that Taiwan "...split away from the mainland amid Civil War 50 years ago." This is factually incorrect, since Taiwan was occupied by the losing side in the Chinese Civil War 50 years ago. As Taiwan was a Japan-held colony before that time, it couldn't "split away."

Another favorite phrase of the newswires is that "*China claims Taiwan as a renegade province and has threatened to attack the island if it seeks independence.*" This is of course China's position, but it would add to the objectivity of the newswires, if they would also mention that the people on Taiwan consider their island a sovereign nation, and do not want to be ruled by Communist China. The "China will attack" ruse has for many years been a scare-tactic by the ruling Kuomintang in Taiwan, and has now started to lead a life of its own.

***Taiwan Communiqué comment:** These are not just mere nuances, but essentially different perspectives of history. The newswires have become too accustomed to their own phraseology, and need to go back and reassess how they report on these matters.*

Boycott “made-in-China”

By E. Gene Deune, MD

Assistant Professor, Johns Hopkins University

China has been vociferous and has been behaving unruly. It is China and not Taiwan which has been the aggressor in upsetting the calm in the Pacific, by not renouncing the use of force against Taiwan, by flying military planes into Taiwanese airspace, by mobilization land troops across the Taiwan Strait, and by lobbing missiles into the waters off of Taiwan (1996).

To do what it’s doing, China relies on money, primarily western capital. To make China as incapable of harming Taiwan and the Asia-Pacific region, we need to starve China of the capital it needs to build and buy its weapons and to feed its troops; This way we diminish to its ability to buy weapons and supplies.

We need to make a conscious effort not to buy anything made in China. So if you need to buy a consumer item that is “Made in China”, spend some extra time and look for a comparable item that is made elsewhere.

I know it’s difficult these days, because a lot of things are made in China. Try hard, because you will be exercising the only thing the Chinese know how to understand: no money; no power. This boycott should also apply to food items. Look carefully at those products in Asian food stores, many of them are made in China. By buying Made in China goods, you are harming the people on Taiwan, by facilitating China’s ability to coerce and frighten and possibly harm the people on Taiwan.

You can also make a difference by writing to the companies you intend to purchase things from that you disagree with the Chinese policies on human rights and on Taiwan, and tell them that you will boycott their products because they are made in China.

Speak with your pocketbook. It worked for the South Africa/Apartheid issue, let’s make it work for the China/Taiwan issue.

FROM:
TAIWAN COMMUNIQUÉ
P.O. Box 15182
CHEVY CHASE, MD 20825

Non profit org.
U.S. Postage
PAID
Bethesda, MD
Permit no. 4362

ISSN Number: 1027-3999

CONTENTS

Taiwan Communiqué no. 92
July 2000

A Profile in Courage	
<i>First Lady Wu Su-chen</i>	1
The first month in office	
<i>Inauguration: Taiwan stands up</i>	3
<i>A press conference: one month after</i>	5
<i>The "One China" confusion</i>	6
Li Thian-hok: Keeping the US engaged	7
China's military threat continues	
<i>DOD issues a new report</i>	11
<i>Arthur Waldron: China's strategic intentions</i>	13
<i>Covering Taiwan under TMD</i>	16
<i>The Israeli Phalcon AWACS sale</i>	17
Mr. Zhu is the joke	
<i>An open letter to Zhu Rongji</i>	18
Who is Elmer Fung ?	21
Notes	
<i>Sloppy newswires</i>	22
<i>Boycott "Made-in-China"</i>	23

Taiwan Communiqué supports a free, democratic, and independent Taiwan, and campaigns for full and equal membership of Taiwan in the international community, including a seat in the UN.
Please support our activities with your contributions.
Internet homepage: <http://www.taiwandc.org>

SUBSCRIPTIONS:	USA (third class bulk mail)	US\$ 21.-
	USA (first class mail)	US\$ 25.-
	Other Countries (airmail)	US\$ 30.-